

AGENDA
ONTARIO CITY COUNCIL - CITY OF ONTARIO, OREGON
Monday, May 19, 2014, 7:00 p.m., M.T.

- 1) **Call to order**
Roll Call: Norm Crume _____ Jackson Fox _____ Charlotte Fugate _____ Dan Jones _____
Larry Tuttle _____ Ron Verini _____ LeRoy Cammack _____

2) **Pledge of Allegiance**

This Agenda was posted on Wednesday, May 14, 2014, and a study session was held Thursday, May 15, 2014. Copies of the Agenda are available at the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website at www.ontariooregon.org.

3) **Motion to adopt the entire agenda**

4) **Consent Agenda:**

- A) Minutes of Meeting of May 5, 2014 1-6
B) Approval of the Bills

5) **Department Head Updates: *Thursday Only***

- 6) **Public Comments:** Citizens may address the Council on items not on the Agenda. Please limit your comment to three (3) minutes. This time limit will be enforced. Please state your name and city of residence for the record.

7) **Old Business:**

- A) Ordinance #2690-2014: Annex/Rezone UGA~RS50 (Saxton) (Final Reading) 7-12
B) Ordinance #2691-2014: Amend OMC 9-2-2, and P&Z 10A-57-95, Add 9-1-1A, Regarding Diagonal Parking (Final Reading) 13-15

8) **New Business:**

- A) Awarding 2014 Leadership Awards 16-18
B) 2014-118: Police Patrol Rifle Purchase from Public Safety Reserve Fund 19-21
C) 2014-119: Purchase Basketball Hoops for Recreation Dept 22-26
D) Ontario Aquatic Center 27-40
E) CH2MHill Proposal (Possibly on Monday night)

9) **Discussion/Informational/Hand-Out Items (*Thursday Only*)**

- A) Financial Reports for Council
B) OPD Stats - April, 2014
C) Purchase of Rifles for OPD from Public Safety Reserve Funds
D) Purchase Repeaters from Public Safety Funds
E) City Manager Update

10) **Correspondence, Comments and Ex-Officio Reports**

11) **Executive Session**

- A) ORS 192.660(2)(a) (*Thursday Only*)

12) **Adjourn**

MISSION STATEMENT: TO PROVIDE A SAFE, HEALTHFUL AND SOUND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT, PROGRESSIVELY ENHANCING OUR QUALITY OF LIFE

The City of Ontario does not discriminate in providing access to its programs, services and activities on the basis of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, political affiliation, sex, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, or any other inappropriate reason prohibited by law or policy of the state or federal government. Should a person need special accommodations or interpretation services, contact the City at 889-7684 at least one working day prior to the need for services and every reasonable effort to accommodate the need will be made. T.D.D. available by calling 889-7266.

**ONTARIO CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Monday, May 5, 2014**

The meeting of the Ontario City Council was called to order by Mayor LeRoy Cammack at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 2014, in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Council members present were LeRoy Cammack, Norm Crume, Jackson Fox, Charlotte Fugate, Dan Jones, Larry Tuttle, and Ron Verini.

Members of staff present were Tori Barnett, Larry Sullivan, Al Higinbotham, Marcy Skinner, Kari Ott, Alan Daniels, Mark Alexander, and Mary Domby. The meeting was recorded, and copies are available at City Hall.

Norm Crume led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

Charlotte Fugate moved, seconded by Ron Verini, to adopt the Agenda as amended. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

CONSENT AGENDA

Charlotte Fugate moved, seconded by Dan Jones, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended - Item A: Minutes of the Council Meeting of April 21, 2014; and Item B: Approval of the Bills. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joseph English, Ontario: stated his thanks to Marcy, Dwayne, and the city for their help on this issue so far. His problem was that he had property located in an area zone Duplex, but he felt the neighbors next to his property were violating the code, by having multiple families residing in a duplex. There were also problems with it being a drug house, a registered sex offender had been located there, and there was harassment towards his tenant. He was fixing up his rental property, and he wanted clarification. He asked that the city look into the situation at 863 SW 1st, which was his rental, and the problem properties were 833, 831, and 831 #2. He had written a letter about this problem, and he was asking that the matter be looked into.

Sherry Reeves, Ontario: stated her concerns with regard to the privatization of the Public Works Department with CH2MHill. There were articles on CH2MHill surrounding bad business dealings. She wondered if the savings would outweigh the problems. She stated CH2MHill was known to take advantage of small cities, so this should be researched more.

NEW BUSINESS

Appointment to Budget Board and Planning Commission (David Mizuta/Ralph Poole)

Tori Barnett, City Recorder/Interim City Manager, stated due to the resignation of Bob Quinn, there was currently an opening on the Budget Board. Due to the resignation of Mike Allen, there was currently an opening on the Planning Commission. Appointments to this board were made by the City Council.

To remain on track with overlapping terms of service on Board, these appointments would be to complete the existing term on record for the individual resigning. David Mizuta would complete the term of Bob Quinn (December, 2016), and Ralph Poole would complete the term of Mike Allen (December 2015).

To not appoint Mr. Mizuta would leave one vacancy on the Budget Board, and the city was nearing the time necessary to enter into Budget Hearings. The appointment of Mr. Poole would leave one vacancy still on the Planning Commission. However, it was the Council's prerogative to appoint or not appoint both Mr. Mizuta and Mr. Poole, or to direct staff to advertise for the vacancy.

Ron Verini moved, seconded by Norm Crume, to appoint David Mizuta to the Budget Board and Ralph Poole to the Planning Commission with a term of appointment coinciding with those established by ordinance. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Resolution #2014-115: Rescinding Minimum Selling Price for the Stelling Property

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated the city owned vacant industrial land known as the Stelling Property, which the city originally purchased in 1993 for \$115,000. In 2006, the Council enacted Resolution 2006-138, which declared the Stelling Property as surplus property and fixed a minimum acceptable sale price for the property of \$20,000 per acre. In 2007, a lift station was constructed on a ½ acre parcel of the property, and the city arranged to have the property divided into separate tax lots. The lift station sat on Tax Lot 6400 and should be retained by the city. The remaining Tax Lots 6401, 6402, 6403 and 6404, were vacant land which the County listed as containing 87.45 acres. Between 2009 and May 5, 2013, the land below the bench, consisting of approximately 74.72 acres, was subject to a series of option contracts with CDH Consulting, which unsuccessfully marketed it as a data center.

Since 2007 the city has done nothing substantial to establish a new market value for the Stelling Property. It remained a viable location for industrial development, because of the availability of city water and relatively low cost power.

Jack Fox moved, seconded by Larry Tuttle, that the City Council approve Resolution #2014-2015, A RESOLUTION RESCINDING THE MINIMUM SALE PRICE FOR THE STELLING PROPERTY. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Resolution #2014-116: Transfer Funds for Airport and Finance Department

Kari Ott, CPA, Finance, stated this item was to adjust the following: To transfer \$28,000 from General Fund contingency to Finance Department Contract Services to cover the contract with G.W. Wilber, CPA's; and to increase the FAA Airport Improvement Grant for \$40,676 unexpected additional funds to be received and expended in 13-14. On April 7, 2014, the Council approved the contract with G.W. Wilber, CPA's.

The budgeted appropriations in the General Fund contingency would be reduced by \$28,000 and General Fund Finance Department Contract Services would be increased by \$28,000. The budgeted amounts in FAA Airport Improvement Grant revenue and FAA Airport Improvement Grant expenditures would be increased by \$40,676.

Norm Crume moved, seconded by Jackson Fox, that the City Council adopt Resolution #2014-116, A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CONTRACTED SERVICES IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT AND TO ADJUST THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM GRANT. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Ordinance #2691-2014: Amend OMC 9-2-2-, and P&Z 10A-57-95; Add 9-1-1A, Regarding Diagonal Parking (1st Reading)

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated this proposed ordinance was to establish guidelines and procedures for implementing diagonal parking at various commercial locations in the city. Staff found that diagonal parking in certain commercial areas of the city might increase the availability of parking without causing traffic flow problems. This began as a pilot program installing diagonal parking in the streets designated as avenues in the downtown C-3 Central Commercial zone.

Currently the City Code did not deal with diagonal parking, except to authorize the City Manager to do it. Staff submitted that it would be helpful to establish guidelines to follow in creating diagonal parking areas.

Proposed Ordinance No. 2691-2014 allowed the Public Works Director to create diagonal parking areas within the city's Commercial zones, subject to certain checks and balances described in the ordinance. The City Council would not be involved, unless there was an appeal to the Council of a decision made either by the Public Works Director or the City Manager.

At its meeting on April 24, 2014, the Public Works Committee recommended that the Council enact the proposed ordinance.

Jackson Fox moved, seconded by Norm Crume, that the City Council approve a first reading by title only of Ordinance No. 2691-2014, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE SECTIONS 9-2-2 AND 10A-57-95, AND ADDING SECTION 9-3-1A REGARDING DIAGONAL PARKING. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Resolution #2014-117: Records Unanticipated Motel Occupancy Tax Revenues, Increases Appropriations, and to Install One Panic Door Close Control in Fire Department Truck Bay

Kari Ott, CPA, Finance, stated the fire department would like to install an emergency bay door close button to close all open bay doors from one location. On June 27, 2013, the Council directed staff to work toward 9-1-1 consolidation with Malheur County.

The Council approved 26.5% of Motel Occupancy Tax Revenues to be earmarked for public safety, and funds began to be allocated to the public safety reserve in January 2014. Staff was asking to appropriate these funds for expenditure.

During normal fire duties and emergency responses, bay doors were in the open position. In the past, Ontario Dispatch had the capability to close all bay doors from the dispatch center to secure the station. With the move to the Malheur County Dispatch Center, staff no longer had the capability of closing all bay doors from one location in a timely manner, providing needed station security. The fire department would like to install an emergency close button, so that staff could immediately close all open bay doors with the push of one button installed in a central location.

A cost estimate was obtained to purchase and install one Red Emergency Button, for \$1,400.00. There were currently no known funding sources for the installation of this equipment; therefore, staff was requesting to proceed with the purchase and installment of the equipment, allocating the purchase from Capital Outlay in the Public Safety Reserve.

This would increase Public Safety Reserve budgeted revenues by \$30,000 and would increase capital outlay by \$1,400 and contingency by \$28,600.

Norm Crume moved, seconded by Charlotte Fugate, that the Council adopt Resolution #2014-117: A RESOLUTION TO RECORD PUBLIC SAFETY RESERVE UNANTICIPATED MOTEL OCCUPANCY TAX REVENUES, INCREASE CONTINGENCY AND TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF AN EMERGENCY DOOR CLOSE BUTTON. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Larry Tuttle and Jackson Fox wanted to hear the presentation from Mark Alexander regarding OPD rifle replacement at the next City Council work session.

Septage Facility Proposed Contract

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated at the Thursday work session, there had been discussion about a draft contract for the septage receiving service that was being worked on. There had been an original draft that Bob Walker had sent to him, and he made revisions. During that discussion, it was suggested that because of the possible role CH2MHill might be playing in the future with respect to the administration of that contract, they should be entitled to review the proposed contract. CH2MHill did review it, and had made some comments. One from Mike Moon to

him, dated May 2nd, showed a number of bullet points that CH2MHill had concerns about with respect to the contract. The primary issue they had was with the 24-hour, seven day a week coverage that would allow septage haulers to use the facility anytime, regardless of whether or not any employee was on staff that would be monitoring the load. If there were particular points in the contract the Council wanted to discuss, he could do that, to some extent. There were a lot of technical aspects of the agreement, like with the particular effluents that were allowed or not allowed, and those came from the work done by Bob Walker. Mr. Daniels might be able to address those pieces.

Mayor Cammack stated CH2MHill had some legitimate concerns.

Alan Daniels, Public Works Director, stated a major concern was the PH of loads, but there was a continuous in-line PH monitor, so they would know if something was out of whack that was discharged. Also, there was a camera system which would monitor the area, which was in this year's CIPs. Then, with staffing levels, there wasn't someone at a counter out there at the WWTP, at all times, to let people in. At some other sites, there had been some issues and they were raising their rates. He believed Boise was increasing to 13¢ a gallon. The system was designed to be accessible at all times, which was the reason for the card-lock and designated keys, and that was probably where the revenue would be generated. But, there were issues that went beyond physically running the facility.

Mayor Cammack stated there was an in-line PH meter, but if there was no one there to watch it, what would occur?

Mr. Daniels stated it was recorded.

Mayor Cammack stated if a hauler came in with a load of contaminate that should not be in the system...

Mr. Daniels stated the only way to know would be after the fact.

Mayor Cammack stated that could potentially be a disaster.

Mr. Daniels agreed. He wasn't an expert, but he didn't know how they would know what would be in the truckload, except for testing, but you couldn't test every load coming in prior to dumping, for all the things that could be a problem. One issue could be if someone picked up industrial waste. He believed that was probably CH2MHill's primary concern. If a major contaminate was put in the system, it could shut down the entire lagoon system.

Councilor Jones stated this came from the debate at the beginning. The city had spent a lot of money for this automated system, and that couldn't be monitored. One hauler could destroy the entire lagoon.

Mayor Cammack asked if the outlet was above or below the surface.

Mr. Daniels stated it went right into the main receiving...

Mayor Cammack asked if it could be seen, as it was leaving the truck.

Mr. Daniels stated no, not really.

Mayor Cammack stated regarding the PH problem, if someone was there watching it, at least they'd have that piece dealt with, but that wouldn't take care of all of it.

Mr. Daniels agreed, but it probably wouldn't hit all the major concerns.

Councilor Crume asked about an alarm on the system, to shut down the PH meter.

Mr. Daniels stated that could probably be done. He didn't know if PH was going to be a major problem, but it could be one of the indicators. This was why CH2MHill was balking on this, because one wrong load could cause major problems.

Councilor Jones stated they needed to respect the concerns of CH2MHill.

Councilor Fugate asked what could be done. If they couldn't see what was being dumped, what could they do?

Mr. Daniels wasn't sure. Many of the other facilities were not 24-hour; they required someone on site.

Councilor Fugate stated if they were standing there watching it come in, they still wouldn't know what it was.

Mr. Daniels stated that was correct. It went from a closed truck to a pipe, through a fitting.

Councilor Jones stated there was less of a chance of, if the vehicles were being inspected, a visual inspection alone would help reduce the risk of contamination. That was one safeguard, having the person there. He had been in favor of visually inspecting the loads from the beginning. He was very concerned about what could happen out there. Boise had already shut down. The only two facilities right now were Nampa and Caldwell, and soon to be Ontario. The phone was already ringing.

Mr. Daniels stated one thing to consider would be to allow limited access to just known haulers. The city could be very restrictive about after-hours usage. One major event, with a lot of port-a-potties in use, with only a 2,000 truck, that hauler would need service. There might be a way to arrive at a compromise for the few local "knows" in the area, with an individual contract with each.

Councilor Fox asked about bonding.

Mr. Sullivan stated they would have to have a large liability insurance policy. The bonding wasn't as much, around \$15K.

Councilor Fox stated the way the facility was designed; it would hit the first pond. If it contaminated that, was there enough money to make them dredge that out? Was the system even designed to do that?

Mr. Daniels stated it would depend. It could be really bad.

Mr. Sullivan stated the liability was \$1M.

Councilor Tuttle asked what they were talking about, regarding dollars and cents. What did "really bad" mean?

Mr. Daniels stated if they closed down certain ponds, could the city continue to put waste into it, and what would that do the city residents, during the time the main pond was down.

Councilor Fox confirmed it was the first pond, no matter what.

Mr. Daniels stated that was correct. He believed what was done in Payette, was it was taken to a large truck, and then the truck was probably tested before going to the Nampa facility.

Councilor Fox asked if the Mayor was asking for action.

Mayor Cammack stated no, it was just up for discussion.

Councilor Fox recommended sending it to the Public Works Committee.

Mayor Cammack stated he believed it was going to require some technical assistance.

Councilor Jones stated this was one of the reasons that CH2MHill was important to the city, with their expertise on another division of Public Works, it warranted their value. To him, with this situation, he would rely on their expertise.

Councilor Crume stated it was obvious they brought out some things that were not presented to the Council before. The idea of the 24-hour service was for convenience and money, but he didn't recall hearing of any possibility of any of these other issues being brought forward.

Mr. Daniels stated he believed in order to be a functional 24-hour facility they would need a separate holding prior to entering the main pond.

Councilor Crume stated even during the day, if the only monitoring was for PH that still didn't show what was in the load.

Mr. Daniels stated there was also the risk of things going through the pipes and into the lift stations. There was always some degree of risk. Some outfits would actually dump directly into a manhole.

Mayor Cammack asked that this item be placed on the next Public Works Committee agenda.

CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS, AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

- ✓ Councilor Fugate asked if the problem with Channel 11 had been looked into.

Ms. Barnett stated they were working with Cable One. It was not a city or 8C issue.

- ✓ Councilor Fox asked for the cost accounting for the septage receiving plans up to date. Also, he wanted it known that the city was not discussing privatization of services.

ADJOURN

Norm Crume moved, seconded by Ron Verini, that the meeting be adjourned. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fox-yes; Fugate-yes; Jones-yes; Tuttle-yes; Verini-yes; Cammack-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder

AGENDA REPORT – OLD BUSINESS
May 19, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Marcy Skinner, Planning & Zoning Technician

THROUGH: Tori Barnett, MMC, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: ORDINANCE #2690-2014: AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING INTO THE CITY OF ONTARIO 0.24 ACRES LOCATED AT 851 N VERDE DRIVE, ASSIGNING CITY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RS-50) ZONING ON SECOND AND FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY

DATE: May 12, 2014

SUMMARY:

Attached are the following documents:

- Ordinance #2690-2014 (with attached legal description and map)

A request for Annexation and Zoning of City owned tax lot 2200, Assessor's Map 18S4705AA, totaling 0.24 acres. The property is currently zoned Urban Growth Area Residential and will be rezoned to City Single Family Residential (RS-50). This is a Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map amendment on Second and Final Reading by Title Only.

BACKGROUND:

November 8, 2013 City Council approved a request for Special Permission to Connect to Sanitary Sewer.

March 10, 2014 Planning Commission recommended to approve the request for Annexation and Zoning from Urban Growth Area (UGA) to City Single Family Residential (RS-50) zone.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of Ordinance #2690-2014.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move that the City Council adopt Ordinance #2690-2014, AN ORDINANCE PROCLAIMING THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF ONTARIO; AND WITHDRAWING SAID TERRITORY FROM THE ONTARIO RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT; AND WITHDRAWING SAID TERRITORY FROM THE ONTARIO RURAL ROAD ASSESSMENT DISTRICT; THE PROPERTY IS ADDRESSED AS 851 N VERDE DRIVE; WITHIN THE ASSESSORS MAP 18S4705AA, TAX LOT 2200, INCLUDING 0.24 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND AND THE ADJOINING STREET, N VERDE DRIVE, AND ASSIGNING CITY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, RS-50, ZONING, on Second and Final Reading by Title Only.

ORDINANCE NO. 2690-2014

AN ORDINANCE PROCLAIMING THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN TERRITORY TO THE CITY OF ONTARIO; AND WITHDRAWING SAID TERRITORY FROM THE ONTARIO RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT; AND WITHDRAWING SAID TERRITORY FROM THE ONTARIO RURAL ROAD ASSESSMENT DISTRICT; THE PROPERTY IS ADDRESSED AS 851 N VERDE DRIVE; WITHIN THE ASSESSORS MAP 18S4705AA, TAX LOT 2200, INCLUDING 0.24 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND AND THE ADJOINING STREET, N VERDE DRIVE, AND ASSIGNING CITY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, RS-50, ZONING

WHEREAS: Land Use Action **2014-01-01AZ** filed by the City of Ontario is to annex the property zone Urban Growth Area Residential, Assessors Map 18S4705AA, Tax Lot 2200; and

WHEREAS: The City has prepared annexation documentation found in Planning File 2014-01-01AZ; and

WHEREAS: The City approved the Request For Special Permission To Connect To Sanitary Sewer on November 18, 2013; and

WHEREAS: Hearings were held before the Ontario Planning Commission on March 10, 2014 after legal notice of this hearing was given to affected property owners, affected agencies; and to the local newspaper and electronic media, and otherwise as required by Section 10B-05-05 and Chapters 10B-03 and 10B-45 of the Ontario Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS: The affected property owners have signed consents to annexation by the City of Ontario as found in Planning File 2014-01-01AZ; and

WHEREAS: At the conclusion of the April 7, 2014 public hearing, the City Council, based upon the Planning Commission's favorable recommendation and upon a motion duly made and seconded, voted to approve the request as set forth above based on decision criteria, findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in this order and exhibits attached hereto by this reference.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

- 1) The City Council adopts the findings in the Planning Commission Staff Report, testimony received, and the findings made by the Planning Commission as the basis for this decision; and
- 2) The City Council accepts the Planning Commission's concluding recommendation on the subject proposal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The burden of proof is upon the applicant in proving the proposal fully complies with applicable Code criteria, Oregon State Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules.
2. The City Council finds that above-mentioned exhibits and evidence and testimony presented at the hearings, address relevant comprehensive plan policies, standards of the Municipal Code, Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Revised Statute and Oregon Administrative Rules sufficiently to support the burden of proof needed to approve the proposed amendment.

THE CITY OF ONTARIO ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

The property particularly described in Exhibit 1 (full tax lot description for entire area, attached) and identified in Exhibit 2 (Map of subject property, attached), and more are hereby annexed to the City of Ontario and are zoned as Single Family Residential (RS-50) as described in Chapter 10A-11 of the Ontario City Code.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The ordinance shall become effective 30 days from the date of passage.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council of the City of Ontario this ____ day of _____, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

APPROVED by the Mayor this ____ day of _____, 2014.

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder

EXHIBIT _____.

Annexation Description of Lands to
The
CITY OF ONTARIO
by
SAXTON LIVING TRUST

A Parcel of land in the E1/2NE1/4NE1/4 of Section 5, Twp. 18 S., R. 47 E. W.M., Malheur County, Oregon being;

All that land as described as PARCEL "B" in that certain deed recorded under Instrument No. 92-4028 together with all that westerly portion of Verde Drive adjacent there to, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast Corner of Sec. 5;
thence South along the Section line, 1206 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;
thence West 132 feet;
thence North 52.5 feet;
thence West 12 feet;
thence North 47.5 feet;
thence East 144 feet;
thence South 100 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

After Recording Return to:

Tori Barnett, City Recorder
Ontario City Hall
444 SW 4th Ave
Ontario, OR 97914

MALHEUR COUNTY CONSENT TO RIGHT-OF-WAY ANNEXATION

1. In accordance with ORS 222.170 it is hereby represented and stated that Malheur County has jurisdiction over the portion of North Verde Drive north of the city limits of the City of Ontario as identified on the Map attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and as more particularly described in Exhibit 2.
2. Malheur County irrevocably consents to annexation of the foregoing rights-of-way by the City of Ontario without an election being held within the territory to be annexed. This irrevocable consent to annexation is an instrument affecting the title and possession of the real property described in Exhibit 2.
3. All terms and conditions herein imposed shall run with the land and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the successors in interest of Malheur County.
4. The terms of this consent were approved by the Malheur County Court on _____, 2014.

MALHEUR COUNTY

By:

Dan Joyce, Malheur County Judge

Attest:

Deborah R. Delong, Malheur County Clerk
By: _____, Deputy

AGENDA REPORT – OLD BUSINESS

May 19, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Larry Sullivan, City Attorney

THROUGH: Tori Barnett, MMC, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: ORDINANCE NO. 2691-2014: ORDINANCE NO. 2691-2014: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE SECTIONS 9-2-2 AND 10A-57-95, AND ADDING SECTION 9-3-1A REGARDING DIAGONAL PARKING - FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY

DATE: May 12, 2014

SUMMARY:

Attached is the following document:

- Ordinance No. 2691-2014

PRIOR COUNCIL ACTION:

05/05/2014 City Council approved the first reading of Ordinance #2691-2014.

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of proposed Ordinance No. 2691-2014 is to establish guidelines and procedures for implementing diagonal parking at various commercial locations in the city. Currently, City Code does not deal with diagonal parking, except to authorize the City Manager to do it. Staff submits that it would be helpful to establish guidelines to follow in creating diagonal parking areas.

Proposed Ordinance No. 2691-2014 allows the Public Works Director to create diagonal parking areas within the City's Commercial zones, subject to certain checks and balances described in the ordinance. The City Council would not be involved, unless there was an appeal to the Council of a decision made either by the Public Works Director or the City Manager.

At its meeting on April 24, 2014, the Public Works Committee recommended approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Council approve the final reading of Ordinance No. 2691-2014.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move the City Council approve Ordinance No. 2691-2014, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE SECTIONS 9-2-2 AND 10A-57-95, AND ADDING SECTION 9-3-1A REGARDING DIAGONAL PARKING on Second and Final Reading by Title Only.

ORDINANCE NO. 2691-2014

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE SECTIONS 9-2-2
AND 10A-57-95, AND ADDING SECTION 9-3-1A
REGARDING DIAGONAL PARKING**

- WHEREAS,** City Code Section 9-2-2 authorizes the City Manager to designate diagonal parking areas without creating a procedure for determining whether diagonal parking is appropriate on certain streets; and
- WHEREAS,** City staff started a pilot program installing diagonal parking in the streets designated as avenues in the downtown C-3 Central Commercial zone and has found that there has not been an increase in accidents and having more parking available has helped traffic flow considerably; and
- WHEREAS,** The City Council finds a need to have more available diagonal parking in certain areas, subject to certain regulations to promote public safety.

NOW THEREFORE, the Common Council for the City of Ontario ordains as follows:

Section 1. Section 9-2-2 of the Ontario City Code is amended by adding those portions that are underlined and by deleting those portions that are stricken:

9-2-2 Duties Of City Manager

The City Manager or his designee shall exercise the following duties:

- (A) Implement the ordinances, resolutions and motions of the Council and his own orders by installing traffic-control devices. Such installations shall be based on the standards contained in the Oregon Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways.
- (B) Establish, maintain, remove or alter the following classes of traffic controls:
1. Crosswalks, safety zones, and traffic lanes.
 2. Intersection channelization and areas where drivers of vehicles shall not make right, left, or U-turns, and the time when the prohibition applies.
 3. Parking areas and time limitations, ~~including the form of permissible parking, parallel or diagonal.~~
 4. The form of permissible parking, parallel or diagonal. Diagonal parking may be implemented only in compliance with Section 9-3-1A of the City Code.
- (C) Issue oversize or overweight vehicle permits.

Section 2. The following Section 9-3-1A is hereby added to Title 9, Chapter 3 of the Ontario City Code:

9-3-1A Diagonal Parking

With the approval of the City Manager, the Public Works Director may implement a diagonal parking plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Public Works Director shall specify the size and layout of all diagonal parking spaces.
2. Diagonal parking shall be allowed in Commercial zones only.
3. Diagonal parking shall not be allowed on streets which are designated by the City as minor collectors, major collectors, minor arterials, principal arterials and State highways.
4. Diagonal parking shall be allowed only on streets in which the minimum width is 52 feet.
5. Diagonal parking shall be allowed only on one side of the street in any one block.
6. Diagonal parking in a C-3 zone on any City block along South Oregon Street shall be allowed only with the written consent of a majority of the property owners, by front footage, on both sides of the street on that block.
7. The Public Works Director shall obtain the approval of the Police Chief, the Fire Chief and the affirmative recommendation of the Public Works Committee before implementing any diagonal parking plan.
8. The City Manager retains the authority to determine that diagonal parking at a particular location poses a safety risk, and may either eliminate diagonal parking or impose additional diagonal parking restrictions at that location.
9. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Public Works Director or City Manager hereunder shall have the right to request review by the City Council. The decision of the City Council shall be final.

Section 3. Section 10A-57-95 of the Ontario City Code is amended by adding those portions that are underlined:

10A-57-95 Developments required to provide more than three parking spaces shall not have backing or maneuvering movements occurring within a public street other than an alley. This does not restrict the City from implementing diagonal parking as permitted under the City Code.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Common Council of the City of Ontario this ____ day of _____, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES:
NAYS:
ABSENT:

APPROVED by the Mayor this ____ day of _____, 2014.

ATTEST:

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder

AGENDA REPORT

May 19, 2012

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Tori Barnett, MMC, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP AWARD - 2014

DATE: May 9, 2012

SUMMARY:

Attached are the following documents:

- Certificate: Vanesse Chew
- Certificate: Taylor Kemble

The City of Ontario developed the City Government Award for Excellence in Leadership in 1998, with the first award being presented in May, 1999. This award was established to recognize student leaders for outstanding service to school and community. Usually, each awardee receives a certificate, along with a \$500 stipend for use towards books, housing, or tuition. In 2014, two additional donations were received from businesses in the area. CK3, LLC, of Ontario, Oregon, donated an additional \$250, and Anderson-Perry & Associates, Inc., of La Grande, Oregon, donated \$750. This enabled the city the opportunity to award two grants, each for \$750.

To qualify for this award, the applicant must be a member of good standing in the senior class at Ontario High School; be a student with post-graduation plans for schooling or career development; and be a student who has demonstrated leadership in a variety of settings. The students must complete an application, which outlines their accomplishments, as well as complete an essay outlining why they feel they should receive the award. Also, at least one letter of recommendation must also accompany the application.

Representatives from the City staff (Tori Barnett), the City Council (Charlotte Fugate), and an OHS staff member (Jon Kilzer) reviewed the applications and selected the most deserving recipients. All applications submitted this year were from outstanding students. There are always those who seem to stand out, and this year was no exception. This year's recipients represent involvement within the community and school, and exemplify what this City should see from its high school graduates.

The 2014 Excellence in Leadership Awards recipients are Vanesse Chew and Taylor Kemble.

**Ontario City Government Award for
Excellence in Leadership
2013-2014**

Vanesse Chew

Awarded by the City of Ontario
and
CK3, LLC.
May 2014

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

**Ontario City Government Award for
Excellence in Leadership
2013-2014**

Taylor Kemble

Awarded by the City of Ontario
and
Anderson-Perry & Associates, Inc.
May 2014

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

AGENDA REPORT

May 19, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Mark Alexander, Police Chief

THROUGH: Tori Barnett, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION NO. 2014-118: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF POLICE PATROL RIFLES FROM PUBLIC SAFETY RESERVE FUND

DATE: May 12, 2014

SUMMARY:

The Police Department would like to purchase eight (8) patrol rifles in order to increase safety and reduce liability. Funding for the purchase is proposed to come from the Public Safety Reserve Fund.

Attached is the following document:

- Resolution 2014-118

PREVIOUS COUNCIL ACTION:

The Council approved allocating 26.5% of Motel Occupancy Tax to a Public Safety Fund in October 2013.

BACKGROUND:

Patrol rifles have become a recognized tool for law enforcement with the increase of school and other active shooter events. The need to transition to patrol rifles resulted from suspects carrying and using similar weapons with increased firepower. Active shooter events occur within the proximity of innocent victims, eliminating the effective use of the patrol shotgun, which had been a common tool for law enforcement for decades. The patrol rifle can be deployed quickly, officers can carry high capacity ammunition and they are proven to be accurate at longer distances.

The Ontario Police Department currently has ten (10) patrol rifles that are shared among eighteen (18) officers. We have officers sharing patrol rifles that are of different body size, mechanics, have different vision and even left and right handed shooters.

Electronic optics has become the recognized standard for sighting systems on patrol rifles. Electronic sights increase officer safety, accuracy and reduce liability. Electronic sights should be tailored to an individual operator, as the before-mentioned differences between officers can affect sight-in differences.

The proposed purchase of additional patrol rifles for individual assignment has been recently recognized, but disregarded due to budgetary restraints in the past two budget sessions.

The Police Department proposed a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) for the purchase of eight patrol rifles in the amount of \$14,300. During a preliminary budget review, it was realized this purchase might qualify through the Public Safety Reserve Fund. This fund comes from Motel Occupancy Tax and is not through the General Fund, as proposed by a CIP. The Public Safety Reserve Fund will continue to replenish itself as well.

ALTERNATIVE:

The Council could decline the purchase. The Council could also decline the purchase through the Public Safety Reserve Fund and leave the proposal as a CIP for budget review.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

\$14,300 would be taken from the Public Safety Reserve Fund for the purchase of eight (8) patrol rifles.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Resolution 2014-118.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move that the Council adopt Resolution 2014-118: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF POLICE PATROL RIFLES FROM PUBLIC SAFETY RESERVE FUND.

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-118
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF POLICE PATROL RIFLES FROM
PUBLIC SAFETY RESERVE FUND

WHEREAS, the Council approved allocating 26.5% of Motel Occupancy Tax to a Public Safety Reserve; and

WHEREAS, the Police Department would like to purchase patrol rifles in order to increase safety and reduce liability; and

WHEREAS, a resolution is necessary to appropriate funds for the expenditure from Contingency within the Public Safety Reserve Fund.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Ontario City Council to approve the following adjustments to the 2013-2014 budget:

| Line Item | Item Description | FY 13-14 Budget | Amount of Change | Adjusted Budget |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| RESERVE FUND-PUBLIC SAFETY | | | | |
| 055-131-871000 | Contingency | \$28,600 | \$14,300 | \$14,300 |
| 055-131-712100 | Equipment Replacement | \$1,400 | \$14,300 | \$15,700 |

Effective Date: Upon adoption

Passed and adopted by the Ontario City Council this _____ day of _____ 2014.

Ayes:

Nays:

Absent:

Approved by the Mayor this _____ day of _____ 2014.

 LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

ATTEST:

 Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder

AGENDA REPORT
May 19, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Debbie Jeffries, Recreation Supervisor

THROUGH: Tori Barnett, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION #2014-119: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COST SHARING OF DROP DOWN BASKETBALL HOOPS WITH FOUR RIVERS COMMUNITY SCHOOL, ONTARIO, OREGON

DATE: May 12, 2014

SUMMARY:

Attached are the following documents:

- Price Quotes
- Resolution #2014-119

The Ontario Recreation Department would like to share the cost of the drop down basketball hoops and installation at the new facility being built at the Four Rivers Community School. We would be paying for half the cost of the baskets and installation. The cost to the Ontario Recreation Department would be \$4,249.00. Sharing costs in these basketball hoops insures the Ontario Recreation Department would have access to the new facility to hold a portion of our youth basketball league in. This new facility would have up-to-date drop down baskets for us to utilize during the season for our K – 3rd grade teams. This would enhance and build our program. The baskets would be safe for the coaches to adjust. Currently we have a paid employee at each practice and game to put baskets up, take them down and make sure they stay in place during the time used. This would save the Recreation Department approximately \$ 580.00 per season that we pay in labor to have the baskets put up and down at each practice date and games. We would be using the facility for 7 weeks a year. In addition to half of the cost of the basketball hoops and installation we would pay \$ 100.00 per season to cover janitorial and electricity cost to Four Rivers Community School.

BACKGROUND:

The Ontario Recreation Department currently uses “homemade” drop down baskets that we have had for the past 15+ years. Each time that we use the baskets we have to load them and take them to the gym we are using and pack them up a ladder and hook them on an existing hoop. We have to use several anchoring devices to make sure the baskets are safe and will stay in place. Having access to an additional gym for our program would relieve some of the pressure that is put on the gyms we currently use.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Ontario Recreation Department did not budget for this expense and would like for the Council to use money from a fund other than the Ontario Recreation Department's 2013-14 budget. We recommend that money be transferred from General Fund operating contingency.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the City Council adopt Resolution 2014-119.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I MOVE THAT THE COUNCIL ADOPT RESOLUTION 2014-119: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COST SHARING OF DROP DOWN BASKETBALL HOOPS WITH FOUR RIVERS COMMUNITY SCHOOL, ONTARIO, OREGON.

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-119

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COST SHARING OF DROP DOWN BASKETBALL HOOPS WITH FOUR RIVERS COMMUNITY SCHOOL, ONTARIO, OREGON

WHEREAS, the Ontario Recreation Department wishes to have access to the drop down basketball hoops that will be installed at the new facility being built at the Four Rivers Community School; and

WHEREAS, the Ontario Recreation Department would like to share the cost of the drop down basketball hoops; and

WHEREAS, a resolution is necessary to appropriate funds for the expenditure from operating contingency within the General Fund.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Ontario City Council to approve the following adjustments to the 2013-2014 budget:

| Line Item | Item Description | FY 13-14 Budget | Amount of Change | Adjusted Budget |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| GENERAL FUND | | | | |
| 001-004-871000 | Operating Contingency | \$1,450,449 | (\$4,249) | \$1,446,200 |
| 001-025-613500 | General Sup & Maint | \$ 7,440 | \$4,249 | \$ 11,689 |

Effective Date: Upon adoption

Passed and adopted by the Ontario City Council this _____ day of _____ 2014.

Ayes:

Nays:

Absent:

Approved by the Mayor this _____ day of _____ 2014.

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder



5970 W. Dannon Way
 West Jordan, UT 84081-6203
 801-280-4000 800-575-3626
 801-280-4040 fax
 sales@adplemco.com

QUOTE NO: 39946 REV

CUSTOMER: HOL01

SECTION:

TO:
 HOLCOMB CONSTRUCTION
 404 NORTH 5TH STREET

JOB NAME:
 FOUR RIVERS COMMUNITY CENTER

NYSSA, OR 97913

ATTN: BRETT
 PHONE: 541-372-3806
 FAX: 541-372-5621

QUOTED LEADTIME: 30 DAYS
 QUOTE EXPIRES ON: 5/5/2014

This material is an add/deduct for alternate # _____

| DATE | SHIP VIA | TERMS |
|----------|--------------|------------------------|
| 3/5/2014 | OLD DOMINION | NET 30 FREIGHT PREPAID |

| QTY | DESCRIPTION | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL |
|-----|---|------------|-------|
| 2 | 1325 BASKETBALL BACKSTOP FORWARD FOLD FRONT BRACED UNIT INCLUDES: 150K MOTOR HOIST 64 GLASS BACKBOARD 42" X 72" 105 BOLT ON CUSHION EDGE PAD 25 BREAKAWAY GOAL 125M MANUAL HEIGHT ADJUSTER | | |
| 1 | FREIGHT-OUT ADP | | |

TOTAL: \$5,998.00

SEE EXCLUSIONS & NOTES BELOW OR ON NEXT PAGE

Bid is for ADP Lemco Inc. products only, subject to architect's approval.
 Ship date is to be scheduled 4-6 weeks after purchase order
 and all approved documents are received by ADP Lemco Inc.
 All funds are U.S. Dollars.

Contractor Licence: OREGON - 190571

Addenda <NONE> noted, all other addenda excluded.

EXCLUSIONS:

1. SALES AND USE TAX
2. FIELD DIMENSIONS (TO BE PROVIDED BY CONTRACTOR)
3. INSTALLATION (IF INSTALLATION IS WANTED ADD \$2,500)

From: Raeshelle Meyer <Raeshelle@4riverscs.org>
To: "debbie.jeffries@ontariooregon.org" <debbie.jeffries@ontariooregon.org>
Date: 4/21/2014 8:52 AM
Subject: installation

Hi Debbie! The install price for the backboards is \$2500.00 Thank you!

Raeshelle Meyer Ed.S.
Director of Student Services
Four Rivers Community School
2449 SW 4th Ave
Ontario, OR 97914
www.4riverscs.org<<http://www.4riverscs.org>>
1.541.889.3715

AGENDA REPORT

May 5, 2014

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Brad Howlett, Facilities Manager

THROUGH: Tori Barnett, Interim City Manager

SUBJECT: AQUATIC CENTER COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION—STAFF ANALYSIS

DATE: May 12, 2014

SUMMARY:

Attached is the following document:

- Revenue Growth Potential Study dated October 28, 2013

This is a financial and operational summary of the Aquatic Center model proposed by the Aquatic Center Committee at the April 21, 2014 Council Meeting. Mayor Cammack also asked staff to provide at least one alternate Aquatic Center proposal for council's consideration.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL ACTION:

The Ontario Aquatic Center closed on September 7, 2013 due to deteriorated building systems and numerous code violations. Staff has provided reports and discussion items to Council on the following dates:

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| August 13, 2013 | Preliminary Summary Report |
| October 28, 2013 | Revenue Growth Potential Study |
| December 2, 2013 | Aquatic Center Follow-up |
| December 30, 2013: | Follow-up—Pendleton Site Visit |

City Council formed the Aquatic Center Committee in January 2014 to answer two questions: "What should the aquatic center look like", and "how should it be funded?" The Committee Chairman delivered the Committee's answers on April 21, 2014, and recommended a \$7.4million renovation/expansion, which was to be funded by an imposed 1% sales tax.

SECTION 1: CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The Aquatic Center Committee recommended a facility which included renovating the City's existing facility, expanding the dry land fitness area, adding an additional natatorium to house an indoor splash park and play features, and adding an outdoor splash park for seasonal use. The total cost to create this facility was estimated at \$7,464,450. This cost was estimated using benchmarks

compiled from past aquatic center renovation bids, cost data provided by Hutchinson Smith Architects (HSA), and historical cost data from the city's Public Works Department. It was determined that benchmarks were the best method to estimate costs since more precise cost data requires detailed architectural plans. The construction benchmarks used by the committee are listed below:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| General construction | \$175/ft2 |
| Bathroom/locker room construction | \$200/ft2 |
| Splash park construction | \$60/ft2 |
| Swimming pool construction | \$278/ft2 |
| Parking lot | \$2,000/stall |

Using these benchmarks, the cost for the Committee's proposed facility breaks down as follows:

| Aspect | Cost | Benchmark | Sq Ft |
|---|--------------------|----------------|--------|
| Renovate existing facility | \$2,300,000 | Bid \$128/SqFt | 17,933 |
| TOTAL EXISTING FOOTPRINT | \$2,300,000 | | |
| Add natatorium (shell) | \$2,205,000 | \$175/SqFt | 12,600 |
| Add indoor pool | \$1,181,500 | \$278/SqFt | 4,250 |
| Spray/water park indoor | \$120,000 | \$60/SqFt | 2,000 |
| Additional indoor equipment for existing pool | \$20,000 | Allowance | |
| Replace lane lines/ starting blocks | \$10,000 | Allowance | |
| Bathrooms/lockers for new pool | \$307,000 | \$200/SqFt | 1,535 |
| TOTAL ADD'L NATATORIUM | \$3,843,500 | | |
| Expand dry land | \$262,500 | | 1,500 |
| Dry Land Bathrooms | \$72,000 | | 360 |
| TOTAL DRY LAND EXPANSION | \$334,500 | | |
| Spray/water park outdoor | \$660,000 | \$60/SqFt | 11,000 |
| Concessions | \$26,250 | \$175/SqFt | 150 |
| Covered patio area | \$10,000 | Allowance | |
| Lockers | \$10,000 | Allowance | |
| Bathroom | \$60,000 | | 300 |
| TOTAL OUTDOOR PARK | \$766,250 | | |
| Additional parking (36 stalls) | \$72,000 | \$2,000/stall | |
| TOTAL PARKING LOT EXPANSION | \$72,000 | | |
| Allowance for architectural design | \$100,000 | | |
| *GRAND TOTAL | \$7,416,250 | | |

*Staff found an error in calculations in the committee's report, hence the -\$48,200 difference.

SECTION 2-A: OPERATING COSTS AND REVENUES-COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED MODEL

Per component, operating costs and revenues have been projected as noted in this section. These costs are largely based upon the Revenue Growth Potential Study submitted by staff in October 2013. Aspects which were not covered in the Revenue Growth Potential Study include the indoor splash park/pool and the associated locker rooms, and concessions. See the chart below for cost and revenue projections for each component.

| Annual Operational Impact | Construction estimate | Profit/loss per aspect | Operating cost | Projected revenues | Subsidy or profit | Payback Period |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Renovate existing footprint (dry land lease not included) | (\$2,300,000) | | (\$350,000) | \$274,311 | (\$75,689) | None |
| *RGPS median minus splash park (\$60,136) and dry land lease | | \$126,599 | | | | |
| **Revenue baseline | | \$147,712 | | | | |
| Add natatorium with indoor splash park (adds 24 parking stalls) | (\$3,891,500) | | (\$126,561) | \$52,000 | (\$74,561) | None |
| Additional annual energy costs | | (\$75,740) | | | | |
| Additional staff=1/day | | (\$40,821) | | | | |
| Additional maintenance/capital reserve costs | | (\$10,000) | | | | |
| Concessions | | \$2,000 | | | | |
| Admittance growth (up 180 annual passes) | | \$50,000 | | | | |
| Dry land expansion | (\$334,500) | | (\$2,079) | \$42,120 | \$40,041 | 8.35yrs |
| Lease arrangement estimate | | \$42,120 | | | | |
| Increased utility cost | | (\$2,079) | | | | |
| Outdoor Splash Park (adds 12 parking stalls) | (\$790,250) | | (\$2,000) | \$62,136 | \$60,136 | 13.14yrs |
| Concessions | | \$2,000 | | | | |
| Admittance growth (RGPS median) | | \$60,136 | | | | |
| Increased utility cost | | (\$2,000) | | | | |
| COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TOTAL (100K for design added) | (\$7,416,250) | | (\$480,640) | \$430,567 | (\$50,073) | None |

*This factor is taken from the Revenue Growth Potential Study as the mid-range revenue growth, less the lease arrangements amount.

**Revenue baseline is \$147,712 per year, and is based on the historic 7yr revenue average.

The above chart breaks down the Aquatic Center Committee’s recommendation, but can also be used to examine the value of individual components of the recommended facility. The numbers above refer in large part to the Revenue Growth Potential Study, but also refer to industry energy cost benchmarks and to Oregon code in regards to lifeguard staffing.

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Energy \$/SqFt/yr, Natatorium | \$5/SqFt/yr |
| Energy \$/SqFt/yr, Dry space | \$1.40/SqFt/yr |
| Lifeguards | 1/40 patrons, or 10/20 second rule |

SECTION 2-B: OPERATING COSTS AND REVENUES-ALTERNATE MODEL

By request, staff has identified an alternative model for the Council’s consideration. This option incorporates many of the components that the Aquatic Center Committee deemed as being valuable, but eliminates the most costly construction cost and operating cost elements. The alternate model also allows for growing the facility in to the committee’s recommended facility at a later date. The

lower construction cost might remove some challenges of funding the project while retaining much of the value the Committee was looking for in the aquatic center. The lower operating costs would reduce recurring annual strain on the general fund. The operating projections show that eliminating these items removes the lowest income-generating elements of the model, so as to only remove the smallest element of revenue generation, and moves the operation closer to a zero dollar subsidy or possibly in to a self-sufficient operation.

The alternate model looks like this:

| Annual Operational Impact | Construction estimate | Profit/loss per aspect | Operating cost | Projected revenues | Subsidy or profit | Payback Period |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Renovate existing footprint (dry land lease not included) | (\$2,300,000) | | (\$350,000) | \$274,311 | (\$75,689) | None |
| *RGPS median minus splash park (\$60,136) and dry land lease | | \$126,599 | | | | |
| **Revenue baseline | | \$147,712 | | | | |
| Dry land expansion | (\$334,500) | | (\$2,079) | \$42,120 | \$40,041 | 8.35yrs |
| Lease arrangement estimate | | \$42,120 | | | | |
| Increased utility cost | | (\$2,079) | | | | |
| Outdoor Splash Park (adds 12 parking stalls) | (\$790,250) | | (\$2,000) | \$62,136 | \$60,136 | 13.14yrs |
| Concessions | | \$2,000 | | | | |
| Admittance growth (RGPS median) | | \$60,136 | | | | |
| Increased utility cost | | (\$2,000) | | | | |
| ALTERNATE MODEL TOTALS (100K for design added) | (\$3,424,750) | | (\$354,079) | \$378,567 | \$24,488 | 140yrs |

*This factor is taken from the Revenue Growth Potential Study as the mid-range revenue growth, less the lease arrangements amount.

**Revenue baseline is \$147,712 per year, and is based on the historic 7yr revenue average.

By eliminating the additional indoor splash park, the cost of construction is reduced (compared to the Committee’s model) by about \$3,891,500, the annual operating costs by \$126,561, and the revenues are reduced by only \$52,000. The overall operational subsidy would be reduced by \$74,561 every year when compared to the committee’s model. Financially, this model is more sustainable over time, and still provides the most utilized amenities recommended by the aquatic center committee.

This model also provides for the later construction of the additional natatorium and related components if the City decided to move forward with the other Committee-recommended amenities. The construction of the additional natatorium would not require any long term closure of the existing facility except as may be needed incidentally.

SECTION 3-A: FINANCING OPTIONS-COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Aquatic Center Committee has recommended that the Council impose a 1% (or less) sales tax to fund the construction of their desired facility and not to begin construction until the city can pay cash for it. The Committee does not wish to put the sales tax to a public vote, but prefers the tax imposed by the council only. The Committee recommended that this tax sunset once the construction is paid for and after the maintenance reserve is fully funded.

Current estimates of how much revenue would be obtained from the tax vary, from \$600,000 (Oster Group) to \$2.5million (old tax measure documents) per year. At \$600,000 per year, the city would be poised for construction about 12 years after the tax is enacted. At \$2.5 million of revenue per year, construction could begin about three years after the tax is enacted. While the Aquatic Center Committee did not specify at what amount the maintenance reserve would be fully funded, staff has assumed for this report that they meant “to have put away sufficient funds to provide for all the maintenance activities necessary over a 30 year life expectancy.” Benchmarking suggests that this is equal to about \$132,800 per year on a facility this size (benchmark of \$3.32/ft2 x 40,000 ft2=\$132,800/yr), not accounting for inflation or cost of service increases. By this definition and benchmark, the maintenance reserve should be contain about \$3,984,000 to be considered fully funded. This does not take in to account any capital improvements that would cost over \$50,000 (the public sector capital threshold benchmark standard). To account for these capital improvements over 30 years, about \$2,000,000 additional should be allowed for projects such as roof restorations, HVAC renovations, regulatory changes, and unforeseen projects.

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Construction: | \$7,416,250 |
| Maintenance reserve: | \$3,984,000 |
| Capital renewal fund: | \$2,000,000 |
| Total: | \$13,300,250 |

The total amount that would need to be collected from taxes (not accounting for inflation or cost of service increases) would be about \$13,300,250 over the life of the tax. Using the information noted above, the tax would sunset between 5.32 and 22.17 years after its imposition.

While the Committee recommends that council impose the sales tax, Council may wish to put the tax to a vote of the public. If that is determined to be most favorable to Council, staff must have the prepared ballot measure to Malheur County on or before August 6, 2014.

SECTION 3-B: FINANCING OPTIONS—ALTERNATES

If the City Council decided that they did not want to consider a tax, a loan would be another alternative. Two types of loans have been identified as being available to the city for the aquatic center project. One type is an open market loan, the other is offered through the League of Oregon Cities “LOCAP” program (Local Oregon Capital Assets Program).

A market rate loan, using assumed parameters and not including loan costs (usually around 1% of the loan amount), could look like the examples shown below.

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Market Rate Loan (fees estimated) | | | Market Rate Loan (fees estimated) | | |
| Assumes a 4% interest rate | | | Assumes a 4% interest rate | | |
| \$7.4 million | | | \$3.5 million | | |
| | 20 yr term | 30 yr term | | 20 yr term | 30 yr term |
| Annual Payment Totals | \$538,110 | \$423,944 | Annual Payment Totals | \$254,512 | \$200,514 |

The LOCAP program provided preliminary numbers and are reflected in the chart below.

| LOCAP Loan (estimated fees included) | | | LOCAP Loan (estimated fees included) | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Annual Payments Vary Slightly | | | Annual Payments Vary Slightly | | |
| \$7.4 million | | | \$3.5 million | | |
| | 20 yr term | 30 yr term | | 20 yr term | 30 yr term |
| Annual Payment Totals | \$517,000 | \$422,000 | Annual Payment Totals | \$245,000 | \$201,000 |

Grant Funding: Grant funding is known to be available for the outdoor splash park feature (currently a maximum 50% of project cost or \$395,125) and there is a possibility that small amount of funding is available for the renovation of the existing building (a maximum of \$100,000 if qualified). Because the grant program for 2015 is yet undetermined, it has been left out of the previously mentioned cost projections. It is being mentioned as a potential avenue to offset capital costs, the potential of which may fluctuate between now and the time the project moves forward.

Since the grant program is expected to be in existence in the immediate future, it can be assumed that some element of funding may be available. It is the details of the funding levels and the availability of funds that is not yet determined, making it difficult to budget grants in to any model at this phase of conceptual development. To understand what grant funding is actually available, the city will need blueprints, costs, and a timeline first.

SECTION IV: APPROACH

Option One: Follow the Committee’s recommendation. Council could impose a 1% sales tax now and begin construction of the facility in a few years, the exact time frame to be determined by exact revenues generated by a 1% sales tax. It would be advised that the city wait to have blueprints drawn up until construction is imminent as building code and pool code will likely change before construction would begin. The city would also need to work closely with the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department to ensure compliance with the grant stipulations we are held to, since the facility was funded by their program.

Option Two: Use the alternate model specified in this report. Council could move forward immediately by authorizing the use of the money currently available in the aquatics budget to update the HSA blueprints to determine the exact cost of the build. Staff could then get bids and more definitively assess grant availability. After the exact costs are known staff could then determine the loan terms and payment amounts, and if they are within the city’s ability to repay the city could begin construction. The commencement of construction could be just a few months in to the future if this approach is adopted. The facility could be expected to open about a year after construction begins.

Option Three: Use both models. Since Option Two does not preclude option one, it is possible to move forward with option two and, following the accumulation of tax revenues, implement the remaining aspects of Option One. Option Two could move forward more quickly, being funded by a loan, with the additional natatorium and related facilities being constructed at a later date with revenues generated from a sales tax. The benefit of this approach is that it improves and opens the

aquatic center at an earlier date than recommended by the Committee, but the community ultimately receives the full benefit of the Committee's model as well. The loan could be paid off by the tax revenues once the tax has been sufficiently collected to do so.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based upon the Aquatic Center Committee's recommendation, as well as the continuous public concern which staff receives about the aquatic center closure, staff recommends that Council adopts Option Three, as outlined above, using the money currently available in the aquatics budget (about \$90,000) to come up with bid-ready architectural drawings for the purpose of getting current bids on construction so that staff may more accurately assess loan and grant terms and potential. Staff makes this recommendation knowing that the city will need to secure a funding source outside of the current capabilities of the city's finances to support the additional natatorium and its related components, whether that be a sales tax or not.

Staff defers to the judgment of the Council in regards to the sales tax enactment, whether it is pursued or not, and whether it is imposed or put to a vote of the public.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move to adopt Option Three and to direct staff to use the funds available in the existing aquatics budget to secure updated blueprints from Hutchinson Smith Architects to reflect current code and the expansion of the dry land fitness space, outdoor splash park, and 12 parking stalls; and to direct staff to seek out bids on those blueprints and to seek out favorable loan terms and grant funding based on the costs projected in those bids; while Council concurrently determines whether they wish to pursue the sales tax (or other funding source) to fund the remainder of the Aquatic Center Committee's recommendation.



City of Ontario
Brad Howlett, Facilities Manager
444 SW 4th Street
Ontario, OR 97914
Voice (541)889-4814
Fax (541)889-7121
brad.howlett@ontariooregon.org

Revenue Growth Potential Study
October 28, 2013

Purpose: Councilor Crume asked me this question, and for the supporting information around the answer: *Is it feasible to increase the revenues of the aquatic center to the extent that the aquatic revenues can pay back an improvements loan when coupled with the current golf course subsidy and energy savings of an up to date facility?* It would take a collaborative effort on the part of the Finance Director and the Facilities Manager, along with many interviews with community entities, loan officers, engineers/architects, and schools to fully study the answer to this question. However, it is my goal to provide a reasonable level of professional discretion and expertise in creating some preliminary projections of future revenues, admittance growth, and operational savings that could be realized after a renovation and the addition of an outdoor splash park.

Assumptions:

1. The golf course would be shut down and approximately **\$105,000** of the current golf course subsidy would be redirected to the aquatic center loan repayment.
2. The aquatic center has been renovated at the beginning of the revenue period.
3. The renovation included the addition of an outdoor splash park or other type of outdoor family attraction, and is located in a highly-visible portion of the property.
4. The renovation provided a state of the art facility with current technology and accounted for operational and energy use efficiencies.
5. The loan is \$3Million (increased from past conversations to account for the addition of a splash park), payable over 20 years, with an interest rate of 3.5%, and the annual payments total **\$208,786** for the duration of the loan.
6. The TOT funding and allocation dynamic will remain constant as historically proven.

Introduction: In a previous aquatic center report, the aquatic center revenues were identified as having potential for growth. The intent of this study is to provide preliminary projections as to about how much growth might be realized if certain changes are implemented with rates, programs, tenant agreements, and more. The ultimate goal in operating the aquatic center is to serve a more holistic demographic, and to become completely self-sufficient, funding all operations, repairs, and relationships with funds coming from aquatic center revenues. This study will examine growth potential.

The numbers in this report are projections based upon the projected totals of the 2013 calendar year (not the fiscal year). The projected revenue for the period is \$204,450, which is at least a 10-year record high. From January 1, 2013 through the date of closure, September 7th, 2013, the revenues were \$153,338. An eight month average was used to determine the projected revenues for the remaining months of 2013.

A. Room to Grow: Outlined in this report are some ideas that can increase revenues and reduce operating costs.

- I. **Admittance Growth Potential (\$40,890-\$92,002 annually):** These are some, but not necessarily all, of the ideas that could increase revenues across the board. A trend identified in my earlier report indicated an increase of 14.4% in admittance rates since 2009, with the steepest increase in admittance during the last year of that period. I believe it is important to note that this growth occurred during a period of regression in the quality of product the aquatic center offered, in spite of the deteriorating condition of the facility. With a new facility and proper management and implementation of the following items, more growth should be realized at an accelerated rate.
 1. **Rate Realignment:** The current rates for aquatic center memberships and usage are, in some areas, out of alignment with the area market. The annual youth rate should be lowered and the annual adult rate should be increased. A rate realignment could increase total revenues by bringing more youth in to the facility, and a percentage of their respective parents would follow.
 2. **Public Relations Management:** With an increase in efforts to promote aquatic programming, public usage of the aquatic center should see an increase of admittance. Some ways to do this are:
 - a. School presentations at least annually: an aquatic center representative should personally present directly to all students at each local school and provide take-home information for parents to better promote memberships and fun aquatic center activities for children, families, and young adults. Some activities to promote include swim lessons, community water safety classes each spring, clinics, specials, events, swim team, etc.
 - b. Advertising: Cost effective advertising should be implemented. An entire study could be performed around this aspect. However, advertising activities should include newspaper and radio spots around events open to the community (free public service announcements should be utilized whenever possible). Banners or posters could be posted in all city-owned facilities such as parks, city hall, and the airport, along with many other public areas. Personal visits for promotional purposes to local non-profits should be done regularly, preferably two to four times per year, at entities such as Boys and Girls Club, Lifeways, churches, the 8C migrant Program, Community in Action, etc.

- c. **Hours Adjustment:** The aquatic center should be open seven days per week, with quarterly (minimum) weekend open swim specials and/or youth activities such as kayak day, friends-of-members-swim-free day, etc.
 - d. **Capitalize on Family Fun:** Families have often complained that the aquatic center wasn't attractive to families for a number of reasons: Poor indoor air quality, too strict of rules, not enough weekend access, and no attractions geared toward children are a few. Adding an outdoor water park, coaching staff to allow some rowdy activity (as long as it is safe), proper management of HVAC, and reasonable weekend hours would provide for a more family-friendly environment, and boost admittance and memberships.
 - e. **Housekeeping:** The International Health, Racquet & Sportsclub Association (IHRSA) has cited the perceived lack of cleanliness as the #1 reason ladies leave their exercise facility. Having renewed locker rooms, entries, and reception area would presumably increase the appeal to use/join the facility, and encourage members to stay members once someone has joined. Retaining members would increase admittance from not just the member, but also from their friends and families.
3. **Admittance Growth Potential Summary:** I believe that if the above activities were properly implemented, combined with the past growth rate of 14.4% since 2009, and assuming that these ideas were not already aggressively implemented in the recent past (and I have found no indication that they were), we could see an increase in admittance numbers between 20%-45% in the next three years. At the *current* membership/pass rate structure, and assuming that a straight-line correlation between admittance and revenues can be established and managed, that translates into about **\$40,890-\$92,002** of additional revenue the first year, compounding during subsequent years.
- II. **Rate Structure Realignment (\$10,222-\$20,444 annually):** Research suggests that the Ontario Aquatic Center is out of synch with nearby indoor aquatic facilities. Realigning the rates before improving the facility would likely decrease revenues due to the lack of product quality. However, if the product quality was improved and brought up to date, the appeal would justify an increase in some areas of the current rate structure. This increase should be coupled with a decrease in youth rates to create a high-value price point to retain and improve membership and admittance, while maximizing revenue. While each pass/membership rate will change individually during a realignment, I believe that it can increase overall revenues by five to ten percent. A five to ten percent increase, without increasing or decreasing admittance levels (although an increase would be expected), would translate into a positive revenue gain of about **\$10,222 to \$20,444** annually.
- III. **Sponsorship Program (\$12,000-\$27,000 annually):** One idea to create an annual revenue stream is a "sponsorship" program, wherein local businesses or entities may donate a set amount (somewhere between \$500 and \$1000) and receive a

banner with their name, logo, contact info, or message that will be hung in the natatorium for the respective year. Each year there will be a drive for “sponsors” that should create a healthy revenue stream to offset operating costs or capital improvements. This should be a way for businesses to give back to their community and increase their organization’s visibility and, effectively, communicate their values to the public. Essentially, it is an additional avenue for businesses to advertise while supporting a good cause. I believe that 50 or more sponsors is a good goal to strive for, but 30 may be more realistic. At a \$500 donation each, assuming that \$100 will go toward creating the banner, 30 sponsors equals **\$12,000** per year. At \$1,000 each and banner costs remaining \$100, the revenue would be **\$27,000**. Market conditions and the local economy will be factors in determining how successful this program is, along with proper leadership, and may grow or shrink accordingly.

- IV. Lease arrangements (\$20,088 annually):** In a conversation with Marty Justus at Four Star Real Estate on October, 25th, he said a reasonably close estimate of the renovated value of the dry exercise rooms would be around \$1/sq.ft, utilities included. The two dry exercise rooms total about 1,674 sq.ft, so annual revenues could be considered **\$20,088**. The reduction in maintenance costs would be minimal, but the greatest savings would be a reduced strain on management in the staffing of classes, and the reduced costs of maintaining and providing exercise equipment. I have left these numbers out of this report as I do not yet know the current costs of ownership of the exercise equipment. The reduction on management would be applied to presenting programming and specials to local entities.
- V. Energy Use Reduction (\$16,880-\$33,759 annually):** If renovated, the aquatic center would see considerable reduction in energy use. Some other controls should be implemented with the renovation to maximize energy use reductions such as pool covers, daylight harvesting, and building automation and controls. I believe a conservative reduction in energy use, accounting for the additional load of a splash park, is 30%, but because of building envelope, filtration, archaic controls, no automation, and the past lack of building operator, the energy savings may be as high as 60%. At the current energy rates a 30%-60% reduction in energy use would net:
- i. Natural Gas: \$6,659-\$13,317 per year
 - ii. Electricity: \$10,221-\$20,442 per year
 - iii. Annual Energy Savings: **\$16,880-\$33,759**

These savings are based on total costs of utilities from July, 2011 through June, 2012.

- VI. Splash Park Appeal (\$45,102 to \$75,170):** It is believed by many that an outdoor splash park would substantially increase admittance to the aquatic center. Some

believe that it would increase by as much as 100 times (10,000%) during the summer months! While I haven't yet experienced the seasonal cycle and gotten to know the regional appeal a splash park would have (assuming it was designed to have adequate regional appeal), some conversations have indicated that families would drive from as far as Baker City simply to play in a splash park. It seems widely known that many area families make the drive to Meridian to enjoy Roaring Springs many times throughout the summer. It would be prudent to add a water park that would be sufficient to keep many local families here in the heat of summer, but not so grandiose that our facility competes with a facility on the scale of Roaring Springs. Based on past summer admittance trends, and assuming that admittance from June through August increases 300% to 500%, day pass revenues should increase by **\$45,102 to \$75,170** in the first year, assuming the baseline amount of pass sales does not change due to other causes.

B. Subsidy Factor: The TOT tax began contributing to the aquatic operations in 2006. Since then, the annual subsidy has been anywhere between \$20,243 in 2008 and \$172,117 in 2006 (2006 was an incomplete year for the TOT). The average over that period of time is **\$95,405**. For the sake of this study we will assume that this average is the number to increase revenues by to create a net-zero subsidy condition.

C. Implementation Costs: The costs to implement these reported aspects cover three primary areas: public outreach (promotion), public relations (perception and expectation management), and operational efficiency (maintenance and operations). The cost of effectively managing these aspects is rolled in to the salaries of the operations supervisor and the building operator. These positions will not be in addition to the past pool of aquatic center positions, but will be rolled in to existing positions at the center. However, the increased cost to recruit and retain the talent necessary to achieve these goals will increase the annual staffing budget about \$25,526 for the building operator and \$10,000 for the Operations Supervisor. The total increase in the annual payroll budget, if this plan is adopted, would be approximately **\$35,526**.

D. Capital Planning/Reserves: Although no capital improvements should be necessary within the first five years of operations in a newly renovated facility, the planning should begin now. The finished product needs to be determined to create an accurate capital renewal schedule, but a beginning annual contribution to cover future capital costs is about **\$7,500** per year. This may not be sufficient to cover all capital costs of the facility throughout its life span, and should be altered once the facility design is finalized and annually as the capital cycle progresses. This fund should be created strictly to cover capital projects and not "dipped into" for covering operational deficiencies. This fund would cover the costs associated with larger purchases and maintenance projects such as pool covers, starting blocks, lighting upgrades, pool painting, roof repairs, filter service and media replacement, lane lines, pump replacement or refurbishment, deck refinishing, etc. A minimum threshold should also be assigned to help define what a capital expenditure is or isn't.

E. Grant Funding/Rebates (\$TBD):

- I. **Programming:** Grant availability is out of our control, but there are many private foundations which grant money for the purpose of benefiting of different cross-sections of society. Low-income families, minority groups, athletics, swimming, and social enhancements are a few of the causes that private foundations may grant money toward. I think it unwise to vest a business plan in an amount that can't be reasonably projected, so I have not assigned a dollar amount to this aspect of the financial plan. However, providing the City has someone that can pursue grants, I would set a goal of \$25,000 per year for programming grant awards which would be used to create programs to benefit the community and increase the aquatic center bottom line.
- II. **Construction:** There may also be grants available to offset the construction costs of an outdoor splash park. My research thus far indicates that grant funding for improving the indoor pool is unavailable, but there may be funding to assist with the outdoor splash park. A finalized plan would be necessary to apply for grant funding, providing that grant funding is available at the right time.
- III. **Rebates:** There are rebates available from Idaho Power that would help offset some of the renovation costs through their Custom Efficiency Program. How much has yet to be determined, and would require a finalized plan to find out how many dollars might be available. I have not included rebate money in this study, as projecting an amount is not possible until plans are finalized and energy reductions can be calculated and quantified. If energy savings are great enough, we may qualify for federal incentives as well. Typically the federal incentive are difficult to secure due to the extreme amount of energy savings necessary to qualify for them, but it may be a possibility depending upon the result of the final design.

Revenue Increase Summary: The potential to grow the revenues sufficiently to become self-sufficient and to pay an improvements loan exists. However, the potential to fall short also exists. It is important to note that the growth trend that was identified in my previous report will likely continue to grow and increase the baseline numbers used to calculate the projections contained within this study. That translates into more positive revenue generation at the bottom line, providing that the growth continues.

It appears that, based upon the factors noted earlier within this study, that the City runs the risk of falling in to a similar deficit pattern if we succeed in securing only the low-range revenue increases. Inversely, if we achieve the high-range numbers, we will be a revenue source for the City and would alleviate the tax-payers of any financial obligation to the aquatic center.

See chart on next page for revenue growth projection totals.

Projected Totals:

| Cost | Item | Increase-Low range | Increase High-Range |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Admittance Growth | \$40,890 | \$92,002 |
| | Rate Realignment | \$10,222 | \$20,444 |
| | Sponsorship Program | \$12,000 | \$27,000 |
| | Lease Arrangements | \$20,088 | \$20,088 |
| | Energy Use Reduction | \$16,880 | \$33,759 |
| | Splash Park Appeal | \$45,102 | \$75,170 |
| | Golf Subsidy Redirect | \$105,000 | \$105,000 |
| | (\$95,405) Subsidy Average | | |
| | (\$35,526) Implementation Costs | | |
| | (\$7,500) Capital Reserve | | |
| | (\$208,786) Annual Loan Amount | | |
| Totals: | | \$250,182 | \$373,463 |
| Bottom Line Range: | | (\$97,035) | \$26,246 |

The "Bottom Line Range" indicates what the subsidy may be if only the low range increases are achieved (\$97,035 subsidy per year), and the high range shows the amount of net revenues that might be achieved if the high range revenue increases are achieved (\$26,246 annual net surplus).

The totals listed in this chart do not reflect a loan balance that may occur if rebates and donations are significant in offsetting the construction costs. The totals listed in this chart do not account for any programming grant funds secured during operations of the aquatic center, the availability of which are out of our control.

End of Report

Discussion/Information /Hand-Out Items

City Council Meeting
May 19, 2014



City of Ontario

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Office of the Chief

444 SW 4th Street

Ontario, OR 97914

Voice (541)889-5312 Ext. 2303

Fax (541)889-3026

mark.alexander@ontariooregon.org

To: Ontario City Council

Date: May 12, 2014

Re: Department Statistics for April, 2014

| Activity | Month of April | Previous Month | Year to Date | Prior Year to Date |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Calls for Service | 873 | 796 | 3131 | 3058 |
| Traffic Stops | 155 | 189 | 563 | 495 |
| Cited Traffic Violations | 97 | 66 | 297 | 279 |
| Motor Vehicle Crashes | 29 | 27 | 127 | 114 |
| Arrests | 80 | 64 | 302 | 342 |
| Arrests w/ Use of Force | 3 | 2 | 9 | 8 |
| Citizen Complaints | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Cases to Dist. Attorney | 39 | 50 | 171 | 251 |
| Ordinance Cases Total | 70 | 51 | 201 | 213 |
| Ordinance-Weeds | 22 | 0 | 23 | 13 |
| Ordinance-Garbage | 4 | 1 | 20 | 19 |
| Dogs to Ani-Care | 5 | 7 | 30 | 30 |
| Junk Vehicles | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| Death Investigations | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| SRO Cases | 41 | 24 | 136 | 131 |
| Gang Related Cases | 8 | 4 | 18 | 38 |
| Gang Designations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Task Force Cases | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Graffiti | 10 | 4 | 23 | 45 |
| Burglary | 9 | 8 | 27 | 26 |
| Robbery | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Larceny | 52 | 29 | 161 | 176 |
| Assault | 8 | 8 | 39 | 28 |
| Homicide | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Sex Crimes | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 |
| Sex Offender Registry * | 18 | 27 | 102 | 95 |
| Alarms | 17 | 22 | 65 | 67 |
| Property Loss/Recover | \$65,324/\$13,907 | \$37,008/\$1,023 | \$152,228/\$26,074 | \$228,817/\$88,433 |

*Registry includes initial registration along with change of address, occupation and annual registration

WHITE CLOUD

Communications Inc.

Phone (208) 362-8700 Fax (208) 362-8900

Quotation

Prepared For: ONTARIO CITY FIRE & RESCUE DEPT. Quotation Date 05/09/14

Tel:

Fax:

ATT: BRULE LEHMAN

| Qty. | Model # | Description | Unit Price | Extension |
|------|--------------|---|-------------|-------------|
| 2 | SVR-250VB | PYRAMID VHF ANALOG VEHICLE REPEATER. | \$ 1,875.00 | \$ 3,750.00 |
| | | 20 CHANNELS, WIDE OR NARROW BAND, ESP PRIORITY WITH MORE THAN ONE VEHICLE ON SCENE. | | |
| | | INTERFACE WITH ANALOG OR P25 | | |
| 2 | BPF-1604 | PRE-SELECTOR 150-174 MHZ | \$ 350.00 | \$ 700.00 |
| 2 | 7501-10-1245 | SVR INTERFACE CABLE FOR KENWOOD/MOTOROLA MOBILES | \$ 100.00 | \$ 200.00 |
| 2 | 1121 | ANTENNA VHF | \$ 8.99 | \$ 17.98 |
| 6 | 5500 | CONNECTOR TNC MALE | \$ 2.50 | \$ 15.00 |
| 2 | 1252 | NMO MOUNT AND COAX | \$ 13.99 | \$ 27.98 |
| 2 | WCKIT | INSTALL KIT LOOM, POWER CABLE, ETC. | \$ 25.00 | \$ 50.00 |
| 8 | LABOR | INSTALL LABOR TO MOUNT PYRAMID REPEATER, ANTENNA SYSTEM AND INTERFACE TO RADIO | \$ 85.00 | \$ 680.00 |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |
| 2 | PROGRAM | PROGRAMMING, TUNING, MODIFICATIONS TO REPEATER. | \$ 85.00 | \$ 170.00 |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |
| | | | | \$ - |

Conditions and/or Conditions
 NOTE: INSTALLS TO BE DONE AT SHOP IN GARDEN CITY, IDAHO.

 NOTE: CUSTOMER WILL NEED TO APPLY FOR A VHF FREQUENCY IN THE 173.00 MHZ RANGE OR USE ONE FROM WHITE CLOUD COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE MINIMUM FREQUENCY SEPERATION FROM MOBILE CUSTOMER CHANNELS

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Quotation Subtotal | \$ 5,610.96 |
| Idaho Sales Tax | \$ - |
| Set-up Fee | \$ - |
| Programming Fee | |
| License Fee | \$ - |
| Installation Fee | |
| Trip charge | |
| Quotation Total | \$ 5,610.96 |

Acceptance of Quotation

The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to order the above items and/or authorize the described labor. Payment will be made according to Invoiced Terms. Any alteration or deviation from the above Quotation involving extra costs shall be executed only upon written orders and shall become an extra charge over and above this Quotation. **Kindly date, sign and return via fax.**

Date of Acceptance

Authorized Signature

This Quotation is valid for 30 days.

AGENDA
MEETING OF THE ONTARIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 14, 2014, 3 P.M., M.T.
**** PUBLIC WORKS OPERATIONS -- 1551 NW 9TH STREET ****

1) Call to Order:

This agenda previously published / e-mailed **May 13, 2014.**

ROLL CALL:

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dan Cummings | <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Hart | <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Miller |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scott Wilson | <input type="checkbox"/> Ron Cornmesser | <input type="checkbox"/> Riley Hill |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bernie Babcock | | |

2) Old Business

- a. Discussion – Septage Receiving Facility
- b. City of Ontario Utility Billing Policy
- c. Two year review of SDC Rates

3) New Business

- a. Contract Operations Update.

4) Updates

- a. Public Works Project Updates

5) Adjourn

* Handout attached