

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**Tuesday, December 13, 2016, 3:00p.m. M.T.**  
**\*\* PUBLIC WORKS HEADQUARTERS \*\***

Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Riley Hill, Public Works Committee Chairman.

Committee members present included Mr. Scott Wilson, Mr. Riley Hill, and Mr. Pat Woodcock (Hart & Babcock - Excused).

Others present included Cliff Leeper, Betsy Roberts, Suzanne Mulvany, Dan Shepard, Adam Brown, City Manager, Hunter Marrow, Argus Observer, and representing Witco are David Ptaszek, Safety Director, & Jerry Ward, Director of Operations for Oregon.

The press was notified. This meeting was recorded (the tape is available at the Public Works Headquarters); the minutes are on file at City Hall and on the city's website at [www.ontariooregon.org](http://www.ontariooregon.org).

---

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES – NOVEMBER 8, 2016**

**RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:**

**The motion was made by Mr. Wilson, seconded by Mr. Woodcock to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting, November 8, 2016: Motion passed unanimously (Hart & Babcock - excused).**

---

**WITCO LOADING ZONE REQUEST**

*DAN SH.*

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

*Witco has requested that they be allowed to install a loading zone along the front of their facility at 690 West Idaho Ave. Their clients arrive on site by private car and public transit bus. Because of Lot constrictions Witco cannot accommodate the transit bus by routing it around the building. There are also times when vehicles not associated with Witco will park in front of the building and further restrict loading and unloading activities. The loading zone would be between the driveway entrances on each side of the property. Witco was informed by public works staff that the loading zone would require a painted curb as well as signage designating the zone. Materials and installation would be paid for by Witco.*

- ~ David Ptaszed - Witco serves and employs persons with all types of handicaps; we have substantial loading and unloading at different times throughout the day. If the area in front of the building gets crowded it makes it very difficult, and there is not enough room for the transit bus to maneuver around the building. We could try to keep people from the area ourselves, but it doesn't always work. Would like to use this area as a temporary loading zone for the safety of our people, and for the ease of getting in and out of the vehicles.
- ~ RH - What is the time frame or Hours needed?
  - o Five (5) days a week (Monday thru Friday), 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- ~ SW - Are there any ordinances that may require them to do anything different?
- ~ PW - Maybe a variance is more appropriate?
- ~ DS - Not sure if this is really a formal variance. The code for parking is specifically up to the city manager.
- ~ RH - No objection while Witco is at this location, but not to stay with the property.
- ~ BR - Suggest that between Dan C. & Dan Sh. we can figure out what the requirements are, and if the committee gives it their blessing send it through the proper channels.
- ~ PW - No way the bus can go around the back?
  - o The vehicles that drop off are the Malheur Council on Aging and the Snake River Transit so looking at 25' to 30' mini busses to make that corner and it just won't do it. The parking lot in back is +/- 20' from the wall to the property line.
- ~ SW - Motion that we pass it on to the City Manager for review & consideration? With Witco only.

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

**The motion was made by Mr. Wilson seconded by Mr. Woodcock that the Public Works Committee recommend to the City Manager that he approve the request from Witco (going through the proper channels); that this approval goes along with Witco, not the property, and to include a 5-year renewal clause: Mr. Scott Wilson – Yes; Mr. Riley Hill – Yes; Mr. Pat Woodcock – Yes: Motion Passed 3-0-2 (Hart & Babcock - excused).**

---

WATER / WASTEWATER RATE STUDY

ADAM

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- ~ AB – After the PWC reviewed this twice, forwarding the recommendation to the City Council it was presented, and they concurred. Would also like to thank this committee because we made a lot of improvements from the first draft to what was presented to Council.
- ~ In addition to approving they asked to take it to a few public meetings. Not required to have a public hearing, but it is required to have an opportunity for the public to comment.
- ~ Planning on having public forums, tonight 6p.m. at the Cultural Center, the 28<sup>th</sup>, and re-take it up on the 5<sup>th</sup> of Jan.
- ~ RH – We made a couple changes that we wanted to see before it went out & wondering how it was received.
  - o AB – The Presentation was received good and thought the final presentation was sent out. However will make sure it gets sent.
- ~ RH – Will there be an auto increase every year??
  - o AB – That is the one thing that changed in Alternative E, to implement ‘x’ and then at 5-years we would look at it; perhaps do the analysis 5-years out, and then take a recommendation for that 6<sup>th</sup> year. So effectively we are setting the rate 6-years out.
  - o The Vice Chair didn’t want to see us go out another 11-years or even another 5-years without some type of incremental increase. Therefore, what they added to your recommendation was that something be tied to the ‘cost of living’ so that there would be an incremental increase each year.
  - o With that we won’t know what it is. We did look back 5-years on average it was 4.96%. So what we show on the projections is the 4.96%, but it will be based on the previous years actual CPI. If they choose to approve it.
- ~ RH – Not really in favor of that... Not part of our recommendation. Our recommendation is what we sent forward.
- ~ AB – The presentation reflects that PWC recommendation was just Alternative “E” as presented, but council told us to move forward with our presentation adding a COLA to it.
- ~ BR – The model is built, and in going out 5-years if the cola is considered would there be another time where there is a “check-in” with the actual model? Within a pretty standard amount of time. What are our actual costs in field –vs- what the cost of living looks like? Are we increasing too much? Not enough?
  - o AB – The consensus from the Council is that an analysis will be done every year, and not wait 5-years. My recommendation was if we are going to tie cola to it that we set that aside to some type of strategic fund or economic development.
- ~ SW – Don’t think we need to do anything different at this point.
- ~ RH – Just wanted to make sure that when our recommendation goes forward that ours is what it is and that the City Council added to it.
- ~ AB – I’ll make sure that I don’t represent the PWC that way when we present it to the public.

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

**No motion.**

**Adam to forward final presentation to the PWC.**

---

**SDC PROCESS UPDATE**

BETSY

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- ~ BR – System Development Charges are basically used for growth & can be used for new projects growth. We have many listed (part of the Master Plan) and have talked about updating that list. During some economic development opportunities there are specific properties that are more desirable than others or available. So we wanted to make sure that those properties had projects identified on the list. In some cases they do & some they don't. Two fold for updating the list:
  - o 1. If property is out there and have a master plan that shows a water line coming over to it but that project is not on the SDC's, it probably should.
  - o 2. There are some projects that have been done and others that are not as applicable as they used to be.
- ~ To be coming up in the next month or two –
  - o First we'll go through the projects, old & new.
  - o Next go through what that process is to approve the list & move it forward/adopt it.
- ~ PW – Are there any other options as for as how you figure that in or charge potential developers? Maybe tie it into their water bill?
- ~ BR – On SDC's may work out a payment with the city. Not add a new tax or amount to the bill.
- ~ SW – Believe there was something in the ordinance for payments and a time table.
- ~

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

**No motion.**

---

**UPDATES**

BETSY/CLIFF

- ~ SRCI:
  - o Met with SRCI a week ago and discussed the contract; issues related to new negotiation of the contract because it expires in October of next year.
    - They want to look at their alternatives. The contract did have a finite timeframe.
    - The way it's working & make sure it works well.
    - They were also willing to discuss the infrastructure needs that we have.
    - We are trying to figure out what happens with the lower lift station as it seems to be a bit undersized.
    -
  - o Their numbers are right under what their contract amount allowed them. Their original contract was in 1990, updated it in 1997, and now this is the 20 year period for '97.
  - o Their flows are actually half of what was estimated in the contract. Therefore, that is what makes us think there is something up with that wet well.
  - o The population for the residence was right under their maximum amount, and their number of staff was at ~900. Total of 3,800 to 3,900. But again their flow numbers were well below contract.
  - o They have acquired some wells that are used for irrigation.
  - o What is the base rate? ERU?
    - Base rate of \$28.08. On the sewer rates are charged on the basis of equivalent residential units. Each ERU is 28.8.
- ~ NPDES Permit:
  - o Submitted a letter to DEQ with list of items related to the permit, they sent back a reply, and now in the process of going back and forth. We will have another formalized meeting tentatively on Jan. 6<sup>th</sup>, in Pendleton; is a negotiation at this point in time. We are proposing this to be a 15 year process, looking at the arsenic issue initially trying to identify where it is coming from, looking at I&I and potential remedies of how to treat it, and try to have as many off ramps as possible. There has got to be some kind of help from the State related to costs involved.

- They are drafting a permit to be set up with the compliance schedule, the 15-year period. That would get us into compliance.
  - Think they understand our financial situation. And so with respect to representative Bentz & others we've said that any time there's going to be financial impact we need plenty of time (18 months to 2-years) for us to get our financing in place to start any type of project. Which gives us an opportunity to hopefully the year before get in front of Representative Bentz to try ask for support. To get in front of the State Revolving Loan funds, etc. Anything that will be a significant cost to us.
  - RH – Did you get the feeling that they were sympathetic to our plight in that they were willing to do some adjustments on standards to give us some relief?
  - BR – They can't just give us a break, there are rules in place and what they can do is:
    - A variance – looking at what your people are already paying, what percent of avg. income is someone paying on their sewer bill already? And is that a hardship to them?
    - Looking at treatment options and what cost impact that is, looking at variances and how we can get a variance from that requirement of 2.1, etc.
- CL – During process we'll get support from legislature, working with them right now.

~ Eastside Tank Update:

- Was repaired, discovered several leaks & because of irrigation season did not do anything. In October drained it, identified areas where leaks were, repaired them, filled it back up and have 3 leaks still. The leaks are not big but are leaks. Contacted the contractor, they will come back, and drain again this winter... All cost is to them. Right now the leaks are just wet spots.

~ Water Treatment Plant Update:

- Moving forward, footings are poured, and working on actual temporary chemical feed system. So when the building is built & they take the old system on-line we have a temporary system to continue feeding & treating. Bid came in slightly higher than projected. \$1.68m after some negotiating; Council approved.

---

**COMMENTS**

~ Notice of term expirations:

- RH – to submit letter to renew
- KH – opted not to renew
- BB – not responded yet

---

**ADJOURN**

**The motion was made by Mr. Woodcock, seconded by Mr. Wilson to Adjourn: Motion passed unanimously (Hart and Babcock - excused).**

**APPROVED:**

  
Signature

(Riley Hill, Chairman / Bernie Babcock, Vice-Chairman)