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

COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
CITY COUNCIL – CITY OF ONTARIO OREGON
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2018, 7:00 PM, MT

Pursuant to the Public Meetings Laws and Rules within the Oregon Revised Statutes, the City Council has the authority, ability, and standing to take action on any items on the Agenda, or add items to the Agenda, during the Study Session or Regular Meeting, as long as all public meeting notice requirements have been met.

1) CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call: Tessa Winebarger _____ Dan Capron _____ Marty Justus _____ Ramon Palomo _____
Betty Carter _____ Norm Crume _____ Mayor Ron Verini _____

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

This Agenda was posted on Friday, February 23, 2018. Copies of the Agenda are available from the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website at www.ontariooregon.org.

3) MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA

4) PUBLIC COMMENTS Citizens may address the Council; however, Council may not be able to provide an immediate answer or response. Our of respect to the Council and others in attendance, please limit your comment to three (3) minutes. Please state your name and city of residence for the record.

5) NEW BUSINESS

A) Resolution #2018-112: Residency Requirement and Incentives for Residency Within the City of Ontario

B) New Draft NPDES Permit for Wastewater Discharge

6) OLD BUSINESS

A) Discussion of Resolution #2005-127: A Resolution Establishing Fees and Charges for Sewer Use Regulations; Sewer Service Rates and Charges; and Disposal of Septic Tank Sludge **TABLED TO NEXT MEETING**

B) Discussion of Service Load and Impacts on Service Delivery at City Hall

7) HAND-OUTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A) Agenda: Airport Committee 02-26-2018

B) Minutes: V&C Board 02-01-2018 and Agenda 03-01-2018

C) Minutes: Planning Commission 11-06-2017 and Agenda 03-05-2018

D) Minutes: Public Works Committee 11-14-2017 and 01-09-2018

E) Minutes: County Court 02-07-2018

8) CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

9) ADJOURN

The City Council may recess/adjourn to Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2) as follows: (a) Employment of Public Officers, Employees, or Agents; (b) Discipline of Public Officers, Employees, or Agents; (d) Labor Negotiations; (e) Real Property Transactions; (f) Exempt Public Records; (g) Trade Negotiations; (h) Litigation /Consult with Legal Counsel; (i) Performance Evaluation of Public Officers and Employees; (j) Trade Negotiations; and/or (l) Labor Negotiations.

AGENDA REPORT
NEW BUSINESS
February 27, 2018

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Adam J. Brown, City Manager

THROUGH: Adam J. Brown, City Manager

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION #2018-112: RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT AND INCENTIVES FOR RESIDENCY WITHIN THE CITY OF ONTARIO

DATE: February 22, 2018

PROPOSED MOTION:

I MOVE THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE RESOLUTION #2018-112, A RESOLUTION REQUIRING RESIDENCY OF CERTAIN CITY POSITIONS AND PROVIDING INCENTIVES FOR ALL EMPLOYEES TO LIVE IN THE CITY.

SUMMARY:

This is a resolution requiring residency for certain positions employed by the City of Ontario and incentives for other employees to live in the city.

BACKGROUND:

Many in the community have voiced beliefs that more city employees should live within the city boundaries or within the immediate area. The Ontario City Council was addressed by a local business owner at their February 8, 2018 meeting and took up discussion on the topic in their meeting. The Council's consensus was to bring a resolution back that would require high level positions with the city to live within the city boundaries and to provide an incentive available to all employees to live within the city.

CURRENT SITUATION:

By City Charter, the City Manager, Police Chief and Fire Chief are required to live within the city boundaries. All three currently live within the city boundaries. My recommendation is that all Department Heads live within the city boundaries or Urban Growth Area.

Discussions with the city's labor attorney convinced me that while we could require new police officers and firefighters to live within the city limits because they are not yet covered by the union, it would likely be challenged by the unions, and the Employee Relations Board (ERB) would very likely rule in favor of the union members right to reside wherever they choose.

The Council appeared to be amenable to offering an incentive for employees to live in the city. An incentive with no General Fund impact and minimal city financial impact would be to offer a credit of up to $50 on a city employee's water and sewer account. The enacting resolution would read that the credit would not exceed the amount of the monthly utility bill. This would only be available for employees receiving water and sewer service from the city.

The city's current employees place of residences are shown below as a percentage.

Where Employees Live	Percentage
Employees in Ontario Plus 97914	52%
Employees in Ontario	45%
Fire Personnel in Ontario	73%
Police Personnel in Ontario	30%
Living in Oregon	67%

<u>ANALYSIS:</u>

A. **<u>FINANCIAL</u>** The financial impact is the cost of providing the incentive. We could set a percentage of employees who live in the city at which the incentive would go away. For example, when 75% of employees live within the city, the incentive would go away. This, however, would likely dis-incentivize employees who are thinking about moving if they think it will only be a temporary incentive.

   If every employee were to reside within the city, the total cost of providing an incentive would be $28,200, which would be split between the Water and Sewer Fund. The cost of providing the incentive for employees who currently live in the city would be $11,400.

B. **<u>TIMING</u>** Timing is not a critical factor.

C. **<u>POLICY/LEGAL</u>** It is within the city's power to require Department Heads to live in the City of Ontario boundaries and to offer incentives for other employees to live within the city. It is recommended that the 97914 zip code be used for *"living within the city"*; however, the incentive would only apply to employees getting water and/or sewer service from the city.

<u>ALTERNATIVES:</u>

Take No Action: Department Heads should still be hired from within the city, but no incentives will be made to draw other employees into the city limits.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of Resolution #2018-112, a resolution requiring residency of certain city positions and providing incentives for all employees to live in the city.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Res #2018-112 Residency Requirement

RESOLUTION # 2018-112

A RESOLUTION REQUIRING RESIDENCY OF CERTAIN CITY POSITIONS AND PROVIDING INCENTIVES FOR ALL EMPLOYEES TO LIVE IN THE CITY

WHEREAS, citizens have expressed a desire that city employees reside in the city or the immediate area within the state; and

WHEREAS, Department Heads have significant responsibility toward the community in which they work; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is desirous for employees to live in the community and to be vested in the impacts of city decisions; and

WHEREAS, the City Council does not intend to cause any employee currently working for the city to be terminated because of residency status; and

WHEREAS, a credit to water and sewer bills for employees living in the city limits would have minimal impact on the water and sewer fund, but would provide greater incentive for employees to live within the city boundaries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that all department head positions hired after February 27, 2018, which are not contracted out, shall be required to live within the city or within the 97914 zip code within 6 months of the commencement of employment. Existing city employees who are promoted to department head positions shall also be required to comply with the terms hereof within twelve months of said promotion. Failure to comply shall be deemed a voluntary termination or employment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, any hiring of a Department Head position not living in the 97914 zip code or who us unable or unwilling to obtain residency may be hired only upon approval by the City Council at the request of the City Manager.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ontario City Council approves of a water/sewer credit of up to $50 per month (not to exceed the monthly amount due) for all city employees receiving water and sewer from the City of Ontario.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 2018

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Ontario City Council this 27th day of February, 2018.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

APPROVED by the Mayor this 27th day of February, 2018.

ATTEST:

Ronald Verini, Mayor

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder

AGENDA REPORT
NEW BUSINESS
FEBRUARY 27, 2018

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Betsy Roberts

THROUGH: Adam J. Brown, City Manager

SUBJECT: NEW DRAFT NPDES PERMIT FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGE

DATE: February 21, 2018

PROPOSED MOTION:

I MOVE THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS TO THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ) OUTLINING THE CITY'S CONCERNS ON THE DRAFT NPDES PERMIT FOR THE CITY'S WASTEWATER TREATMENT OPERATIONS.

SUMMARY:

The City of Ontario's wastewater discharge permit, known as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or NPDES permit, expired in 2008. NPDES permits are authorized for 5-year terms and permit holders are required to apply for renewal every 5 years. The City filed for renewal of the NPDES permit in 2007 and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality has administratively extended the prior permit conditions every year since 2008.

DEQ recently completed a draft NPDES permit for the City's wastewater treatment facility, the first since 2008. A draft of the permit was provided to the City on January 26, 2018 and comments on the draft permit are due to DEQ by March 16, 2018. After receiving comments from the City, DEQ will provide public notice of the permit and allow 35 days for public comment. After the public comment period, DEQ will then take a final action on the permit.

Once the permit is issued by DEQ, the City or other third parties have the right to appeal any conditions of the permit. Providing comments to DEQ as requested in advance of issuing the draft permit for public comment does not legally bind the City regarding a future decision to appeal or not appeal the permit once a final action is taken by DEQ. However, the pre-draft comments to DEQ from the permit holder typically provide arguments consistent with the issues raised on appeal.

In the event that the City appeals the final permit, the new permit essentially remains in affect during the appeal process including the schedule of compliance deadlines. If the appeal is upheld, a new permit is issued, if it is denied, the permit and original compliance deadlines remain as written.

The new NPDES permit will include for the first time new effluent limits for new pollutants. The most notable are the new final effluents limit for arsenic and hydrogen sulfide. According to DEQ staff, Ontario will be the first municipal wastewater treatment facility in the state of Oregon to have a final effluent limit for arsenic at this low concentration. Identification and elimination of the sources of arsenic in wastewater requires more study and investment in the elimination of arsenic from the wastewater collection system. However, even with these efforts further treatment will be needed and the City's current aerated lagoon treatment system does not have the capability of meeting the new final effluent limit. The City will need to undertake extensive study to determine how to comply with the limit and final compliance may exceed the affordability criteria for the community in achieving final compliance.

The draft permit provides a 15-year schedule of compliance to attain the final effluent limit for arsenic but a number of interim tasks must be completed in accordance with a set timeline. The schedule of compliance provides an opportunity for the City to comply with the final effluent limit for arsenic through a variance application once more data is collected in the future.

A point of contention between City staff and DEQ staff remains in the fact that the final effluent limit for arsenic imposed on the City will do nothing to achieve the final water quality standard for the Snake River without dramatic efforts to address other sources of arsenic. The City's wastewater flow is less than 0.1% of the total river flow in the Snake River and DEQ has no resources allocated for addressing non-point source pollution from arsenic. Without additional efforts to reduce other sources of arsenic, the City will be potentially spending millions of dollars without any measureable improvement in arsenic concentrations in the Snake River. City staff requested that the schedule of compliance should be tied to equal efforts to reduce arsenic from other sources.

BACKGROUND:

In June 2010, the Environmental Protection Agency disapproved the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's water quality criteria over concerns that the criteria were not sufficiently protective for people who consume fish from waters within the State. DEQ revised the State's water quality criteria through rulemaking and published the new criteria in June 2011. EPA then approved the new criteria. A detailed question and answer information sheet produced by DEQ is attached to this memorandum for informational purposes.

There are numerous implications of the new water quality criteria that have impacted the draft NPDES permit for the City, including greater monitoring and reporting and study requirements. However, the greatest concern is the new pollutant limits for arsenic, copper and mercury. These pollutants are bio-accumulative toxins that aggregate in fish tissue. The pollutant with the greatest impact to the wastewater treatment process is arsenic. The new discharge criteria for arsenic is lower than the current drinking water standard and arsenic removal is not achievable with the current aerated lagoon treatment system.

In June 2016, DEQ notified the City that a new NPDES Permit was being drafted and it would include new limits as required by the new State water quality criteria. Immediately, staff engaged with DEQ in an effort to convey the concerns of the City and to have those concerns reflected in the issuance of the new NPDES permit.

The initial request from the City was to delay issuance of the new NPDES permit in order to allow the City time to undertake studies and assessments to determine if the City is able to comply with the final effluent limit for arsenic or if a variance is appropriate. After completion of the studies, the City would update the 2007 NPDES permit renewal application and a new NPDES permit would be issued with certainty as to how the City would achieve compliance with the final effluent limit for arsenic. DEQ rejected this request on the grounds that DEQ is under a court order to reduce the statewide backlog of NPDES permits.

The City inquired with DEQ staff as to the appropriateness of different variance options as a path to final compliance. The first inquiry was for use of an intake credit for water supply withdrawn from the Snake River and treated as drinking water. An intake credit is outlined in DEQ guidance as a potential method of compliance. The response to date has been that the intake credit would not apply to concentrations of arsenic water withdrawn from the Snake River (4-6ppm), but rather the credit would only apply to concentrations of arsenic introduced into the drinking water system (1-2ppm). The application of an intake credit in this manner does not provide a method of compliance for the final effluent limit for arsenic for the City. The second request was for a site-specific background condition and this too was rejected. The final inquiry was for a variance based on affordability criteria and DEQ acknowledges that this may be applicable depending on the results of future study and analysis.

City staff also inquired as to viability of achieving the water quality standard In the Snake River given the magnitude of non-point source contributions and flow modification of the river. Under the Clean Water Act, there is a provision to modify a water quality standard through a Use Attainability Study. DEQ's response to date is that DEQ is not pursing a Use Attainability Study and efforts to do so would be borne by watershed stakeholders. The success of Use Attainability Studies in modifying water quality standards is extremely limited and expensive to undertake. DEQ also has indicated that there are no financial resources allocated to DEQ to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) which is a plan to achieve the water quality standard through pollutant load allocations to point and non-point sources.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION - Inorganic Arsenic Levels in System

Location	Inorganic Arsenic Level (ug/l)
River (background)	3.8
Well Water (background)	4.6
WTP Effluent	1.5
Influent to WWTP (end of collection system)	3.9
WWTP Effluent	6

CURRENT SITUATION:

The proposed permit contains the following substantive changes from the 2004 permit:

Schedule A – The following changes to the effluent limits in Schedule A are described below:

Parameter	Limit type	Old Limit	New Limit	Comment
BOD5	Average Weekly	1150 lb/day	1100 lb/day	Updated calculations
TSS	Average Weekly	3600 lb/day	3300 lb/day	Updated calculations
pH		Between 6 and 10	Between 6 and 9	To reflect Basin Standard
Total Residual Chlorine	Daily Max	0.1 mg/l	0.02 mg/l	To reflect ambient concentrations
Total Residual Chlorine	Average monthly	0.04 mg/l	0.01 mg/l	To reflect ambient concentrations
Ammonia: Interim Limit	Daily Max		30.1 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Interim Limit	Average monthly		11.7 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Final Limit	Daily Max		9.8 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Final Limit	Average monthly		5.5 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Arsenic: Interim Limit	Daily Max		11.0 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Interim Limit	Average monthly		7.6 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Final Limit	Daily Max		2.5 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Final Limit	Average monthly		2.1 ug/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Interim Limit	Daily Max		160.3 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Interim Limit	Average monthly		59.5 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Final Limit	Daily Max		3.42 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Final Limit	Average monthly		1.97 mg/l	New limit

In addition to the changes to the facility's effluent limits the following changes were reflected in **Schedule A** of the permit.

- Mixing Zone: a regulatory mixing zone was granted to the facility.
- Biosolids: requirements for the facility to develop and submit a bio-solids management plan and land application plan to the department for review were included in the Schedule. Additionally, the Schedule included biosolids management requirements and pollutant limits.
- Chlorine usage: the schedule describes the chlorine based effluent disinfection system and the effluent limits.
- Mercury Minimization Plan: the schedule included a requirement for the permittee to conduct monitoring and then develop and implement a plan to identify sources of mercury, reduce the inputs into the collection system and quantify the improvements in effluent quality.

Schedule B – The following changes are reflected in Schedule B of the permit:

- Electronic reporting: the permittee is directed to submit various reporting data electronically
- Effluent Monitoring: the permit includes the direct requirement to monitor the effluent for a series of priority pollutants rather than relying upon application requirements
- Ambient Monitoring: the permit includes requirements for the permittee to perform ambient characterization monitoring
- Mixing Zone: the permittee will conduct a mixing zone study and submit a report to the department
- Pre-treatment: the permittee will conduct a Significant Industrial Users Survey as a general permit requirement and no-longer as part of a compliance schedule
- Mercury Minimization: the permittee will develop a mercury minimization program and submit to the department for approval. The permittee will monitor the mercury concentration in the effluent and report the mass loading rate of mercury to the receiving waterbody
- Biosolids: the permittee will conduct a Bio-solids depth and mapping survey to quantify sludge depths and determine level of treatment cell effectiveness. The permittee will conduct biosolids monitoring in support of the facilities approved biosolids monitoring plan
- Analytical Limits: the permittee is required to meet minimum analytical limits, where indicated, for all required monitoring
- Temperature: the permittee will monitor and report the effluent for temperature
- Conventional parameters: the permittee will monitor the concentration of alkalinity, hardness and total dissolved solids in the effluent and in the receiving waterbody upstream of the outfall
- Copper and Aluminum: Ambient, mixed and effluent data to support the development of site-specific water quality criteria and determination of reasonable potential.

Schedule C – The permittee will implement a series of tasks described in the Compliance Schedule to accomplish the following tasks:

- Ammonia: design and construct an in-stream diffuser as to meet effluent limits for ammonia
- pH: design and construct a pH treatment system to meet effluent limits for pH
- Arsenic: develop and implement an arsenic minimization program
- Arsenic and Hydrogen Sulfide: develop and implement a facility plan to address excess concentration of arsenic and hydrogen sulfide in the effluent

Schedule D – The following changes are reflected in Schedule D of the permit:

- I&I: the permittee is directed to develop and implement a Inflow Removal Program
- Mixing Zone: as described in Schedule B and C, the permittee will conduct a mixing zone study and submit a report to the department
- Emergency Response: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain an Emergency Response and Public Notification Plan
- Biosolids Management: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain a Biosolids Management Plan
- Land Application: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain a Land Application Plan
- Solids Transfers: the permittee is directed to manage transfers of wastewater solids

according to the requirements described in the permit

- Hauled Waste: the permittee is directed to manage the acceptance of hauled wastes according to the requirements described in the permit
- Recycled Water Use Plan: the permittee is directed to update the plan and submit to DEQ for approval by the end of the second year of the permit term.

ANALYSIS:

A. FINANCIAL

The new NPDES permit for the City of Ontario will require considerable investment in order to attain compliance. An estimate of additional costs above the current base condition is provided below:

NEW COSTS (ESTIMATED) IN FIRST PERMIT CYCLE	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
PH CONTROL SYSTEM INSTALLATION AND OPERATION	$10,000	$100,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
MIXING ZONE STUDY		$50,000			
DIFFUSER	$5,000	$50,000			$50,000
POLLUTANT SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM (ARSENIC, I/I)			$50,000	$250,000	$250,000
WATER QUALITY MONITORING	$60,000	$40,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
BIOSOLIDS MONITORING & MANAGEMENT PLAN	$10,000	$10,000	$25,000	$10,000	$10,000
MERCURY MINIMIZATION PLAN	$10,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
TOTAL	$95,000	$255,000	$135,000	$320,000	$370,000

Total over 5-year Term **$1,175,000**

NEW COSTS (ESTIMATED) IN SECOND PERMIT CYCLE	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10
PH CONTROL	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
WATER QUALITY MONITORING	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
BIOSOLIDS MONITORING AND REPORTING	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
POLLUTANT SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM (ARSENIC)	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
FACILITY PLAN STUDY OUTLINE	$25,000				
FACILITY PLAN (TECHNICAL & FINANCIAL ANALYSIS)		$350,000	$250,000		
FACILITY PLAN PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION			$50,000	$50,000	
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TO SECURE FINANCING				$100,000	$100,000
OBTAIN FINANCING					$125,000
DEBT SERVICE RESERVE FOR NEW DEBT FINANCING		$100,000	$250,000	$250,000	$500,000
TOTAL	$340,000	$765,000	$865,000	$765,000	$1,040,000

Total over 5-year Term **$3,775,000**

Estimate for third 5-year period

The final compliance pathway for arsenic cannot be determined at this time but we know the three most likely pathways to compliance are as follows:

- Elimination of arsenic sources sufficient to obtain the limit without treatment;
- Additional wastewater storage infrastructure sufficient to eliminate discharge to the Snake River; or
- New wastewater treatment infrastructure to remove arsenic.

The costs for compliance may range from $25-$75 million in improvements that will need to be financed over as long a period as possible in order to keep rates below EPA's affordability criteria of 2% of Median Household Income. In the event the required improvements cannot be implemented without exceeding the affordability criteria, the City would be eligible for a variance in complying with the water quality standard for arsenic.

B. **TIMING** The response to DEQ is due by March 16, 2018.

C. **POLICY/LEGAL** - A final decision on whether to appeal any provision of the new NPDES permit would follow final action on the permit by DEQ.

ALTERNATIVES:

Provide written comments to DEQ outlining concerns with the draft NPDES permit.

Do not provide written comments to DEQ regarding the draft NPDES permit.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Public Works Commission recommend to the City Council *to* authorize the City Manager to provide written comments to DEQ outlining the City's concerns on the draft NPDES permit for the City's wastewater treatment operations.

DEFINITIONS

NPDES: A special permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that monitors discharge of certain pollutants.
TMDL: The maximum amount of pollutant that a body of water can receive while still meeting water quality standards.
NON-POINT SOURCE: A source of pollution that issues from widely distributed or pervasive environmental elements.
POINT SOURCE: A localized and stationary pollution source.

Water Quality Standards Rulemaking: Revised Water Quality Standards for Human Health and Revised Water Quality Standards Implementation Policies

Questions and Answers

1. What are water quality standards?

Water quality standards establish goals for Oregon's surface waters, such as protecting communities of fish and other organisms that live in the water, sources of drinking water and helping ensure that the fish we eat from Oregon waters is safe. DEQ's final rules establish levels of toxic pollutants (also known as the human health criteria) that allow the state to meet the goals of safely eating fish and drinking water.

2. How does DEQ ensure that Oregon waters meet the water quality standards?

DEQ ensures water quality standards are met by putting in place requirements for sources of these pollutants when needed. Two important ways DEQ accomplishes this is by issuing permits to facilities that discharge treated wastewater, also known as National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, and by developing clean water plans, also known as Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), when data or information indicate the waterbody does not meet water quality standards. In addition, DEQ works with land management agencies such as the U.S. Forest Service and Oregon Department of Transportation, as well as regulatory agencies such as the state Departments of Forestry and Agriculture, to prevent nonpoint source pollution.

3. What did this rulemaking do?

This rulemaking revised the state's toxics water quality criteria to establish appropriate water quality standards goals protecting Oregonian consumption of fish as a regular part of their diet and the ability of communities to obtain drinking water from Oregon streams and lakes without adverse health effects caused by toxic pollutants. This rulemaking also includes several new and revised implementation tools to assist wastewater and industrial dischargers in complying with new requirements that may result from the new water quality standards. Because toxic pollutants also come from nonpoint sources of pollutants such as agricultural, forestry and construction activities, DEQ revised elements of the water quality standards and pollution load allocation (Total Maximum Daily Load) rules to clearly state that best management practices and other control measures established by the Oregon Department of Forestry must not violate water quality standards. Further, state Agricultural Water Quality Management Act plans must be designed to achieve and maintain water quality standards. These changes make DEQ's rules consistent with existing state statutes.

4. What are toxic water pollutants? Which toxic pollutants is DEQ concerned about?

Toxic water pollutants are chemicals released into waters in amounts that can be harmful to fish, wildlife or people. They can come from "point" sources such as municipal wastewater treatment plants and industries, or "nonpoint" activities such as agriculture, forestry, roads, and construction activities. Some toxic pollutants are naturally occurring, but many are manufactured for use in industry or agriculture, or for personal uses such as hygiene and medical care. These synthetic and naturally occurring chemicals can be concentrated to toxic levels and transported to streams through human activities such as mining or wastewater treatment and through processes such as erosion.

Toxic pollutants of concern addressed by this rulemaking include methylmercury (produced from the burning of fossil fuels), bis (2-ethylexyl) phthalate (a plasticizer), benzo(a)pyrene, chlordane, toxaphene, dioxin, and now-banned pollutants such as PCBs, the pesticide aldrin and insecticide DDT, which remain in the environment as persistent and bioaccumulative toxics. These "PBTs" can build up in the food chain to levels that are harmful to human and ecosystem health. They can also be transported long distances and can move among land, air and water. Because of their persistent and bioaccumulative properties, these pollutants do not break down easily and are particularly difficult to clean up. Many of these substances are human-made and have only been in existence for a relatively short period of history. Others are natural elements, such as mercury. It is the refinement and concentrated human use of these substances that creates environmental and human health problems.

5. What are the human health effects of toxic contaminants?

Many of the pollutants addressed by the toxics criteria can cause cancer. Others can cause adverse health effects on the immune system, reproductive system, nervous system or endocrine system. Mercury can affect the nervous system and the brain; even low doses can impair the physical and mental development of human fetuses and infants exposed via their mother's diet. DDT has been linked to neurological and developmental disorders in birds and other animals. People can be exposed to these pollutants through the consumption of fish and water contaminated with these pollutants. EPA maintains a database containing numerous studies documenting the adverse health effects associated with these pollutants. Additional information on the health effects of toxic substances may be found in the Human Health Focus Group Report (available on DEQ's water quality standards/toxics web page) and on EPA's water quality criteria websites.

6. Why did DEQ propose this rule?

DEQ's current human health toxics criteria do not provide adequate protection for Oregonians who eat fish and shellfish on a regular basis. These revisions address concerns expressed by Tribes and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency about previous criteria DEQ adopted in 2004, which were not protective because they were based on a low fish consumption rate (17.5 grams per day or 2.3 8-ounce fish or shellfish meals per month).

In June 2010, EPA disapproved the 2004 criteria based on these concerns, causing Oregon's criteria to revert back to criteria based on an even less-protective fish consumption rate of 6.5 g/day. This rule addresses EPA's disapproval by adopting significantly more protective human health toxics criteria based on a higher fish consumption rate of 175 g/day (23 8-ounce meals per month). In the absence of this rulemaking, EPA would have been required to adopt human health toxics criteria for Oregon.

7. Will this rule result in the reduction of toxic pollutants?

Not all pollutants addressed by this rulemaking will need reduction, although there are some that DEQ is aware of that will likely need further reduction (see Question #4). For many pollutants of concern, actions are already occurring to reduce these pollutants. This rulemaking will result in requirements to continue those efforts and, where the pollutants are found at high levels, additional actions may be needed to reduce levels of those pollutants.

8. When do the rules become applicable?

The Environmental Quality Commission adopted the human health toxics criteria and accompanying implementation policies on June 16, 2011. However, the rules that EPA considers water quality standards will only become effective after EPA approval (i.e. human health criteria, site-specific background pollutant provision, and variances). EPA will likely complete its review by fall 2011 or early 2012. The other rules become applicable upon adoption by the Environmental Quality Commission and publishing in the Secretary of State bulletin.

9. Who is affected by these rules?

Oregonians who eat fish and shellfish on a regular basis will benefit from the health protections provided by the revised human health criteria. Cities, businesses and other facilities that discharge to state waters will be affected by this rulemaking if their discharge contains one or more of the regulated toxic pollutants. Forest and agricultural land managers, transportation and other construction projects and other parties subject to programs that control point and nonpoint sources of pollution could also be affected if their activity results in the transport of regulated toxic pollutants to surface waters. Residents and consumers may also be affected in cities that implement pollution reduction programs or enhance their wastewater treatment.

10. How much will the new rules cost?

The potential cost of the new rules will vary widely depending on the pollutants, the source of the pollutants and whether additional actions are needed to help achieve the new standards. DEQ compiled a “Statement of Need and Fiscal and Economic Impact” that is available on its website and describes potential fiscal impacts and estimated costs, where known.

Generally, if dischargers use tools, such as intake credits or a site specific background pollutant provision, anticipated costs will be minimal. However, if a discharger cannot achieve effluent limits to meet water quality standards with these tools, a variance may be another option for a discharger. There will be costs associated with applying for a variance, implementing a pollutant reduction plan, and renewing a variance (if needed). In some cases, a discharger may be required to install treatment technologies or optimize existing treatment to either meet or approach effluent limits necessary to meet water quality standards. Dischargers are not expected to install costly, unproven treatment technologies to meet effluent limits.

Additional waterbodies in Oregon may be listed as "impaired" for toxic pollutants in the future, leading to an increase in the subsequent number of TMDLs developed to meet toxics load allocations. Entities identified to participate in the TMDL may include Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Department of Forestry, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, municipalities and irrigation districts. These agencies may need additional resources in order to conduct TMDL implementation monitoring and best management practice effectiveness monitoring. It is difficult to quantify the potential costs to these agencies or other significant pollutant sources until data is collected and analyzed. It is likely that many of the management practices to control toxics from nonpoint sources will be the same under the new criteria as they would be to meet current criteria.

11. How did DEQ develop the fish consumption rate of 175 grams/day, and how does it protect most Oregonians?

Between 2006 and 2008, DEQ conducted an extensive outreach and information gathering project in collaboration with EPA and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. It held seven public workshops to solicit broad public input and consulted with two advisory groups; one focused on evaluating public health data and information and the other focused on evaluating economic impacts and implementation strategies.

From these workgroup discussions and analysis of fish consumption studies, DEQ concluded that a fish consumption rate of 175 g/d, or about 23 8-oz fish meals per month, is a reasonable and protective rate to use as the basis for Oregon's human health criteria.

The EPA, CTUIR, and DEQ issued a joint recommendation to the Environmental Quality Commission on Oct. 23, 2008 to revise Oregon's toxics criteria for human health based on a fish consumption rate of 175 g/d. The commission agreed with this recommendation and directed DEQ to proceed with a rulemaking process to revise the criteria.

175 grams per day represents the 95th percentile value from a comprehensive study of Columbia River Tribes (the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission study) and is within the range of the 90th percentile values from other Northwest studies. The 175 g/d rate is consistent with public health experts' recommendations to:

- use 90th or 95th percentile values to represent the proportion of the population the criteria should be designed to protect,
- use a fish consumption rate that represents fish consumers, rather than a per capita rate derived from the overall population including both consumers and non-consumers of fish, and
- include salmon and other marine species in the rate.

12. Does the fish consumption rate vary geographically? If not, why?

No, the fish consumption rate does not vary geographically across the state. Although DEQ and stakeholders discussed the idea of applying different consumption rates for different geographic areas within the state during development of the 2004 toxics criteria, DEQ did not pursue this option because nearly all the major river basins in Oregon are usual and accustomed fishing areas for an Oregon tribe.

In addition, people may catch fish in many locations around the state and not just in the river basin in which they live. Another factor in applying the fish consumption rate to all waters of the state is that having different criteria in different basins can create complexities in the regulations and its implementation.

13. Why were salmon and other marine fish included in the fish consumption rate?

Salmon and other marine fish spend the majority of their life cycle in the ocean, where they have the potential to be exposed to toxic pollutants accumulated over their lifetime. Although pollutant concentrations in the deep ocean are not likely to be influenced by Oregon water quality standards, DEQ and stakeholders recommended that salmon and marine fish be included in the fish consumption rate because these fish are an important part of the fish diet in the Northwest. DEQ did not use the highest fish consumption values from studies that included large amounts of marine fish.

Also, these fish spend some portion of their life in Oregon fresh and coastal waters and thus may be exposed to contaminants carried by state rivers to estuaries and important coastal waters. Water quality standards in Oregon apply to fresh, estuarine, and marine waters within Oregon's jurisdiction.

14. Do any other states use this fish consumption rate?

No other state is using this fish consumption rate. As a result, Oregon will have the most stringent human health toxics criteria of any state in the country. Other states with fish consumption rates that are higher than the EPA nationally recommended rate of 17.5 g/day are in the 30 - 33 g/day range. The EPA has approved a fish consumption rate of 389 g/day for the Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and a rate of 170 g/day for the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. Both tribes are in Oregon.

15. Not everyone eats this much fish from Oregon waters. Why is it set so high?

A fish consumption rate of 175 g/day protects 90 to 95 percent of Oregon's population who regularly eat fish and shellfish. DEQ acknowledges that not all Oregonians eat fish, or eat less fish than this population. The Oregon Environmental Quality Commission agreed with this rate and directed DEQ to use a fish consumption rate of 175 g/day to protect a majority of Oregonians, rather than using a per capita consumption rate of the total population and including people who do not eat fish or eat it rarely.

16. How can dischargers meet these very low toxic criteria?

Some dischargers may already be able to meet requirements based on the revised criteria; other dischargers may use pollutant source reduction or treatment technologies, or a combination of these approaches to comply with new requirements. The options available will vary depending on the pollutant and the source of that pollutant. In some cases, if treatment technologies or other approaches are not available that would result in meeting the new requirements, DEQ will explore other approaches that may allow the facility to comply with its requirements while continuing to make progress toward meeting the standards (e.g., compliance schedules, variances with pollutant reduction plans—see question #10).

17. What if a discharger cannot meet revised criteria for a toxic pollutant?

In some cases, a discharger will need time to implement pollution reduction programs or to install new treatment systems. DEQ can put a schedule of actions in a permit that allows the discharger to operate until these actions can be put in place and result in reducing pollutant concentrations.

The final rule includes three permitting tools to assist dischargers in this position. The first, an intake credit, allows a discharger to account for a pollutant that is already in its intake water. The second tool is a site-specific background pollutant provision. Similar to the intake rule, this rule allows up to a 3% increase in the concentration of a pollutant already present in its intake water, as long as the discharger does not increase the mass of the pollutant. The third, a variance, is a tool that is already available in Oregon and has been used many times in other states. DEQ is proposing rule revisions to clarify the variance procedures and make this a more usable alternative. This approach will allow a discharger to put in place affordable treatment technologies and actions that will result in progress toward meeting the pollutant goals, but not require the use of prohibitively expensive treatment. DEQ will use this tool where appropriate and has EPA support for this approach.

18. How will DEQ manage the anticipated workload associated with permit compliance and enforcement?

Reducing toxic pollutants in Oregon waters is a DEQ priority. DEQ will continue to manage its resources and priorities to address increased workloads where they occur. These revised rules will result in changes in requirements and actions over time (e.g., upon permit expiration and renewal). In some cases, the resource requirements will not result in differences from DEQ's implementation of the current rules. By clarifying the variance provision and adopting the site-specific background pollutant and intake credit provisions, permit writers will have clearer direction and guidance to address these situations. In addition, DEQ anticipates that EPA will be able to assist with some aspects of implementation, such as the economic analysis required for some variances. EPA has provided this assistance for other states.

19. Will landowners be given load allocations to comply with a TMDL?

DEQ anticipates that it will work with ODF for non-federal forests, ODA for agricultural lands, and other designated management agencies to implement TMDLs. Although DEQ has authority under Oregon Administrative Rule 340-042 to assign load allocations to sources, including individual landowners, DEQ believes it is more efficient to use existing programs such as Oregon Forest Practices Act rules and Agricultural Water Quality Management area plans and rules to meet load allocations for nonpoint sources. DEQ will provide opportunities for ODA and ODF to develop implementation strategies for landowners to meet load allocations.

20. Do the revisions related to forestry and agriculture best management practices and other control measures provide DEQ with additional authority?

No. The revisions to the water quality standards and pollution load allocation (Total Maximum Daily Load) rules makes more clear how DEQ will interact with the state Departments of Agriculture and Forestry to use the agencies' respective authorities to achieve water quality standards. In addition, the rules make clear that best management practices and other control measures established by the Oregon Department of Forestry must not violate water quality standards. Further, the rules state that Agricultural Water Quality Management Act plans must be designed to achieve and maintain water quality standards. These changes make DEQ's rules consistent with existing state statutes.

21. What happens if implementation of Best Management Practices established by ODF or implementation strategies for Agricultural Water Quality Management Area plans do not show progress in waterbodies meeting water quality standards?

TMDL implementation is a developing, often phased-in process and DEQ expects that adjustments will be needed over time to attain water quality standards. If TMDL milestones and timelines are not being met, DEQ will work with sources, including ODF or ODA, to determine whether additional measures or resources are needed to meet TMDL milestones and load allocations and to attain water quality standards in the waterbody.

22. What is EPA's role in this rulemaking?

EPA will review and approve or disapprove Oregon's rules it considers water quality standards, as required by the federal Clean Water Act. DEQ anticipates that EPA will act within approximately six months of the June 2011 adoption by the Environmental Quality Commission. EPA must ensure that the criteria protect fishing, swimming and other uses of the nation's waters and serve the act's goal "to restore and maintain the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the nation's waters." EPA sets national water quality criteria recommendations for toxic pollutants and has published guidance for how states should establish human health criteria. In absence of the Environmental Quality Commission adoption of the human health criteria, EPA would have had to set criteria for the state of Oregon within a reasonable time frame.

23. Will EPA approve these new standards?

DEQ has worked closely with EPA at all levels in developing these new criteria and standards. EPA is supportive of DEQ's efforts and prefers that Oregon adopt revised toxics criteria for human health rather than EPA acting on behalf of the state. EPA has provided feedback throughout the toxics criteria review and development project; that feedback is reflected in the final rule.

24. I understand there is a lawsuit related to this rulemaking. What effect does it have on Oregon's rulemaking efforts and timeline?

In 2006, Northwest Environmental Advocates filed suit against EPA because EPA had not acted on the toxics water quality standards DEQ adopted in 2004. EPA and Northwest Environmental Advocates entered into an agreement that required EPA to approve or disapprove Oregon's 2004 standards. EPA did not immediately act since DEQ was already underway with revisions to those standards. EPA expressed a strong preference for Oregon to complete their work to adopt more protective toxics criteria. The Clean Water Act gives primary responsibility for setting water quality standards to the states. In June 2010, EPA disapproved the majority of DEQ's human health criteria for toxic pollutants. They concluded that the fish consumption rate used to set the 2004 criteria was inadequate to protect all Oregonians based on the amount of fish and shellfish some are known to consume. EPA's June action addressed their obligation under the litigation.

The adopted human health criteria for toxic pollutants will address EPA's disapproval. Without revisions to Oregon's water quality standards to address EPA's disapproval, EPA must establish standards for Oregon.

25. What would happen if DEQ did not complete this rule in a timely fashion?

The adopted human health criteria for toxic pollutants will address EPA's disapproval. In addition to revising the numeric human health criteria, the EQC adopted rules that will be used to implement these criteria. If the June 2010 deadline had not been met, EPA was prepared and required to step in and adopt protective toxics criteria for Oregon. If this occurred, it is likely that EPA would include in its rule only the numeric criteria values.

26. How does this rulemaking relate to separate DEQ water quality rulemakings to revise human health criteria for arsenic, iron and manganese?

DEQ expedited revisions to the arsenic, iron and manganese criteria, and adopted final revisions for iron and manganese in December 2010. The criteria for iron and manganese are now applicable for state and Clean Water Act purposes following EPA's approval on June 9, 2011. DEQ reopened the public comment period on arsenic at the end of January 2011. The Environmental Quality Commission adopted the revised criteria for arsenic in April 2011, however, the arsenic criteria revision must await EPA approval before it becomes applicable.

The expedited rulemakings for arsenic, iron and manganese human health criteria will result in criteria that continue to protect health and address the naturally-occurring concentrations of these pollutants. DEQ withdrew the iron and manganese human health criteria that are not necessary to protect human health. The arsenic criteria incorporate the same higher fish consumption rate used to revise the other toxics criteria in order to protect fish consumers. In addition, the adopted arsenic criteria are based on other scientific information and policy considerations to account for the presence of natural sources of arsenic in Oregon waters and to balance the goals of human health protection and a program that is cost effective and will achieve environmental results.

27. What else is DEQ doing to address toxic pollutants in Oregon?

DEQ is developing an agency-wide toxics reduction strategy using a comprehensive and integrated approach to determine how to most effectively and efficiently reduce the release of priority toxics to Oregon's air, land and water. Recommendations from this agency-wide strategy could include enhancing existing toxics programs; adding new voluntary, incentive or regulatory programs; and improving the alignment/coordination of all toxics reduction programs. DEQ expects a final toxics reduction strategy in February 2012. Additional information is on DEQ's website: http://www.deq.state.or.us/toxics/index.htm.

DEQ also has several programs already underway that contribute to controlling and reducing toxics in Oregon's environment, including the water quality standards rulemaking, water quality's Priority Persistent Pollutants project, the Portland Air Toxics Solutions project, Clean Diesel initiatives, product stewardship initiatives (e.g., electronic and paint waste recycling), household and small business hazardous waste collection events, the watershed-based Pesticide Stewardship Partnership Program, the state drinking water source protection program, the Toxics Use and Hazardous Waste Reduction Program, hazardous waste management compliance activities, the contaminated site cleanup program and others.

28. Where else can I go to find out more about this rulemaking?

For more information on this rulemaking, including final rule language, human health toxics criteria (Table 40), responses to public comments, and supporting issue papers, visit the human health toxics rulemaking website: http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/standards/humanhealthrule.htm.

Mr. Spencer Bohaboy
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Water Quality Division
811 SW Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

Subject: City of Ontario NPDES Permit Number 101633
Applicant Review Comments

Dear Spencer,

The City of Ontario received from Oregon DEQ the draft NPDES Waste Discharge Permit on January 26, 2018 requesting review and comment from the City. This transmittal letter and the attached document provide the City's comments on the draft permit as requested.

The new draft permit is a dramatic departure from the previous permit in terms of new pollutant effluent limits and new pollutant monitoring. The efforts update and modify the City's wastewater collection and treatment system to comply with the requirements under the new permit will be monumental.

Our discussions over the past two years have reflected the intensity associated with these historic requirements as we debated how best to proceed and the paths available for compliance. Although challenging at times, the City commends you for the effort that has been made in drafting this permit.

On many occasions, the City has brought up the fact that if DEQ does not acquire the resources to develop a TMDL and address nonpoint sources of arsenic (which make up over 99% of the pollutant loading) that the City's dramatic investment in new infrastructure will do nothing to ensure that the Snake River meets the water quality standard for arsenic. We understand that at the staff level this issue cannot be addressed in permitting, but we feel compelled to continue to highlight the issue as it is a very real potential outcome and our citizens deserve to have this issue raised to whatever level it takes for something to be done. Our request is to have the City's schedule of compliance for arsenic be tied to the pace of progress from non-point source reductions.

In addition, we have always been nervous about a firm schedule of compliance given how little information we have at this point as to how best to comply with the final effluent limit for arsenic. Our hope is that we can eliminate sources of arsenic in the collection system that would eliminate the need for new treatment facilities or new storage facilities to facilitate year-round land application. We know that our water supply system meets the final effluent limit and we do not have any commercial or industrial activity that would be a source of arsenic. Therefore, we know that either shallow groundwater infiltration or private wells would be the only sources of arsenic in the collection system. We need to make sure we have adequate time in the schedule of compliance to address this issue. The current schedule of compliance should have wording that insure that this flexibility is explicitly provided for in the permit language.

Attached to this letter are our specific comments to each page of the draft permit. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft permit. Please contact either myself or Betsy Roberts if you have any questions or concerns regarding the attachment.

Thank you,

Adam J. Brown
City Manager
City of Ontario, Oregon

Cc: Don Butcher
Water Quality Permit Manager
Eastern Region

Resolution 2005-127

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING FEES AND CHARGES FOR SEWER USE REGULATIONS, SEWER SERVICE RATES AND CHARGES, AND DISPOSAL OF SEPTIC TANK SLUDGE FOR THE CITY OF ONTARIO

WHEREAS, It is the policy of the City of Ontario to require the ascertainment and recovery of certain City costs from fees and charges levied therefore in providing City services and regulations; and,

WHEREAS, The City Manager shall periodically cause a review of City fees and charges to recover the percentage of City costs in providing City services and regulations and recommend adjustments to the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, The City Manager has caused a review of all City fees and charges and determined the cost of such fees and charges; and,

WHEREAS, This fee resolution amends sections within Title 8, Chapter 7 Sewer Use Regulations, Chapter 9 Sewer Service Rates and Charges, and Chapter 10, Disposal of Septic Tank Sludge.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Ontario City Council to approve the following fee schedule regarding Sewer Use Regulations in Title 8, Chapter 7 and Sewer Service Rates and Charges in Title 8, Chapter 9 of Ontario City Code.

Title 8 Chapter 7 Sewer Use Regulations

8-7-3 Building Sewers and Connections

(B) Fee for Constructing a Sewer Tap: When a sewer is tapped by any City employee or employees, the person for whom or which such sewer is tapped will pay a charge or fee of $250.00 in advance of the tap being made.

(C) Sewer Connection and/or Tap Permit Required, Conditions: Any person desiring a connection to be made to any sewer will first obtain from the Public Works Director a permit to connect or hook up such sewer. The Public Works Director will impose a fee of $100.00 for the issuance of such permit to connect to a sewer. Such permit from the Public Works Director will be first had and obtained whether such connection to a sewer be performed by the City or by a licensed plumber.

8-7-3.5 Sewer Service Rates

Meters will be read twice annually for all users including, but not limited to, residential, motels/hotels, manufactured home parks, businesses, multi-family residential dwellings and apartment complexes.

Users' wastewater charge shall be established based upon the average water consumption during the months of November, December, January, February and March of each fiscal year.

The consumption will then be divided by five (5) months to determine the average sewer usage per month.

New accounts will be based on an average of similar accounts or 7,700 gallons per month.

The City shall establish a surcharge on users discharging wastes into the sewerage system which exceed either the BOD and/or TSS for the ERU. Said surcharge shall be in accordance with the formulas proposed in the City of Ontario Sewer Rate Study dated October 1994.

Title 8 Chapter 9 Sewer Use Regulations

8-9-2 Sewer Service Rates, Computation of Charges

Base	Monthly Rate Inside City Limits	Per	Monthly Rate Outside City Limits	Per
$5.00	$4.58	1,000 gallons	$8.02	1,000 gallons

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 18, 2005.

Passed and adopted by the Ontario City Council this 1st day of August, 2005.

Ayes: Cummings, Allen, Gaskill, Cammack, Cheatham, Mosier, Jacobs

Nays: None

Absent: None

Approved by the Mayor this 1st day of August, 2005.

ATTESTED:

LeRoy Cammack

LeRoy Cammack, Mayor

Tori Ankrum

Tori Ankrum, City Recorder

Airport Committee Meeting Agenda

February 26, 2018 - 6:00 PM
Airport FBO Office

Committee Members: Shay Myers ____ Amanda Vansickle ____ Gary Taylor ____ Dale Cruson ____
Jack Terry ____ Shawn Coleman ____ Jim Bain ____ Alternate: John Freeburg ____

Ex Officio Members: Norm Crume (City Council) _____ Adam Brown (City Manager) _____
Airport Manager/Staff: Daniel Beaubien _____
FBO: Tom Frazier _____

I. Public Comment
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Approval of Minutes
IV. Old Business
    a. Grass strip irrigation
V. New Business
    a. Airport manager's update
    b. Engineer's update
    c. FBO update
    d. TVCC update
VI. Committee Member Comments
VII. Adjournment

AGENDA
ONTARIO VISITORS AND CONVENTIONS BUREAU BOARD
MARCH 1, 2018 - 7:00 a.m. M.T.
CLARION INN

1) Call to order:
This agenda was emailed: February 22, 2018

(a) Roll Call:
Debbie Blackaby____ Cheryl Cruson_____ Laura Davis____
Doug Dean____ John Hall____ Bob Quinn____ Ron Verini____

City Manager Adam Brown____
V&C Director John Breidenbach____

2) New Business

a) Grant Request: Malheur County Fair Board

3) Motion to adopt V&C Meeting Minutes of February 1, 2018 meeting

4) Review Financial Report

5) Adjourn

VISITORS AND CONVENTION BOARD
C/O Ontario Area Chamber of Commerce
251 SW 9th St.
Ontario, OR 97914
541-889-8012 (Voice)   541-889-8331 (Fax)
info@ontariochamber.com

PROMOTION AND EVENT FUND APPLICATION

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name of Applicant Organization: Malheur County Fair Board

Complete Mailing Address: 795 NW 9th St   Ontario, OR 97914

Telephone: 541-889-3431 Fax: ____________ E-Mail: fair@malheurco.org

Principal Contact Lynelle Christiani

Complete Mailing Address: Same

Telephone: Same as Above Fax: ____________ E-Mail: ____________

Name of Event and Date and Time Event Will Be Held: County Fair Concert Series

Has organization applied for a V&C Grant Before: X___ **Yes** _____ **No**

****If yes was the V&C grant request approved and for what amount:***

X___ **Yes** _____ **No** / $ $4,000

****If grant request was approved did the organization give their 90 day follow-up report***

X___ **Yes** X___ **No**

Description of Promotion or Event: In 2017 the Fair Board with the help of Melissa Shermar (4-H Extension) brought back a concert to coincide with our County Fair. We all felt it was a success and decided to have a bigger and better version this year. Mark your calendars for August 2. While the adults are having a blast at the concert the Fair Board will provide a "Make and Take" craft session to educate and entertain the kids.

NATURE OF PROMOTION/EVENT: 2nd Annual County Fair Concert Series

X___ Tourism based capital project   _____ Multi-night local lodging event

X___ Special media promotion   X___ Education and/or training project

Amount of Funding Support Requested: $ 6,500

Total Promotion/Event Budget: $ $18,000

What specific expenditures will the granted funds be used for?*: This grant will pay for the professional stage. It will also pay for the sound and light technician and our security.

List promotion/event supporters or partners**: This year's concert will be financed and supported by Northwest Farm Credit as their "Grower's Appreciation" night. In the past NWFC has gone to the Caldwell Night Rodeo. They've committed to buy 400+ tickets . We would appreciate having the V & C Board as another of our sponsors.

PROJECTED PROMOTION/EVENT IMPACT:

Describe how the promotion/event will impact the Ontario economy (e.g., room nights, number of visitors/attendees, restaurant sales, retail sales, etc.)*:

Of these additional 400 NWFC members

I would say at least 30% will stay in Ontario Hotels, eat breakfast in Ontario restaurants, and 60% + will fill up at the gas stations.

FINANCIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

For established groups, please provide two years of P & L Statements, a current Balance Sheet, and a proposed budget for this year's promotion/event. For newly formed groups, please provide a proposed budget of revenues and expenditures in a form similar to the one below:

PROPOSED REVENUES

Source #1 V & C Grant	Amount $ $6,500
Source #2 Northwest Farm Credit	Amount $ $5,500
Source #3 Bi-Mart	Amount $ $1,000
Source #4 Fair Board	Amount $ $5,000
Source #5	Amount $

TOTAL REVENUES $ 18,000

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES

Use #1 Band # 1	Amount $ 6,000
Use #2 Band # 2	Amount $ 3,500
Use #3 Band # 3	Amount $ 1,500
Use #4 Stage + Light + Sound	Amount $ 4,000
Use #5 Security	Amount $ $1,500
Use #6 Hospitality + Misc	Amount $ $1,500
Use #7	Amount $
Use #8	Amount $
Use #9	Amount $
Use #10	Amount $

TOTAL EXPENDITURES $ 18,000
REVENUES MINUS EXPENDITURES $ 0

As a final condition to accepting granted funds, the applicant agrees to provide the Ontario Visitors and Conventions Board with a final report summarizing results of the promotion/event (e.g., attendance, local and regional publicity, hotel/motel occupancy, closing revenue and expenditure report, etc.) within 90 days of the event/promotion.

February 16, 2018
Date

Signed

Malheur County Fair Board
Printed Name of Applicant

Date Received: ____________ Ontario Area Chamber President/CEO: ____________________

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	R E V E N U E S					
3-01-0101	CASH ON HAND	40,000-	--	36,222.81-	3,777.19-	91
	REVENUE	40,000-		36,222.81-	3,777.19-	91
3-30-3501	STATE APPORTIONMENT	50,000	50,963.61	50,963.61	963.61-	102
	INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE	50,000	50,963.61	50,963.61	963.61-	102
3-40-4100	OTHER REVENUE	10,000	12,809.40	12,809.40	2,809.40-	128
3-40-4114	GRANT REVENUE	1,250	1,250.00	1,250.00	--	100
3-40-4700	FAIR ADMISSIONS	52,000	56,814.49	56,814.49	4,814.49-	109
3-40-4701	FAIR OUTSIDE BOOTHS	2,000	1,864.60	1,864.60	135.40	93
3-40-4702	FAIR COMMERCIAL BLDG	10,000	7,500.00	7,500.00	2,500.00	75
3-40-4703	FAIR FOOD CONCESSIONS	17,000	16,339.06	16,339.06	660.94	96
3-40-4704	FAIR CARNIVAL	2,800	3,010.00	3,010.00	210.00-	108
3-40-4705	FAIR MISCELLANEOUS	10,500	9,136.57	9,136.57	1,363.43	87
3-40-4707	GRANDSTANDS	1,500	600.00	600.00	900.00	40
3-40-4708	AUCTIONS AND SALES	1,100	745.00	745.00	355.00	68
3-40-4709	HORSE SHOWS	2,000	2,550.00	2,550.00	550.00-	128
3-40-4710	CLEANING FEE DEPOSIT	8,000	6,825.00	6,825.00	1,175.00	85
3-40-4711	RODEO/TEAM ROPING	41,000	38,423.00	38,423.00	2,577.00	94
3-40-6300	STALL RENT	6,500	7,740.00	7,740.00	1,240.00-	119
3-40-6301	STORAGE/RV RENTAL	4,000	4,315.00	4,315.00	315.00-	108
3-40-6302	COMMERCIAL BLDG RENT	21,000	19,600.00	19,600.00	1,400.00	93
3-40-6500	DONATIONS	29,121	24,149.00	24,149.00	4,972.00	83
3-40-6501	MEMORIALS	100	335.00	335.00	235.00-	335
3-40-6503	FUNDRAISING	5,000	7,225.00	7,225.00	2,225.00-	145
3-40-6642	INSURANCE PROCEEDS	100	--	--	100.00	0
3-40-6644	TVCC LEASE	9,000	9,000.00	9,000.00	--	100
	CHARGES FOR SERVICES	233,971	230,231.12	230,231.12	3,739.88	98
3-50-6101	INTEREST EARNED	--	.82	.82	.82-	0
	INTEREST EARNED		.82	.82	.82-	0
3-90-9111	ECONOMIC DEV TRANSFER	29,500	29,500.00	29,500.00	--	100
	INTERFUND TRANSFERS	29,500	29,500.00	29,500.00		100
T O T A L DEPT 100 R E V E N U E		273,471	310,695.55	274,472.74	1,001.74-	100
	E X P E N S E S					
5-10-1101	FAIR MANAGER	46,372	46,371.12	46,371.12	.88	100
5-10-1102	CARETAKER/MAINT.	18,801	13,509.89	13,509.89	5,291.11	72
5-10-1400	SALARIES--EXTRA HELP	2,000	--	--	2,000.00	0
5-10-2910	PAYROLL COSTS	36,848	19,288.21	19,288.21	17,559.79	52
5-10-2911	UNEMPLOYMENT RESERVE	500	500.00	500.00	--	100
5-10-8041	ADMINISTRATIVE CHG	2,000	2,000.00	2,000.00	--	100
	PERSONAL SERVICES	106,521	81,669.22	81,669.22	24,851.78	77
5-20-3000	TEAM ROPING	41,000	40,981.00	40,981.00	19.00	100
5-20-3100	MEMORIALS	100	--	--	100.00	0

2/04/16
3:44 PM
LDUBOIS
FUND-224 COUNTY FAIR FUND
DEPT-100 NON-DEPARTMENTAL

MALHEUR COUNTY
REVENUE/EXPENDITURE REPORT
7/01/14 THRU 6/30/15

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
5-20-4100	WATER	6,000	5,617.63	5,617.63	382.37	94
5-20-4101	POWER, ELECTRIC	5,000	7,431.85	7,431.85	2,431.85-	149
5-20-4102	GAS, UTIL.	4,000	2,014.29	2,014.29	1,985.71	50
5-20-4300	REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE	14,095	23,126.05	23,126.05	9,031.05-	164
5-20-5200	INSURANCE, BONDS	--	710.00	710.00	710.00-	0
5-20-5300	TELEPHONE	2,500	1,281.41	1,281.41	1,218.59	51
5-20-5800	TRAVEL & TRANSPORTATION	1,500	515.42	515.42	984.58	34
5-20-6110	OFFICE SUPPLIES	1,000	625.25	625.25	374.75	63
5-20-6120	LICENSE, DUES	1,000	780.00	780.00	220.00	78
5-20-6503	FUNDRAISING	6,021	6,021.00	6,021.00	--	100
5-20-6600	GENERAL SUPPLIES	1,000	742.18	742.18	257.82	74
5-20-6700	GAS & OIL	3,500	2,546.35	2,546.35	953.65	73
5-20-6800	INS PROCEEDS EXPENDITURES	1,000	--	--	1,000.00	0
5-20-8030	CLEANING FEE REFUND	7,000	5,500.00	5,500.00	1,500.00	79
5-20-8042	GRANT EXPENSE	1,250	1,250.00	1,250.00	--	100
5-20-8057	SOLAR PROJECT	8,000	7,993.50	7,993.50	6.50	100
5-20-9054	ADVERTISING, PUBLICITY	500	649.65	649.65	149.65-	130
5-20-9069	COMM BLDG SECURITY FEE	5,000	1,680.00	1,680.00	3,320.00	34
	MATERIALS & SERVICES	109,466	109,465.58	109,465.58	.42	100
5-40-7200	CONSTRUCTION	4,100	4,100.00	4,100.00	--	100
	CAPITAL OUTLAY	4,100	4,100.00	4,100.00		100
5-70-4303	FAIR MAINTENANCE	5,125	5,125.96	5,125.96	.96-	100
5-70-6600	FAIR SUPPLIES	6,060	6,059.82	6,059.82	.18	100
5-70-9032	FAIR ENTERTAINMENT	6,000	6,000.00	6,000.00	--	100
5-70-9033	FAIR JUDGES/CONSULTANTS	5,000	4,093.32	4,093.32	906.68	82
5-70-9055	FAIR CONTRACTED SERVICES	9,550	9,550.00	9,550.00	--	100
5-70-9066	FAIR MISC.	2,649	3,554.05	3,554.05	905.05-	134
5-70-9067	FAIR RIBBONS	4,000	4,000.00	4,000.00	--	100
5-70-9068	FAIR PREMIUM PRIZES	15,000	15,000.00	15,000.00	--	100
	OTHER MATERIAL & SERVICES	53,384	53,383.15	53,383.15	.85	100
	TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICES	106,521	81,669.22	81,669.22	24,851.78	77
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	109,466	109,465.58	109,465.58	.42	100
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY	4,100	4,100.00	4,100.00		100
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	53,384	53,383.15	53,383.15	.85	100
TOTAL DEPT 100 EXPENDITURE		273,471	248,617.95	248,617.95	24,853.05	91
TOTAL FUND 224 REVENUE		273,471	310,695.55	274,472.74	1,001.74-	100
	FUND PERSONNEL SERVICES	106,521	81,669.22	81,669.22	24,851.78	77
	FUND MATERIAL & SERV	109,466	109,465.58	109,465.58	.42	100
	FUND CAPITAL OUTLAY	4,100	4,100.00	4,100.00		100
	FUND ALL OTHER	53,384	53,383.15	53,383.15	.85	100
TOTAL FUND 224 EXPENDITURE		273,471	248,617.95	248,617.95	24,853.05	91
	FUND PRIOR BALANCE	36,222.81-				
	NET FUND BALANCE	25,854.79				

MALHEUR COUNTY
REVENUE/EXPENDITURE REPORT

7/01/14 THRU 6/30/15

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	GRAND TOTAL REVENUE	273,471	310,695.55	274,472.74	1,001.74-	100
	FUND PERSONNEL SERVICES	106,521	81,669.22	81,669.22	24,851.78	77
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	109,466	109,465.58	109,465.58	.42	100
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY	4,100	4,100.00	4,100.00		100
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	53,384	53,383.15	53,383.15	.85	100
	GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	273,471	248,617.95	248,617.95	24,853.05	91
	PRIOR BALANCE	36,222.81-				
	NET FUND BALANCE	25,854.79				

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	R E V E N U E S					
3-01-0101	CASH ON HAND	--	--	25,854.79	25,854.79-	0
	REVENUE			25,854.79	25,854.79-	0
3-30-3501	STATE APPORTIONMENT	50,000	53,666.67	53,666.67	3,666.67-	107
	INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE	50,000	53,666.67	53,666.67	3,666.67-	107
3-40-4100	OTHER REVENUE	1,500	15,464.43	15,464.43	13,964.43-	31
3-40-4700	FAIR ADMISSIONS	53,000	53,052.65	53,052.65	52.65-	100
3-40-4701	FAIR OUTSIDE BOOTHS	2,000	3,699.00	3,699.00	1,699.00-	185
3-40-4702	FAIR COMMERCIAL BLDG	5,000	8,049.00	8,049.00	3,049.00-	161
3-40-4703	FAIR FOOD CONCESSIONS	16,000	16,629.61	16,629.61	629.61-	104
3-40-4704	FAIR CARNIVAL	2,800	1,635.00	1,635.00	1,165.00	58
3-40-4705	FAIR MISCELLANEOUS	2,000	3,384.20	3,384.20	1,384.20-	169
3-40-4707	GRANDSTANDS	1,000	700.00	700.00	300.00	70
3-40-4708	AUCTIONS AND SALES	--	860.00	860.00	860.00-	0
3-40-4709	HORSE SHOWS	2,100	4,300.00	4,300.00	2,200.00-	205
3-40-4710	CLEANING FEE DEPOSIT	5,000	10,250.00	10,250.00	5,250.00-	205
3-40-4711	RODEO/TEAM ROPING	40,000	41,004.00	41,004.00	1,004.00-	103
3-40-4714	EVENTS/SHOWS	5,000	250.00	250.00	4,750.00	5
3-40-4715	FAIR ENTERTAINMENT	6,000	--	--	6,000.00	0
3-40-6300	STALL RENT	6,500	10,222.30	10,222.30	3,722.30-	157
3-40-6301	STORAGE/RV RENTAL	4,500	4,585.00	4,585.00	85.00-	102
3-40-6302	COMMERCIAL BLDG RENT	15,000	23,055.00	23,055.00	8,055.00-	154
3-40-6303	OFFICE RENTAL	--	300.00	300.00	300.00-	0
3-40-6500	DONATIONS	100	142.00	142.00	42.00-	142
3-40-6501	MEMORIALS	100	750.00	750.00	650.00-	750
3-40-6503	FUNDRAISING	100	1,700.00	1,700.00	1,600.00-	700
3-40-6504	FAIR DONATIONS	250	1,491.00	1,491.00	1,241.00-	596
3-40-6642	INSURANCE PROCEEDS	--	2,706.75	2,706.75	2,706.75-	0
3-40-6644	TVCC LEASE	9,000	9,000.00	9,000.00	--	100
3-40-6645	IDAHO POWER	3,600	4,484.12	4,484.12	884.12-	125
	CHARGES FOR SERVICES	180,550	217,714.06	217,714.06	37,164.06-	121
3-50-6101	INTEREST EARNED	--	220.27	220.27	220.27-	0
	INTEREST EARNED		220.27	220.27	220.27-	0
3-90-9111	ECONOMIC DEV TRANSFER	10,500	10,500.00	10,500.00	--	100
	INTERFUND TRANSFERS	10,500	10,500.00	10,500.00		100
T O T A L DEPT 100 R E V E N U E		241,050	282,101.00	307,955.79	66,905.79-	128
	E X P E N S E S					
5-10-1101	FAIR MANAGER	46,372	46,968.66	46,968.66	596.66-	101
5-10-1102	CARETAKER/MAINT.	15,000	13,781.86	13,781.86	1,218.14	92
5-10-2910	PAYROLL COSTS	14,349	14,016.67	14,016.67	332.33	98
5-10-2911	UNEMPLOYMENT RESERVE	500	500.00	500.00	--	100
5-10-8041	ADMINISTRATIVE CHG	2,000	2,000.00	2,000.00	--	100
	PERSONAL SERVICES	78,221	77,267.19	77,267.19	953.81	99
5-20-3000	TEAM ROPING	40,000	41,770.00	41,770.00	1,770.00-	104

FUND-224 COUNTY FAIR FUND 7/01/15 THRU 6/30/16
DEPT-100 NON-DEPARTMENTAL

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
5-20-3100	MEMORIALS	1,290	2,295.00	2,295.00	1,005.00-	178
5-20-4100	WATER	6,000	6,017.54	6,017.54	17.54-	100
5-20-4101	POWER, ELECTRIC	6,000	997.76	997.76	5,002.24	17
5-20-4102	GAS, UTIL.	4,000	3,272.16	3,272.16	727.84	82
5-20-4300	REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE	18,135	18,125.01	18,125.01	9.99	100
5-20-5200	INSURANCE, BONDS	5,650	864.36	864.36	4,785.64	15
5-20-5300	TELEPHONE	1,500	663.77	663.77	836.23	44
5-20-5800	TRAVEL & TRANSPORTATION	750	1,234.61	1,234.61	484.61-	165
5-20-6110	OFFICE SUPPLIES	500	1,207.71	1,207.71	707.71-	242
5-20-6120	LICENSE, DUES	750	780.00	780.00	30.00-	104
5-20-6503	FUNDRAISING	100	--	--	100.00	0
5-20-6600	GENERAL SUPPLIES	1,000	2,091.74	2,091.74	1,091.74-	209
5-20-6700	GAS & OIL	3,500	1,866.95	1,866.95	1,633.05	53
5-20-6800	INS PROCEEDS EXPENDITURES	1,000	1,214.95	1,214.95	214.95-	121
5-20-8030	CLEANING FEE REFUND	5,000	8,540.00	8,540.00	3,540.00-	171
5-20-8057	SOLAR PROJECT	9,593	11,190.90	11,190.90	1,597.90-	117
5-20-9054	ADVERTISING, PUBLICITY	1,000	1,495.06	1,495.06	495.06-	150
5-20-9069	COMM BLDG SECURITY FEE	6,410	7,260.00	7,260.00	850.00-	113
	MATERIALS & SERVICES	112,178	110,887.52	110,887.52	1,290.48	99
5-60-8080	CONTINGENCY FUND	3,151	--	--	3,151.00	0
	CONTINGENCIES	3,151			3,151.00	0
5-70-4303	FAIR MAINTENANCE	5,000	4,971.54	4,971.54	28.46	99
5-70-6600	FAIR SUPPLIES	6,000	2,941.53	2,941.53	3,058.47	49
5-70-9032	FAIR ENTERTAINMENT	6,000	7,955.00	7,955.00	1,955.00-	133
5-70-9033	FAIR JUDGES/CONSULTANTS	4,500	4,100.41	4,100.41	399.59	91
5-70-9055	FAIR CONTRACTED SERVICES	9,600	9,900.00	9,900.00	300.00-	103
5-70-9066	FAIR MISC.	3,000	3,048.75	3,048.75	48.75-	102
5-70-9067	FAIR RIBBONS	7,400	7,394.32	7,394.32	5.68	100
5-70-9068	FAIR PREMIUM PRIZES	6,000	6,000.00	6,000.00	--	100
	OTHER MATERIAL & SERVICES	47,500	46,311.55	46,311.55	1,188.45	97
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	78,221	77,267.19	77,267.19	953.81	99
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	112,178	110,887.52	110,887.52	1,290.48	99
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	50,651	46,311.55	46,311.55	4,339.45	91
TOTAL DEPT 100 EXPENDITURE		241,050	234,466.26	234,466.26	6,583.74	97
TOTAL FUND 224 REVENUE		241,050	282,101.00	307,955.79	66,905.79-	128
	FUND PERSONAL SERVICES	78,221	77,267.19	77,267.19	953.81	99
	FUND MATERIAL & SERV	112,178	110,887.52	110,887.52	1,290.48	99
	FUND CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	FUND ALL OTHER	50,651	46,311.55	46,311.55	4,339.45	91
TOTAL FUND 224 EXPENDITURE		241,050	234,466.26	234,466.26	6,583.74	97
	FUND PRIOR BALANCE	25,854.79				
	NET FUND BALANCE	73,489.53				
	GRAND TOTAL REVENUE	241,050	282,101.00	307,955.79	66,905.79-	128

FUND-224 COUNTY FAIR FUND
DEPT-100 NON-DEPARTMENTAL

7/01/15 THRU 6/30/16

ACCOUNT	DESC	BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	78,221	77,267.19	77,267.19	953.81	99
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	112,178	110,887.52	110,887.52	1,290.48	99
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	50,651	46,311.55	46,311.55	4,339.45	91
	GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	241,050	234,466.26	234,466.26	6,583.74	97
	PRIOR BALANCE	25,854.79				
	NET FUND BALANCE	73,489.53				

DATE ACCOUNT	TYP # DESC ACCOUNT	DESC BUDGET	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	EXPENSE YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	REVENUES					
3-01-0101	CASH ON HAND	28,000	--	73,489.53	45,489.53-	262
	REVENUE	28,000		73,489.53	45,489.53-	262
3-30-3501	STATE APPORTIONMENT	53,000	--	--	53,000.00	0
	INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE	53,000			53,000.00	0
3-40-4100	OTHER REVENUE	6,000	--	11,257.00	5,257.00-	188
3-40-4700	FAIR ADMISSIONS	53,000	--	48,068.34	4,931.66	91
3-40-4701	FAIR OUTSIDE BOOTHS	2,000	--	3,212.00	1,212.00-	161
3-40-4702	FAIR COMMERCIAL BLDG	5,000	--	5,350.00	350.00-	107
3-40-4703	FAIR FOOD CONCESSIONS	16,000	--	14,579.67	1,420.33	91
3-40-4705	FAIR MISCELLANEOUS	500	--	1,035.00	535.00-	207
3-40-4707	GRANDSTANDS	1,000	--	250.00	750.00	25
3-40-4709	HORSE SHOWS	2,100	--	1,600.00	500.00	76
3-40-4710	CLEANING FEE DEPOSIT	5,000	--	1,350.00	3,650.00	27
3-40-4711	RODEO/TEAM ROPING	35,000	--	31,262.00	3,738.00	89
3-40-4715	FAIR ENTERTAINMENT	6,000	--	--	6,000.00	0
3-40-6300	STALL RENT	6,500	--	6,965.00	465.00-	107
3-40-6301	STORAGE/RV RENTAL	4,500	--	1,600.00	2,900.00	36
3-40-6302	COMMERCIAL BLDG RENT	15,000	--	10,799.00	4,201.00	72
3-40-6303	OFFICE RENTAL	100	--	--	100.00	0
3-40-6500	DONATIONS	100	--	--	100.00	0
3-40-6501	MEMORIALS	500	--	--	500.00	0
3-40-6504	FAIR DONATIONS	250	--	1,010.25	760.25-	404
3-40-6644	TVCC LEASE	9,000	--	4,500.00	4,500.00	50
3-40-6645	IDAHO POWER	2,500	--	2,548.86	48.86-	102
	CHARGES FOR SERVICES	170,050		145,387.12	24,662.88	85
1/04/17	JV 2090 3-50-6101	INT INT DIST ADB	13.30			

DATE ACCOUNT	TYP # DESC	ACCOUNT	DESC BUDGET	EXPENSE	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
3-50-6101	INTEREST EARNED		--		13.30	119.93	119.93-	0
	INTEREST EARNED				13.30	119.93	119.93-	0
3-90-9111	ECONOMIC DEV TRANSFER		20,000		--	20,000.00	--	100
	INTERFUND TRANSFERS		20,000			20,000.00		100
TOTAL DEPT 100 REVENUE			271,050		13.30	238,996.58	32,053.42	88
			EXPENSES					
1/31/17	PR 92019	5-10-1101	CHRISTIANI LYNE	3,333.33				
5-10-1101	FAIR MANAGER		45,000		3,333.33	23,333.31	21,666.69	52
1/12/17	AP 117166	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	568.00				
1/18/17	AP 117211	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	568.00				
1/18/17	AP 117211	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	568.00				
1/18/17	AP 117211	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	568.00				
1/26/17	AP 117311	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	1,022.40				
1/26/17	AP 117311	5-10-1102	AMERICAN STAFFING INC	568.00				
5-10-1102	CARETAKER/MAINT.		25,000		3,862.40	15,835.49	9,164.51	63
5-10-1400	SALARIES--EXTRA HELP		1,000		--	--	1,000.00	0
1/31/17	PR 92019	5-10-2910	CHRISTIANI LYNE	1,141.32				
5-10-2910	PAYROLL COSTS		20,158		1,141.32	7,798.26	12,359.74	39
5-10-2911	UNEMPLOYMENT RESERVE		500		--	500.00	--	100
1/10/17	AP 117126	5-10-8041	MALHEUR CO	2,000.00				
5-10-8041	ADMINISTRATIVE CHG		2,000		2,000.00	2,000.00	--	100
	PERSONAL SERVICES		93,658		10,337.05	49,467.06	44,190.94	53
5-20-3000	TEAM ROPING		42,000		--	44,659.96	2,659.96-	106
5-20-3100	MEMORIALS		100		--	--	100.00	0
1/12/17	AP 117147	5-20-4100	CITY OF ONTARIO	53.21				
1/12/17	AP 117147	5-20-4100	CITY OF ONTARIO	284.71				
5-20-4100	WATER		7,000		337.92	3,218.14	3,781.86	46
1/18/17	AP 117191	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	186.63				
1/18/17	AP 117191	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	21.15				
1/18/17	AP 117191	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	244.34				
1/26/17	AP 117297	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	166.37				
1/26/17	AP 117297	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	24.37				
1/26/17	AP 117297	5-20-4101	IDAHO POWER COMPANY	510.53				
5-20-4101	POWER, ELECTRIC		3,000		1,153.39	2,654.11	345.89	88
1/12/17	AP 117149	5-20-4102	ONTARIO SANITARY SERVICE IN	98.93				
1/18/17	AP 117196	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	25.43				

DATE / ACCOUNT	TYP	# / DESC	ACCOUNT	DESC / BUDGET	EXPENSE	MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
1/18/17	AP	117196	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	211.78				
1/18/17	AP	117196	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	16.68				
1/18/17	AP	117216	5-20-4102	CABLE ONE	118.97				
1/26/17	AP	117305	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	52.22				
1/26/17	AP	117305	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	330.23				
1/26/17	AP	117305	5-20-4102	CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORP	96.39				
1/26/17	AP	117318	5-20-4102	CABLE ONE	127.39				
5-20-4102		GAS, UTIL.		4,000		1,078.02	3,741.96	258.04	94
1/12/17	AP	117159	5-20-4300	JOHN DEERE FINANCIAL	446.25				
1/12/17	AP	117171	5-20-4300	HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES	16.56				
1/12/17	AP	117184	5-20-4300	LYNELLE CHRISTIANI	96.88				
1/26/17	AP	117319	5-20-4300	HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES	45.33				
5-20-4300		REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE		20,000		605.02	31,695.58	11,695.58-	158
5-20-5200		INSURANCE, BONDS		13,200		--	13,784.33	584.33-	104
5-20-5300		TELEPHONE		1,500		--	--	1,500.00	0
1/12/17	AP	117184	5-20-5800	LYNELLE CHRISTIANI	52.49				
5-20-5800		TRAVEL & TRANSPORTATION		1,250		52.49	1,677.29	427.29-	134
1/12/17	AP	117184	5-20-6110	LYNELLE CHRISTIANI	64.98				
5-20-6110		OFFICE SUPPLIES		500		64.98	549.22	49.22-	110
1/12/17	AP	117187	5-20-6120	ONTARIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	150.00				
5-20-6120		LICENSE, DUES		750		150.00	850.00	100.00-	113
1/12/17	AP	117180	5-20-6600	JEFF CARPENTER	400.00				
1/18/17	AP	117203	5-20-6600	CLARION INN	25.50				
1/26/17	AP	117307	5-20-6600	CLARION INN	8.50				
5-20-6600		GENERAL SUPPLIES		1,000		434.00	1,397.04	397.04-	140
1/18/17	AP	117190	5-20-6700	FARMERS SUPPLY COOP	41.65				
1/26/17	AP	117296	5-20-6700	FARMERS SUPPLY COOP	11.57				
5-20-6700		GAS & OIL		3,500		53.22	782.58	2,717.42	22
5-20-6800		INS PROCEEDS EXPENDITURES		800		--	344.13	455.87	43
5-20-8030		CLEANING FEE REFUND		5,000		--	4,035.00	965.00	81
1/18/17	AP	117210	5-20-8057	ROGER FINDLEY	799.35				
1/26/17	AP	117310	5-20-8057	ROGER FINDLEY	799.35				
5-20-8057		SOLAR PROJECT		9,593		1,598.70	5,595.45	3,997.55	58
1/12/17	AP	117145	5-20-9054	ARGUS OBSERVER	288.00				
5-20-9054		ADVERTISING, PUBLICITY		2,000		288.00	506.50	1,493.50	25
5-20-9069		COMM BLDG SECURITY FEE		5,000		--	3,870.00	1,130.00	77
		MATERIALS & SERVICES		120,193		5,815.74	119,361.29	831.71	99
5-60-8080		CONTINGENCY FUND		4,699		--	--	4,699.00	0

FUND-224 COUNTY FAIR FUND 1/01/17 THRU 1/31/17
DEPT-100 NON-DEPARTMENTAL

DATE ACCOUNT	TYP # DESC ACCOUNT	DESC BUDGET	EXPENSE MONTH-TO-DATE EXPENSE/REV	YEAR TO DATE EXPENSE/REV	UNEMCUMBERED BALANCE	%
	CONTINGENCIES	4,699			4,699.00	0
5-70-4303	FAIR MAINTENANCE	5,000	--	8,688.65	3,688.65-	174
5-70-6600	FAIR SUPPLIES	6,000	--	8,555.38	2,555.38-	143
5-70-9032	FAIR ENTERTAINMENT	10,000	--	7,428.20	2,571.80	74
5-70-9033	FAIR JUDGES/CONSULTANTS	4,500	--	3,723.26	776.74	83
5-70-9054	FAIR ADVERTISING	--	--	2,130.00	2,130.00-	0
5-70-9055	FAIR CONTRACTED SERVICES	10,000	--	14,055.00	4,055.00-	141
5-70-9066	FAIR MISC.	3,000	--	361.00	2,639.00	12
5-70-9067	FAIR RIBBONS	4,000	--	443.01	3,556.99	11
5-70-9068	FAIR PREMIUM/PRIZES	10,000	--	10,000.00	--	100
	OTHER MATERIAL & SERVICES	52,500		55,384.50	2,884.50-	105
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	93,658	10,337.05	49,467.06	44,190.94	53
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	120,193	5,815.74	119,361.29	831.71	99
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	57,199		55,384.50	1,814.50	97
T O T A L DEPT 100 E X P E N D I T U R E		271,050	16,152.79	224,212.85	46,837.15	83
T O T A L FUND 224 R E V E N U E		271,050	13.30	238,996.58	32,053.42	88
	FUND PERSONAL SERVICES	93,658	10,337.05	49,467.06	44,190.94	53
	FUND MATERIAL & SERV	120,193	5,815.74	119,361.29	831.71	99
	FUND CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	FUND ALL OTHER	57,199		55,384.50	1,814.50	97
T O T A L FUND 224 E X P E N D I T U R E		271,050	16,152.79	224,212.85	46,837.15	83
	FUND PRIOR BALANCE	30,923.22				
	NET FUND BALANCE	14,783.73				
	GRAND TOTAL REVENUE	271,050	13.30	238,996.58	32,053.42	88
	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	93,658	10,337.05	49,467.06	44,190.94	53
	TOTAL MATERIAL & SERV	120,193	5,815.74	119,361.29	831.71	99
	TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY					0
	TOTAL ALL OTHER	57,199		55,384.50	1,814.50	97
	GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURE	271,050	16,152.79	224,212.85	46,837.15	83
	PRIOR BALANCE	30,923.22				
	NET FUND BALANCE	14,783.73				

V&C GRANT CRITERIA CHECKLIST

Applicant/Event: Malheur County Fair Concert Series

	Criteria	Meets No Criteria - Point Value 0	Partly Meets Criteria - Point Value 1	Sufficiently Meets Criteria - Point Value 3	Exceeds Criteria - Point Value 5
1	The project is a capital project, which enhances tourism such as, but not limited to, beautification. Examples of such potential projects might include coordinated refuse bins in shopping areas or enhancements to the highway arterial entrances to the City of Ontario such as shrubs, lighting or signage.				
2	Events that would attract attendees and participants from out of the area and would promote local tourism and business. Extra consideration will be given to multi-night events that necessitate over night lodging in the Ontario area.				
3	Projects consisting of special area media promotions. These could include, among others, special brochures or videos or advertising co-op projects designed to extol the virtues of Ontario as a tourism, convention, cultural, or recreational destination.				
4	Projects related to the education and/or training of the Visitors and Conventions Director or Board members.				

	ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS	YES	NO		
	Is this a not for profit project?			X	X
	TOTAL POINTS				

POINT SYSTEM

0	Unable to provide funding.
1 through 3	May provide funding with or without contingencies.
4 through 5	May provide funding with or without contingencies.

Date: 03/01/18

Ontario V&C Minutes
February 1, 2018
7:00 am
Clarion Inn

Meeting called to order at 7:00 am by Chairman Bob Quinn.
Roll Call – Debbie Blackaby, Cheryl Cruson, Laura Davis, Doug Dean, John Hall, Bob Quinn, Ron Verini, V&C Director John Breidenbach
Absent: City Manager Adam Brown

NEW BUSINESS

Grant Request: Border Town Comic Con 2018
Peter Lawson and Randall Kirby presented the funds request for Border Town Comic Con 2018. The previous two events were quite successful, bringing in several people to Ontario. There were about 1,000 people last year, which increased from the first Border Town Comic Con. Hours have been changed after analyzing attendance from previous years. The event has also been expanded to cover two days instead of one, bringing in over-night stays to Ontario as well. Vendors showed a positive turn-out with their sales and they quickly ran out of vendor space for the upcoming Border Town Comic Con. Vendors have applied from areas such as Boise, Fruitland, and Portland. The registration fee for vendors is set at $60 for two days. Most vendors are expected to stay for both days of the event. Sponsorships have been received from Country Insurance, Country Financial, Malheur Federal Credit Union, and Kinney & Keele. Advertising will be done in Boise and local newspapers. As long as the attendance does well, they anticipate putting together the Border Town Comic Con again for 2019. The carry-over from last year's event was at $6,000; because of this, Peter Lawson and Randall Kirby believe this will be the last time they make a V&C grant request. Funds would be used to pay for Four Rivers Cultural Center's facilities.
Funds in the full amount of $1,500.00 for the Border Town Comic Con were approved. Moved by John Hall and seconded by Cheryl Cruson. Motion carried.

Grant Request: Friends of the Aquatic Center
Megan Cook presented the funds request for the Friends of the Aquatic Center. She reported that the committee branched off from a City committee and initially gathered information from local students about their desires for a future pool. A survey on the subject was also given to the community. A simulated splash pad event was well-attended with over 700 attendees. There will be three part-time workers that would watch the area. The max capacity for the splash pad has yet to be determined and the entrance fee is currently situated around $2-$3. Profit from the splash pad would be used to renovate the original pool and its building. The focus would be placed on removing the roof from the building, due to its ventilation issues. As such, this would create a seasonal pool. With the current funds of the Friends of the Aquatic Center, the pad for the splash pad can be installed. They would like to create two bathrooms for the splash pad area. Applications for various grants have been made as well. Funds would be used for the deck surrounding the splash pad.
Funds in the full amount of $10,000.00 for the Friends of the Aquatic Center were approved,

with the requirement of a more detailed budget, with operational and maintenance expenses, at a later date. Moved by Doug Dean and seconded by Debbie Blackaby, with an opposition from John Hall. Motion carried.

MINUTES/FINANCIALS

The October 2017 minutes were reviewed; it was moved by Cheryl Cruson and seconded by Debbie Blackaby to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried. Financials were presented by Laura Davis. It was moved by Ron Verini and seconded by Cheryl Cruson to approve the financials as presented. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

CITY OF ONTARIO VISITORS AND CONVENTIONS BOARD PROMOTIONS AND EVENT FUND BALANCES THROUGH **DRAFT FEBRUARY 2018**			
2017	*RESOURCES*	*EXPENSES*	*BALANCE*
BALANCE FORWARD	$612,152.15	$599,665.68	$12,486.47
JULY *T.O.T. Disbursement -$2500*	$2,500.00	$1,569.62	$13,416.85
AUGUST *T.O.T. Disbursement -$2500*	$2,500.00	$10,825.00	$5,091.85
SEPTEMBER *T.O.T. Disbursement -$2500*	$2,500.00	$139.24	$7,452.61
OCTOBER *T.O.T. Disbursement -$2500* *V&C Proj.Reimbrsmnt-$662*	$3,162.00	$2,259.62	$8,354.99
NOVEMBER	$2,500.00	$0.00	$10,854.99
DECEMBER	$2,500.00	$0.00	$13,354.99
2018			
JANUARY	$2,500.00	$0.00	$15,854.99
FEBRUARY	$2,500.00	$12,069.62	$6,285.37
MARCH			$6,285.37
APRIL			$6,285.37
MAY			$6,285.37
JUNE			$6,285.37
TOTAL FISCAL	$20,662.00	$26,863.10	
ACCRUALS FROM JULY 1997 TO PRESENT	$632,814.15	$626,528.78	$6,285.37

CITY OF ONTARIO
VISITORS AND CONVENTIONS BOARD
ACTIVITY SUMMARY
BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 1997

DATE	REQUESTOR	REQUESTED	GRANTED	DISBURSED
Sep, 1997	Chamber V&C Director (Conference & Travel Expenses)	$ 893.13	$ 893.13	$ 893.13
MAY 2017	V&C BREAKFAST MEETING (04/17/17 - CK# 121646)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
JUNE 2017	V&C BREAKFAST MEETING (06/08/17 - CK# 121816)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
JUNE 2017	REVITALIZE ONTARIO RING OF FIRE FESTIVAL	$ 4,844.00	$ 4,844.00	$ 4,844.00
JUNE 2017	ONTARIO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE REIMBURSEMENT FOR GOVERNOR'S CONF. ON TOURISM	$ 856.00	$ 856.00	$ 856.00
JULY 2017	V & C BREAKFAST MEETING (07/06/17 - CK# 121989)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
JULY 2017	ONTARIO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PROMOTION OF AWE ONTARIO	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
AUG 2017	BULLS & BRONCS EXTRAVAGANZA BULLS & BRONCS EXTRAVAGANZA EVENT	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00
AUG 2017	ONTARIO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SOLAR ECLIPSE BANNERS & BUSSES	$ 1,825.00	$ 1,825.00	$ 1,825.00
AUG 2017	SNAKE RIVER NISEI GOLF ASSOCIATION 83RD ANNUAL NORTHWEST NIKKEI GOLF TOURNAMENT	$ 4,000.00	$ 4,000.00	$ 4,000.00
SEP 2017	V & C BREAKFAST MEETING (08/03/17 - CK# 122090)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
SEP 2017	V & C BREAKFAST MEETING (09/08/17 - CK# 122134)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
OCT 2017	V & C BREAKFAST MEETING (10/06/17 - CK#122233)	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
OCT 2017	TVCC RODEO TEAM TVCC CHUCKAR RODEO	$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00	$ 2,000.00
OCT 2017	VETERAN'S SMALL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT VETERAN'S SMALL BUSINESS BROCHURE PUBLICATION	$ 190.00	$ 190.00	$ 190.00
NOV 2017	NO NEW ACTIVITY	$ -	$ -	$ -
DEC 2017	NO NEW ACTIVITY			
JAN 2018	NO NEW ACTIVITY			
FEB 2018	V & C BREAKFAST MEETING (02/01/18) *** Check #122724 dated 02/08/18***	$ 69.62	$ 69.62	$ 69.62
FEB 2018	BORDER TOWN COMIC CON BORDER TOWN COMIC CON 2018	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,500.00
FEB 2018	FRIENDS OF THE AQUATIC CENTER SPLASH PAD PARK	$ 10,500.00	$ 10,500.00	$ 10,500.00
	2/22/2018	$ 717,976.84	$ 600,331.57	$ 600,331.57

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
CITY OF ONTARIO OREGON
MARCH 5, 2018
7:00 P.M., M.T.

1) **Call to Order:**
Commissioner Craig Smith _____ Commissioner Cindy McLeran _____ Commissioner Max Twombly _____
Commissioner John Hall _____ Commissioner John Briedenbach _____ Commissioner Richard Newman _____
Chairman Ralph Poole _____

City Council Ex-Officio_____ City Manager _____
Economic Development Director _____ Planning & Zoning Technician _____

2) **Pledge of Allegiance**

3) **Motion to Adopt the Agenda**
This Agenda was posted on 02/26/18. Copies of the Agenda are available at the Community Development Center and on the city's website at www.ontariooregon.org.

Public Comments: Citizens may address the Planning Commission; however, the Planning Commission may not be able to provide an immediate answer or response. Out of respect to the Commissioners and others in attendance, please limit your comment to three minutes. Please state your name and city of residence for the record.

4) **Approval of Minutes**
A) Minutes: Planning Commission Meeting of November 6, 2017 ....

5) **Old Business**

6) **New Business**
A) Land Use Action #:2017-12-21AZ A REQUEST FOR ANNEXATION AND REZONE AT 510 SE 13th STREET ....

7) **Hand-Outs/Discussion Items**
A) Housing Incentive Program Update........
B) Report from the Community Development Director: Quarterly Presentation ....
C) Discussion on PC Meeting days ....
D) Recent Building Permit Activity ....

8) **Comments from Commissioners**

9) **Adjourn**

CITY OF ONTARIO, 444 SW 4TH STREET, ONTARIO OREGON 97914

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
Monday
November 6, 2017

The Ontario Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Commission members present were Vice-Chairman Max Twombly, Cindy McLeran, Craig Smith, John Hall, and Richard Newman. John Briedenbach and Chairman Ralph Poole were excused.

City Staff present were Dan Cummings, Community Development Director and Marcy Siriwardene, Planning and Zoning Technician. Adam Brown, the City Manager, was present as well.

The meeting was recorded on tape and the tape is on file at the City Community Development Center. The Agenda for this meeting was emailed and/or hand delivered on or before October 30, 2017. Copies of the Agenda were available at the City Community Development Center.

Commissioner Twombly led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

MOTION TO ADOPT AGENDA
John Hall moved, seconded by Craig Smith, to adopt the amended Agenda. Roll call vote: Smith-yes; McCleran-yes; Twombly-yes; Hall-yes; Briedenbach-out; Newman-yes; Poole-out. Motion carried 5/2/0.

NOMINATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VICE-CHAIRMAN
Craig Smith moved, seconded by John Hall, to nominate Max Twombly as Vice-Chairman. Roll call vote: Smith-yes; McCleran-yes; Twombly-yes; Hall-yes; Briedenbach-out; Newman-yes; Poole-out. Motion carried 5/2/0.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES
John Hall moved, seconded by Richard Newman, to adopt the minutes of July 10, 2017. Roll call vote: Smith-yes; McCleran-yes; Twombly-yes; Hall-yes; Briedenbach-out; Newman-yes; Poole-out. Motion carried 5/2/0.

Presentation by Adam Brown, City of Ontario City Manager.
Adam Brown gave an update on the new program for the housing incentive program. The City of Ontario's new residential construction amounts are much lower than across the river and the City Council wanted to give an incentive to new home builders (owners or builders) to build their home in Ontario. The program would use the City's Business Revolving Loan Fund to offer a $10,000 cash incentive. An agreement would be made upfront and when a Certificate of Occupancy was issued, the person would receive $10,000. Mr. Brown welcomed comments and suggestions from the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Hall asked if the funds would benefit the homeowner or the builder.

Mr. Smith answered that it was more of an incentive to get builders over.

Mr. Cummings added that he would assume that the incentive would be offered to the home owner if he were building his own home as well.

Mr. Hall commented that either way it would benefit both the homeowner and builder.

Mr. Twombly asked if there were buildable lots for the program. There were.

Mr. Cummings said that there were some buildable lots around town including Sage Ridge Place Subdivision but not a lot of buildable lots in the city.

Mr. Brown commented that there was around $460,000 in the Revolving Loan Fund.

Mr. Twombly asked about the time limit for the program.

Mr. Brown answered that there had not been an ending date discussed although it may be reevaluated after a certain amount of years.

PUBLIC HEARING 2017-08-16AZ-A REQUEST FOR ANNEXATION AND REZONE OF A PARCEL OF LAND BEING LOCATED AT 510 SE 13TH STREET. IF APPROVED, THIS ACTION WILL RESULT IN THE ANNEXATION OF 0.39 ACRES OF LAND INTO THE CITY OF ONTARIO; AND, THE REZONING OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM URBAN GROWTH AREA GENERAL COMMERCIAL (UGA C-2) TO THE CITY GENERAL HEAVY COMMERCIAL (C-2H) ZONE. THE APPLICANT IS CHARLES OAKES, ORGANIZER AND PROPERTY OWNER IS E.O. INVESTMENTS LLC.

There were no unscheduled public appearances.

There were no objections to Planning Commission jurisdiction and no abstentions or ex-parte contact.

There were no Old Business Discussion Items.

Mr. Cummings presented the following staff report:.

II. SUMMARY & BACKGROUND:

The applicants own lots in the Ridgeview subdivision, known as 18S4711BC, tax lot 800. The applicants wish to annex and rezone the property into the City for future development. This application, if approved, will result in the annexation of 0.39 plus the right of way for SE 5th Avenue and SE 13th Street of land into the City and a rezone of the property from Urban Growth Area General Commercial (UGA C-2) to City General Heavy Commercial (C-2H).

This request for annexation and rezone needs a recommendation for approval or rejection from the Planning Commission to the City Council. The Ontario Municipal Code (OMC) designates the Planning Commission as the decision making body for a request for rezone, without City Council participation. The OMC designates the City Council as the decision making body for a request for annexation, without Planning Commission participation. State Law requires an Ordinance be adopted by the local governing body to accomplish a rezone. The City's governing body is the City Council, and they are the only body that may adopt an Ordinance; therefore, a request for rezone should go before the Council for a final decision. Staff feels that the best procedure is consistency with State law; therefore, this matter needs a recommendation from the Planning Commission, and then will be forwarded to the City Council for their decision.

III. PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

Nothing on this request.

IV. Applicable Ordinance & Comprehensive Plan Criteria and Standards:

The proposed development must comply with applicable provisions of the OCC (City of Ontario Zoning Ordinance as set forth in the Ontario City Code), and the City of Ontario Comprehensive Plan. Generally, unless otherwise noted, if a request is found to be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance it is considered to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

A. Rezone

1. *Section 10B-20-30 REQUIRED FINDINGS, DECISION CRITERIA. In preparing findings to support a quasi- judicial zoning map amendment decision, the following findings shall be addressed except when alternatives are set forth or where a required findings clearly does not apply to the current action:*

   a. *The zoning map amendment is in conformance with statewide planning goals and guidelines.*

   b. *The zoning map amendment is in conformity with the acknowledged comprehensive plan.*

   c. *The applicant has demonstrated a mistake or error in the original zone designation or the applicant has demonstrated a change in physical, social or market conditions generally effecting the area which make the proposed change appropriate.*

   d. *A public need is demonstrated for this zoning at this location and is not the granting of a special privilege for a single property or small group of properties.*

   e. *The property effected by the change is adequate in size and shape to facilitate its use and development as permitted under the new zoning classification.*

   f. *The property effected by the proposed change of zone is properly related to streets and public facilities and with services adequate to meet the demands of the uses allowed in the new zone.*

   g. *The proposed zoning map change will not result in adverse effects upon surrounding properties or surrounding uses from dust, noise, vibration, odor, heat, glare, lighting, or discharges into the air, water or land.*

Findings of fact based on the answers and information given in the application made a part hereof:

a. The City of Ontario Municipal Code Implements policies contained in the City of Ontario Comprehensive Plan, which conforms to the Statewide Planning Goals; if a proposed rezone meets all criteria and standards contained in the OMC, the request will be consistent with Comprehensive Plan Policies and therefore conform to the Statewide Planning Goals.

b. The subject properties are currently zoned UGA C-2 (General Commercial) and the request is to rezone to the companion City C-2H (General Heavy Commercial) Zone that is the same zone as adjacent and nearby properties. The requested zone allows basically the same use as the UGA zone, and is reflected in the Comprehensive Plan. No Comprehensive Plan amendment is necessary for this rezone; therefore, the proposal is consistent with, and conforms to, the Comprehensive Plan.

c. The applicants have requested annexation into the City of Ontario concurrent with the request for rezone; a City Zone must be applied to the property once within City Limits. The existing zone is not a mistake, and there is no need to demonstrate a change in conditions in the surrounding area; the change in zone is necessary and appropriate.

d. This request is legally necessary due to the annexation of the property; granting of this request is not a special privilege and no public need has to be demonstrated.

e. The subject property is adequate in size and shape for the proposed use to be rezoned from UGA Commercial to City C-2H General Heavy Commercial.

f. The property owner of tax lot 800 proposes future development and is requesting annexation and rezoning for timely redevelopment of the property in the near future. City Water and Sewer is available adjacent to the property on the west in SE 13th Street and City water is available adjacent to the property on the north in SE 5th Avenue. City fire and police services will be available upon annexation for the property.
Additional right of way for SE 5th Avenue and SE 13th Street will be a requirement of this annexation process and will be granted to the City prior to final approval of the Annexation order. City streets, including curb, gutter, sidewalks and public utilities will be deferred under a Deferred Improvement Agreement (DIA) being recorded prior to or concurrent with final approval of this action.

g. Uses allowed by the current zone are basically identical to the proposed zone. No significant difference in allowed uses will occur as a result of the rezone. Requirements in the OMC applicable to uses in the commercial zone will ensure that impacts from dust, noise, vibration, odor, heat, glare, lighting, or discharges into the air, water or land are minimized.

Conclusion: The proposed rezone is consistent with all applicable criteria and standards.

B. Annexation:

1. *10B-45-10 INITIATION OF ACTION. When a person, authorized by statute, wishes to extend the city's boundaries, an application on forms supplied by the city shall be filed with the Planning Director and which include: annexation consent forms, by the property owners, and by tenants if required by law or court decision; request for a change in zoning map designation, or plan change if required; request for other quasi-judicial action if required; fees, and other exhibits and requirements for a quasi- judicial action as set forth in this Title. All land use actions associated with the annexation shall be consolidated, as feasible, and one fee paid.*
2. *Oregon Revised Statute 222.125: Annexation by consent of all owners of land and majority of electors; proclamation of annexation. The legislative body of a city need not call or hold an election in the city or in any contiguous territory proposed to be annexed or hold the hearing otherwise required under ORS 222.120 when all of the owners of land in that territory and not less than 50 percent of the electors, if any, residing in the territory consent in writing to the annexation of the land in the territory and file a statement of their consent with the legislative body. Upon receiving written consent to annexation by owners and electors under this section, the legislative body of the city, by resolution or ordinance, may set the final boundaries of the area to be annexed by a legal description and proclaim the annexation.*

Findings based on the answers and information given in the application made a part hereof:

1. The applicants have paid the fees and provided the proper application with signatures.

2. The property is annexable because it lies inside the Urban Growth Boundary and is contiguous with current city limits.

3. The property is currently zoned for Commercial use in the Urban Growth Area; the requested zone, City General Heavy Commercial (C-2H), is consistent with contiguous property.

4. Findings from preceding sections of this report are herein included by this reference. A change to the comprehensive plan map or text is not necessary to annex the property; however, the annexation of the property must be consistent with all applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies.

5. Annexation would benefit the city by increasing tax revenue, and, by providing more potentially developable commercial lands in a highly developable area.

Conclusion: All criteria and standards applicable to a request for annexation have been met. The property may be annexed.

V. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION

A request for annexation and rezone of property may be recommended for approval or denial by the Planning Commission to the City Council if all applicable decision criteria and standards are found met, or able to be met through appropriate conditions of approval. In this case, findings must be made by the Planning Commission that the specific criteria are either met, able to be met through conditions of approval, or not met; options and discussion are provided under "**Findings:**" and "**Conclusion:**" for each criterion. **All** of the criteria and standards must be met in order for the request to be recommended for approval.

VI. SUGGESTED MOTIONS FOR APPROVAL/DENIAL

A. Approval:

1. I move that the request for Annexation of the subject properties into the City of Ontario, and the request for Rezone of the subject properties from UGA C-2 General Commercial to C-2H City General Heavy Commercial, as set forth in **ACTION 2017-08-16AZ** be recommended for **APPROVAL** to the City Council, based on the information, findings and conclusions set forth in Sections I through IV above, subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in Section VII of this report.

B. Denial:

1. I move that the request for Annexation of the subject properties into the City of Ontario, and the request for Rezone of the subject properties from UGA C-2 General Commercial to City C-2H General Heavy Commercial, as set forth in **ACTION 2017-08-16AZ** be

recommended for **DENIAL** to the City Council, based on the information, findings and conclusions stated below:

VII. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The approval of the annexation and rezone granted herein is valid for a period of one year from the date the decision of the Council is final; that final decision date shall be the date of expiration of the 21-day period for appeal to LUBA as required by Oregon Revised Statute and as noted in the Notice of Decision for this request.
2. The owner of the property dedicated to the City of Ontario the required additional 5 feet of right of way along SE 5th Avenue for 35 feet of right of way adjacent on the north of this property and an additional 10 feet of right of way along SE 13th Street for 30 feet of right of way adjacent to the west of this property as both are measured from the sectional line/centerline of the street.
3. The owner shall sign a Deferred Improvement Agreement (DIA) and cause it to be recorded prior to the final recording of the Ordinance authorizing the Annexation and rezoning.

Mr. Cummings explained that the applicants wanted to defer the street improvements of SE 5th Avenue and SE 13th Street until further development in the area. He said that the Deferred Improvement Agreement would be written as part of the Ordinance.

Mr. Hall asked what would trigger the street improvements.

Mr. Cummings answered that there were several triggers: the development of that parcel that would necessitate the street improvements due to increased traffic. Also, if an LID were formed, and development of the surrounding properties would also trigger the street improvements. The City would determine when the street improvements would need to happen.

Mr. Smith asked if both streets had to be developed at the same time.

Mr. Cummings said that they could be done at separate times, depending on the development. Also, some property would have to be dedicated for the remainder of the right of way.

Testimony by Proponents: The applicant (Mr. Oakes) stated that the annexation and rezone was straight forward and that he would be available for questions.

Testimony by Opponents: There were no opponents.

ADOPTION OF ANNEXATION
John Hall moved, seconded by Richard Newman, to annex the subject property into the City of Ontario, and the request for Rezone of the subject properties from UGA C-2 General Commercial to City C-2H General Heavy Commercial as set forth in Action 2017-08-16AZ. Roll call vote: Smith-yes; McCleran-yes; Twombly-yes; Hall-yes; Briedenbach-out; Newman-yes; Poole-out. Motion carried 5/2/0.

REPORTS
Mr. Cummings presented the quarterly City of Ontario Community Development Report. This included the building permit activity for the City of Ontario. He also explained that he had recently done a comparison of development permits and new residential home costs of several different jurisdictions.

Options were being discussed for the vacant airport property.

Mr. Brown commented that an option would be to use it for an aviation compatible industrial park. He had met with Business Oregon recently to go over possibilities. One possibility would include TVCC programs. ADA bathrooms and interior remodeling were being discussed.

Mr. Cummings gave an update on the ongoing development of the West Park Plaza and the Sprinter Shuttle service.

ADJOURN

Craig Smith moved, seconded by Cindy McLeran, to adjourn. Roll call vote: Smith-yes; McCleran-yes; Twombly-yes; Hall-yes; Briedenbach-out; Newman-yes; Poole-out. Motion carried 5/2/0.

Max Twombly
Vice-Chairman

Attest: Marcy Siriwardene
Planning & Zoning Technician

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 14, 2017, 3:00 p.m. MT
** PUBLIC WORKS HEADQUARTERS **

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

Committee members present included Mr. Scott Wilson, Mr. Bernie Babcock, Mr. Riley Hill, and Mr. Pat Woodcock (one vacant position).

Others present included Cliff Leeper, Betsy Roberts, Suzanne Mulvany, Dan Shepard, and Adam Brown, City Manager.

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.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 10, 2017

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

The motion was made by Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Woodcock to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting, October 10, 2017: Motion passed unanimously.

DRIVEWAY STANDARDS

DAN SH.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Last meeting - requested committee to review the driveway standards and come back with comments:

~ RH – There are some circumstances where they (the standards) may not work; we need to allow flexibility & make accommodations for such times.
~ DS – In the current standards we have two driveways. Pretty inflexible in that only one can be used in commercial applications, and only one residential driveway. However, the Idaho Standards have possibly 4 or 5 so we should be able to meet just about any application with those. We normally do work with unusual/existing situations but try to avoid any great change; in some cases, come back to the Public Works Director or refer to the Public Works Committee.
~ RH – A previous Public Works Director made a good comment: Development -vs- Redevelopment, and in redevelopment many times you can't accommodate the standards that are set out, therefore you have to have some flexibility.
~ CL – Believe we should remain flexible and be willing to work with the individual/homeowner and try to accommodate them as best as we can according to the regulations. So, if we need to adopt or modify what we have so we are not so set in stone that is what we need.
~ PW – Prefer the driveway standard in the ISPWC than ODOT.
~ BB – Therefore, the ISPWC is the one we plan to follow and there is some flexibility in unusual situations.
~ PW – Is there any talk about adopting the whole ISPWC even for sewer water, etc.?
~ DS – Yes, we haven't actually done that but we have a supplemental.

CH2M CONTRACT

BETSY

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Last meeting – sent out contract to members:

~ RH – Hard to figure out what was original, changes, prices now, etc.
~ CL – Contract expires June 30, 2019. The rollover coincides with the budget, and don't want to wait until only a month is left .. too much pressure.

- SW – Are changes planned??
- CL – That's what we are asking. What do you want to see in the contract?
- Also for those who have not heard CH2M has been purchased by Jacobs Engineering, which is a good thing & plan on continuing to partner with the City of Ontario.
- BB – Common thought process is that the price will increase.
- CL – Since CH2M came on board (in the contract), there is a percentage that CH2M could have increased fee by, however had decided not to increase at that rate and has remained at a static percent for 3 years.
  - SNOW PLAN – Intend to modify this due to last years' experience.
    - 1. Residential areas 6" + to plow, cars parked on both sides of the street, etc. Plan to mirror Baker City and rotate cars parked on the side of the street from one side to the other, etc.
    - 2. Did not plow curb-to-curb because sympathetic to those individuals that shoveled their drive and sidewalks. And Residents need to shovel snow into own yard, not into the street.
  - BB – Send out flyer on snow removal in the water bill.
- BB – Continue discussion, maybe get a short version of the planned changes.
- BR – No major changes planned. The question is "What can we do better?"
- SW – Any questions that come up may use us, the PWC, as a sounding board in a less formal session than council meetings.
- BR – To Riley for questions from the community that one thing that doesn't have numbers but a lot of value is that we've brought in different people from other Cities/projects, and we share information; valuable information at no cost.

UPDATES

BETSY

- **SRCI Lower Lift Station Review:** *(handout)*
  - **Hydraulic Conclusions**
    1. The Wet well is undersized and pumps are cycling about every 8 minutes.
    2. Pump curve indicates flow should be about 1,500 gmp but is only about 700 gpm, which means the "head" in the pipes is significantly higher than it should be.
    3. 6" and 10" forcemains are in substandard condition (probably occluded).

  - **Options**
    1. No Action $ 0.00.
    2. Minor Facility Rehabilitation $162,000.
       a. Electrical upgrade
       b. Valve modification
       c. Force main cleaning (pigging) (about $100 k of total) *(Salt & ice dissolve)*
    3. Minor Facility Upgrade $3.6 k
       a. Expand wetwell capacity via set point modification – this reduces response time *(includes better ventilation for pumps)*
       b. Upsize pumps
       c. Replace 90 degree elbows
    4. Rebuild Lift Station at existing location $2.92 M
       a. Fully replaced lift station
    5. Siphon
       a. Eliminate LS altogether and build siphon $1.86 M *(engineering is included)*

  - **Timeline**
    1. November 14 – PW Review
    2. November 21 – City Council Review.
    3. Early December – Department of Corrections Review.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- *Must have redundant pumps to make sure we have one that works in case of an issue. Must have reaction time*
- *Seams Siphon is best option*
- *BR – Time wise we have a few challenges.. It's going to be at least a year. They work on a biennium and do we have a consensus to get the electrical upgraded and cleaned up? Let's get that done, maybe hold off on pigging to a point.... To share this with the council on the 21st.*
- *RH – 1. What's the Cost? and 2. The Contract is expired are they going to participate?*
- *BR – The contract has been extended one year, and we are responsible for the maintenance. There was about $100,000 for the pigging so it's in that range of $60-65 k. for the electrical upgrade.*
- *BB – Recommend if chance of failure that has significantly higher costs associated with it then should fix it.*
- *BB – Moving forward...*
    - *PWC ok with doing electrical repairs? Yes.*
    - *Ask DOC on paying ½ of necessary electrical costs.*
    - *Research pigging and come back*

COMMENTS

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

➢ *NW 4th Ave & N. Verde – At what point do we need to have a 4-way stop????*
Need to do an evaluation

ADJOURN

The motion was made by Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Wilson to Adjourn: Motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED:

Signature ____________________ 1/9/18 *Date*

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 9, 2018, 3:00 p.m. MT
** PUBLIC WORKS HEADQUARTERS **

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

Committee members present included Mr. Scott Wilson, Mr. Bernie Babcock, Mr. Pat Woodcock and Mr. Riley Hill (one vacant position).

Others present included Cliff Leeper and Betsy Roberts.

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.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – NOVEMBER 14, 2017

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

- Correction on last page: Contact DOC... to pay 50% of necessary electrical costs.

The motion was made by Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Wilson to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting, November 14, 2017 with the noted correction: Motion passed unanimously.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

- Mr. Babcock, Public Works Committee Chairman;
- Mr. Hill, Public Works Committee Vice-Chairman;
- Mr. Woodcock, Public Works Committee Secretary.

The motion was made by Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Wilson to keep the Officers as is: Motion passed unanimously.

SRCI UPDATE

BETSY

~ BR – The report has been sent to them, and have asked Christine Coleman several times for their input. Will ask again now that holidays have past.

~ RH – At the last meeting we talked about that because those are possibly constricted is why was forcing a higher head on the pump? BR – Correct

~ CL – We talked about doing a procedure called "Ice Pigging". (Force main cleaning where salt & ice dissolve)

~ RH – Cost? Is it worth it?

~ CL – Approximately $100k, and believe it is worth it. Not yet had an opportunity to meet with them due to the Holidays.

~ SW – Whatever option is decided will take years so this may need to be done.

~ BR – It's the phasing and that will be part of it because the options will tell us what our schedule is. And if it is that far out ... the siphon, etc. which means property (all that coordination) it goes backward in time and... and will be part of it. Because the options will tell us what our schedule is. And if it is that far out ...

~ BB – With those options wouldn't pigging be required anyway?

~ BR – Yes. And thought is there a situation where you can get away with Not doing it because it is so expensive. Again, looking at the options and the timing we will have to weigh that when we see it.

~ CL – We are going to recommend that we move forward; whether they agree with us is the question. The system has been in service for over 20 years now.

~ RH – Would those lines be abandon if the Siphon came in? BR – Yes

CAPITAL PROJECTS – BUDGET MODIFICATIONS

BETSY

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

The Budget committee is looking at some potential changes. The Council is trying to gather information on what are some mid-year adjustments that we can do to, focusing on the Capital Projects, and would like the Public Works Committees' input as well. (PowerPoint Handout)

- ~ BB – What is the background behind a mid-year budget adjustment?
- ~ BR – It's based on the 1% Sales Tax now having to go to vote. If it would have just pasted this would have been fine and left as is. But now that we are uncertain of the future we need to plan ahead. The reason Wastewater is in here to look at is because it is impacted somewhat from the NPDES and want to get your input.
- ~ CL – The City may have significant cuts for the next year's budget because of "lack of funds"; if they don't spend those funds prior to the new fiscal year coming on board they will be that much better off.
- ~ BR – These are some of the ones that have not been done yet, but were approved in the budget.
- ~ RH – Where is this money coming from? General fund?
- ~ BR – Yes
- ~ BB – For clarification essentially, we entered the year with a balanced budget, attempted to pass a 1% tax to make up for a deficiency in the future. And basically, starting to set aside funds or reserve funds because if that doesn't pass they have a fiscal crisis next cycle.?? Correct.
- ~ CL – Understand it to be a $900,000 short fall for next year's budget.

CAPITAL PROGRAM

Potential mid-year adjustments to capital program

- **AGENDA**
  - General Fund Review
  - WW Fund Review
- **2017-2018 GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Capital Projects	Budget	Actual
Downtown trash enclosures	$33,000	
Concrete work – Oregon Street	$36,000	
Road Repair	$30,000	
Meadow Planter Agreement	$40,000	$17,000
Community Development Parking Lot	$9,100	
Website Revision	$5,475	
Skid Steer (street fund share)	$50,000	$0

- ✓ TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX FUNDS FOR SPLASH PAD
  - 12.5% (on 8% tax) of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) funds must go towards Parks/Rec/Other Community Enhancement
  - The Council has designated funds thus far to the Aquatic Center
  - Multi-year collections have been budgeted for approximately $210,000 through the end of this fiscal year.
  - Future year's distributions could be used for other Parks/Recreation/Other Community Enhancements.
- ✓ DOWNTOWN TRASH ENCLOSURES
  - $33,000 Total
  - One for each block at a cost of $11,000 per enclosure
  - In conjunction with an ordinance for consolidated waste stream downtown
- ✓ CONCRETE WORK
  - $36,000 - Removal of Mid-Block Crossings on Oregon Avenue & Restriping
  - Without removal, we will need to re-stripe parking to come into compliance, this will result in fewer parking spaces.
- ✓ ROAD REPAIR
  - Annual road repair budget.
  - It is for unanticipated repairs or regular patching and repair.
  - There are several places identified

- ✓ MEADOW PLANTER AGREEMENT
  - $40,000 budgeted
  - $17,000 has been spent on tree grates
  - **$23,000 remaining will not be spent**
- ✓ COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PARKING LOT
  - $9,100 committed from General Fund
  - Using CH2M labor to match funding from the building fund this will leverage another $29,000
  - We may be able to bring this down with neighbor participation
- ✓ WEBSITE REVISION
  - $5,475 – Make current website mobile compliant and ADA compliant
  - Greater improvements are really needed beyond the $5,475
  - 21st Century city has mobile applications, and customer resource management (CRM)
- ✓ SKID STEER
  - CH2M purchased the equipment for the city's use.
  - $50,000 projected to be spent out of the public safety fund can be removed from the budget.
- ✓ GENERAL FUND ALTERNATIVES
  - Adjust the budget by resolution
  - Re-convene budget committee for review and discussion prior to amending budget

~ BB – What is the impact of the changes to the General fund budget long term?

~ CL – For example, if decided not to do chip seal, the immediate change would probably not see anything but will impact the future.

~ BR – May want to prioritize this list.

~ CL – We can hold off on chip seal, however cannot hold off on crack fill. We'll lose a road.

~ BB – Skidsteer – resolved, Website revision – necessary due to compliance, and probably the concrete work and road repair need to be accomplished at some point in time & were budgeted for – two priorities of this list. (own opinion)

~ BB – Entertain a recommendation or motion that Road repair and concrete work be maintained as priorities within this process…

~ RH – Concrete work as important???

~ BR – Could state it so that we could give order here but if by doing any of these it makes up default on crack fill in particular, and potentially chip seal in the future budget year, then go for the crack fill and chip seal over the others.

~ RH – Reason for this is to try to fill a gap that we know is going to happen next year. So seems to be prudent to say that the trash enclosures, concrete work, parking lot, and the website are low priorities as opposed to putting money in there for chip seal and crack filling next year?

~ CL – Correct

~ BB – **So recommend basically of those items on the list we feel that the Road repair should not be deferred. Everyone agree?? -- *multiple* -- Yes.**

~ BR – Can express that this committee has concerns about next year's chip seal and crack fill, making sure that happens.

~ SW – Therefore, if crack fill & chip seal were at the bottom of the list, we would recommend that all would be eliminated except these two.

➢ **<u>2017-2018 WASTEWATER FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS</u>**

Capital Projects	Budget	Actual
Facility Plan Update	$270,000	$0
SRCI Lift Station Evaluation	$40,000	$25,000
Total Cost	$310,000	$25,000
Additional Work		
Mixing Zone Study	$0	$50,000
WWTP pH Adjustment Plan	$0	$10,000
WWTP pH Adjustment Design	$0	$30,000
Anticipated Additional Cost	**$0**	**$90,000**

We had $270,000 sitting in for the Facility Plan that included a SCADA update, but because of the SCADA emergencies we've had to do some of that work ahead of time. With the NPDES the DEQ has moved that Facility Plan out a good solid five (5) years, therefore do not need that budgeted and is now available to us. The SRCI Lift Station we budgeted $40,000, we did it in-house and completed it a bit under the $25,000.

Things that are coming out of the NPDES that we did not have a budget for that we are going to need to do are the Mixing Zone Study, and these come up timing wise in the NPDES such that we would need to start on this. We would need to start on a PH Adjustment Plan for the end of the WWTP: a plan and then a design.

Ultimately did not spend the $270,000 but need to spend $90,000 = $180,000 left.

BR – Had hoped to have the NPDES draft permit in front of us yesterday to start the review within the city so you'd be able to see it, however, we have not received it yet. But we will be able to give you an idea when it comes in what some of those costs are going to be at least what some of the big items are.
BB – Temporary permit?
BR – No, the permit will be good for 5 years.
CL – Once we get the permit with our comments before it goes to council the Public Works Committee needs to review it.
BR – PWC to review/comment, we'll send it to DEQ, they incorporate our comments, and even if they choose to ignore them they will still be part of the public record, then it goes out for public comment for 6 weeks.
With all that said the schedule that the DEQ provides is basically a 2-week time frame, but we've said we need more time to meet Council, PWC, etc. at the right times. We will keep you updated.

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

None

COMMENTS

RH – Infrastructure issues - if Government comes out with those "Shovel ready projects", what can we do that would put us at the top of the list?
CL – We have a whole series of infrastructure issues here in the City of Ontario:

- Need to deal with the solids @ our WW plant
- New requirement for the NPDES permit
- Issues with increasing capacity at the Water Plant
- Have a significant horizontal water distribution pipe that is 70+ years old
- ETC.

RH – Just saying we should do the prep work and ready to go.

ADJOURN

The motion was made by Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Woodcock to Adjourn: Motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED: [signature] 2/20/18

Signature *Date*

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

MALHEUR COUNTY COURT MINUTES

February 7, 2018

County Court met with Judge Dan Joyce presiding with Commissioner Don Hodge present. Staff present was Administrative Officer Lorinda DuBois.

Also present was John Braese of the Malheur Enterprise.

ROAD DEPARTMENT

Road Supervisor Richard Moulton met with the Court. Commissioner Hodge moved to approve Crossing Permit #13-18 to Idaho Power Company to install a pole and transformer for a pivot on Hope Road #569. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed.

Mr. Moulton explained he had received various bids for a pickup for Jordan Valley. Bids from Ford dealerships and Dodge dealerships were received (Chevy dealerships were requested but not returned). The low bid was from Auto Ranch for a 2017 Ford 1-ton for $30,000. Commissioner Hodge moved to accept the bid from Auto Ranch for the 2017 Ford 1-ton. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed. Bids were also obtained for an utility box; the low bid was from Cobalt for $10,620. Commissioner Hodge moved to accept the low bid from Cobalt for the utility box. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed.

The County-owned property in Jordan Valley has been surveyed; Mr. Moulton will obtain bids for fencing of the lot.

COURT MINUTES

Commissioner Hodge moved to approve Court Minutes of January 31, 2018. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed.

BUDGET BOARD MEMBERSHIP

Commissioner Hodge moved to appoint Richard Eiguren to a second term on the Budget Board. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed.

AWARD CONTRACT- FAIRGROUNDS REBUILD - RY WEST HOMES

Commissioner Hodge moved to award the contract for the rebuild of Girvin Hall and the Small Animal Barn to Ry West Homes Inc., bid of $1,516,000. Judge Joyce seconded and the motion passed. A construction contract will be drafted.

FAIRGROUNDS UPDATE

Fairgrounds Manager Lynelle Christiani provided an update of activities. Repairs of the Hog Barn have started. Eight contractors attended the pre-bid conference for the rebuild of Girvin Hall and the Small Animal Barn; four bids were received; and the low bid was Ry West Homes Inc. A concert will be held during the Fair on Thursday evening; the concert venue will be behind the Red Barn. A safety meeting was held last week; various entities including city police departments, fire departments, and the Sheriff's Office were invited to attend the meeting. Security and preparedness for emergency situations was discussed; the fair board is working towards developing its own emergency preparedness plan. Work is underway to obtain superintendents and volunteers for this year's Fair. A local school has requested to bring some of its special education students to volunteer at the fairgrounds. Ms. Christiani expressed concern on how to complete the budget document for the next fiscal year as there are a lot of unknowns with the new buildings. Commissioner Hodge asked about the solar project; there is no change with the status of the project.

Mr. Braese left the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING - ORDINANCE NO. 215

Present for the first public hearing to consider Ordinance No. 215: An Ordinance for a Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment to Include a Portion of Tax Lot 1600 Map 18S47 of the Malheur County Assessor's Office as a Significant Aggregate Site to Malheur County's Comprehensive Plan, Goal 5, Mineral and Aggregate Inventory was Planner Alvin Scott. Notice of the hearing was published in the Argus Observer. Planning Department File #2018-01-002.

Judge Joyce opened the hearing and asked for a Staff Report.

Mr. Scott explained that the requested action is to add an approximate 10 acre aggregate site to the Goal 5 Resource Inventory. The property is located on the Idaho side of the Snake River; the parcel size is approximately 226 acres and the proposed aggregate site is approximately 10 acres. The Owner/Applicant is Pete Ciraulo/ Ciraulo Snake River Ranch. The zoning of the parcel is Exclusive Farm Use. There are 70.10 acres of water right associated with the parcel; none of which is in the proposed mining site. Fire protection is provided by the New Plymouth, Idaho Fire Protection District. The Planning Commission approved the site at its January 25, 2018 meeting and recommended that the Court add the site to the Comprehensive Plan Goal 5, Mineral and Aggregate Inventory. No comments in opposition to the matter were received.

Judge Joyce closed the hearing. The second public hearing for consideration of the matter will be February 21, 2018.

COURT ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned.