

**MISSION STATEMENT: TO CREATE A HEALTHY, SAFE, DIVERSE, AND PROSPEROUS CITY
BY ENGAGING COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO DEVELOP AN ENRICHED QUALITY OF LIFE.**



**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE AGENDA
CITY OF ONTARIO OREGON
TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2021, 3:00 PM, MT**
[Zoom Link](#)

1) CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call: Bernie Babcock ____ Pat Woodcock ____ Jackson Fox ____
Scott Wilson ____ Jake Galeener ____

City Council Ex-Officio ____ City Manager ____
PW Director ____ City Engineer ____

This Agenda was posted on 3/2/2021. Copies of the Agenda are available from the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website at www.ontariooregon.org.

2) MOTION TO ADOPT MINUTES

A) February 02, 2021

3) ELECTION OF OFFICERS

- A) Chairman
- B) Vice-Chairman
- C) Secretary

4) OLD BUSINESS

A) Capital Improvement Projects Update

5) NEW BUSINESS

A) Mission, Purpose, Role

6) CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

7) ADJOURN



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021, 3:00 p.m. MT

Meeting called to order at ~3:10 p.m. by Chairman Bernie Babcock.

Committee members present included Bernie Babcock, Scott Wilson, Pat Woodcock, Jake Galeener, and Jackson Fox.

Others present included Al Cablay, Paul Woods, Adam Brown, Peter Hall, Casey Mordhorst, Jay Hysell, Kim Lord, Suzanne Mulvany, and Hewitt Griffin, Argus Observer.

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 <https://www.ontariooregon.org/public-works-committee.html>.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 13, 2020

RESOLUTION, ACTION &/OR MOTION:

BB – On the Northeast Ontario project section, it says “SRCI: pavement evaluation around...” The “SRCI” appears to be a typo and needs to be removed; outside of that didn't have any other changes.

THE MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. FOX, SECONDED BY MR. WILSON TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING, OCTOBER 13, 2020 WITH THE NOTED CORRECTION: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – FY 2021/2022



Public Works Committee

January and February Meeting – February 2, 2021

Special Combined Session

for

Fiscal Year 2021-22

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) BUDGET



Public Works Management Staff

- **Administration** – Al Cablay, Director
Suzanne Mulvany, Office Administrator
- **Engineering** – Paul Woods, City Engineer
- **Facilities, Parks and Cemeteries** – Jay Hysell, Supervisor
- **Field Services** – Casey Mordhorst, Superintendent
- **Water and Wastewater Treatment Plants** – Kim Lord, Supervisor





AC – What we intend to do is give you as much of the background and content that we developed in the CIP's. It's a look into five years, but what we're trying to help you focus on is how we got to this year's CIP numbers. With that I introduce Paul Woods, City Engineer.

City of Ontario CIP					
	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25	FY25-26
Cemetery Fund					
• Cemetery Building and Grounds Improvements	\$0	\$47,500	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
• Cemetery Irrigation Systems	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Cemetery Fund Total:	\$0	\$47,500	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
Streets Fund					
• Economic Development Initiatives (i.e. Downtown Beautification)	\$290,000	\$50,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,400,000	\$0
• Traffic Control – ODOT signals	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$1,510,000	\$0
• Traffic Control (signs, striping, etc.)	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
• Pavement Repair and Maintenance	\$471,000	\$750,000	\$2,430,000	\$430,000	\$2,230,000
• Sidewalks and School Zones	\$130,000	\$215,000	\$0	\$300,000	\$0
• Maintenance Building and Grounds	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	\$20,000	\$0
Streets Fund Total:	\$926,000	\$1,025,000	\$4,195,000	\$3,660,000	\$2,235,000
Wastewater Fund					
• Economic Development Initiatives (i.e. Capacity expansion)	\$600,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
• Wastewater Treatment Plant Repair and Replacement	\$839,000	\$300,000	\$8,000	\$50,000	\$0
• Farm System Repair and Replacement	\$305,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$20,000
• Building and Grounds	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
• NPDES Regulatory Compliance	\$932,500	\$1,410,000	\$585,000	\$505,000	\$500,000
• Lift Station Repair and Replacement	\$38,000	\$15,000	\$17,500	\$42,500	\$2,000
Wastewater Fund Total:	\$2,739,500	\$1,760,000	\$645,500	\$632,500	\$522,000
On-Going NPDES Regulatory Compliance Documentation & Reporting					
• On-going Compliance Documentation & Reporting	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$92,000	\$72,000	\$72,000
Wastewater Fund Total:	\$82,000	\$82,000	\$92,000	\$72,000	\$72,000
Field Services – Sewer Collection & Water Distribution (Utility Capitalization Fund)					
• Economic Development Initiatives	\$380,000	\$1,110,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
• Collection System Repair and Replacement	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
• Water Distribution System Repair and Replacement	\$100,000	\$20,000	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Utility Capitalization Fund Total:	\$880,000	\$1,530,000	\$500,000	\$410,000	\$410,000
Water Fund					
• Economic Development Initiatives (i.e. Capacity expansion)	\$2,750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
• Wells and River Supply Systems Repair and Replacement	\$47,500	\$40,000	\$35,000	\$40,000	\$35,000
• Water Treatment Plant Repair and Replacement	\$289,500	\$640,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$40,000
• Booster Pump Station Repair and Replacement	\$275,000	\$265,000	\$36,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
• Reservoir Repair and Replacement	\$27,000	\$390,000	\$50,000	\$530,000	\$5,000,000
• Building and Grounds	\$117,500	\$140,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$90,000
Water Fund Total:	\$3,506,500	\$1,475,000	\$186,000	\$600,000	\$5,180,000
Stormwater Fund					
• Economic Development Initiatives	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
• Mainline, CB Repair and Replacement	\$90,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
• Regulatory Compliance	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0
Stormwater Fund Total:	\$110,000	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
SRCI Infrastructure and Maintenance Fund					
• Infrastructure Improvement Projects	\$510,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
SRCI Fund Total:	\$510,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Support Vehicles and Equipment					
• Cemetery	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,500	\$ 30,000	\$ -
• Streets	\$ 401,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 350,000
• Wastewater	\$ 510,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
• Field Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
• Water	\$ 16,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -
Vehicles Total:	\$ 963,000	\$ -	\$ 313,500	\$ 60,000	\$ 350,000



PIW – Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I’m honored to be here today with you serving as the City Engineer and serving with our team walking through the CIP’s. I thought instead of us droning on with a long presentation, we could go through the funds one by one and just see if you have any questions or if you’d like us to elaborate on any. The first request I’d have is was this helpful in sorting and organizing the Capital Improvement Plan? The reason for these categories is that these are individual funds that the city budget has. Was this summary sheet too little information? Too many categories? Not enough categories?

BB – Scott and I drilled through this many times and thought it was very good. The one thing I appreciated was the fact that on the letter to us they identified what the resources were. Something that’s been missing every year.

JF – I think it’s a step in the right direction, but I’ve got questions. On the face page are these numbers at the bottom the projected revenue? Or is that what’s in the budget? How do we work backwards on something like this without knowing what projected revenue is, and then I don’t see anywhere in here any emergency funds?

PIW – So the individual funds are built on projected expenses and then this cover sheet, which I think we’re going to work on improving in the future. This shows the projected revenue that’s available for capital improvement projects after operating expenses have been subtracted. So, this is our forecast of available revenue for capital improvement projects. Is that correct?

JF - Are we burning up all projected revenue on these capital improvements? Or is there emergency funds set aside?

PIW - As it relates to each individual fund, there’s revenue that’s generated by user fees, which is primarily the water and wastewater fund. And then there are revenues generated by other forms of taxation. But at this point in the budgeting process, I’ll let Adam or Peter speak to the total budget and the contingency for that question.

AB – We set a goal to have a 3-month fund balance in each fund; we’ve achieved that and maintained that. These Projects are per fund, i.e. the Water and Wastewater Funds. And then some are competing for general fund dollars. For example, the Street Fund, Cemetery and Parks may be competing against other projects. I think the important thing is that we’re trying to get better each year with how we use you as a Public Works Committee. The thing is that we, the staff, tells you what is needed to keep the systems going, and then you review and tell us if you’re going the right direction or wrong direction. Also, you may agree or disagree with the priorities within those funds, and then we can take that to the City Council and Budget Committee; indicate that this is how the Public Works Committee prioritized the projects.

BB – I thought I heard you say (to answer Jacksons question) that you have three- or four-months’ worth of Contingency funds available? That you have a reserve for each of these funds.

AB – Yes, 90 days.

JF – I’d like to Go back into your statement on “the staff identifies need.” All through this pamphlet I do not see any footnotes on a lot of stuff identifying the need. It’s just written down. Are we supposed to question every item? How do we recommend to the Council unless we know the need?

AB – What is the plan? Is there a formal presentation going through the CIP’s today?

AC – That wasn’t our intent. Going on past history we’re trying to build on that; that is why we have Casey, Jay and Kim here to give you the justification. We have done the due diligence and we can give you that backup on any number of items.

BB – Let’s go ahead and get started on the presentation and as we move forward, we’ll definitely have questions.

PIW – The plan was to dig into the details on each one of these sub tabs.

PtW – Please explain the prioritization schedule? i.e. there is a 2, 5 and 1.

PIW – Part of the reason you don’t see a three and a four is that they’re vehicle related; we took all the vehicles and put those at the back end. So, if we do not want to do that in the future, that’s fine. We’re just trying to allow you to look at all the vehicles in one spot.

(Continued discussion)



JH – The sprinkler system is our number one priority. Right now, we have risers that stick up above the ground and there's a stop and waste on each one. We have to go in and turn them on and off manually, and this new system will have electric valves where the stop and waste will run on its own.

PIW – The \$53,000 in this year's budget has not been spent at all, and the price came in higher than that, so we're saving it, rolling it forward, and then the remaining funds are coming through the energy performance contract the City has with Ameresco, another third party will bring the balance of that money through the project and then finance it overtime.

If you're not familiar with that it's an energy performance contract that was awarded to Ameresco. A third party who came in and looked at all of the City's operations looking for energy efficiency. And then where they find them, they can actually make those improvements and then get paid back overtime with the energy savings.

AB – So they've included actual savings, they did an energy audit of the systems where they put measurement instruments on pumps; it's pretty comprehensive and it's not done. We're still massaging and making sure that the things that were supposed to pay for themselves, pay for themselves. And some of these projects that we already had it makes sense for them to throw it in because they can extend our capacity to complete projects with their construction management style.

AC – That's the reason nothing is shown there.

JF – But that's very confusing and not the way to build a budget.

BB – I believe Jackson's right. It would be helpful if you were to put a figure in there and explain it.

PIW – We are happy to adjust this as we go forward. I hope that you understand that the intent was not to hide anything. We put all the vehicles together so that you can say, "what are all the vehicles that you're requesting?" Some people like that, so they can say I want to make sure I know how many vehicles and where. If that's not the way that you like to receive the information, we're happy to put it back into the individual funds.

JF – I was wondering why there were more than one fund for each department? I'd like to look at the Cemetery and move onto the Streets. Or it seems more logical to me. Maybe the rest of the committee doesn't feel that way.

PtW – I like how it was broke out. In the future maybe have a separate page that's got all the vehicles but also keep them on the fund pages too.

BB – I have a question regarding SE 5th Ave. This council has mentioned many times the need for that to be improved yet it is not mentioned anywhere in the Street fund and it's not funded for five years. That's a huge priority in terms of liability, yet it's not mentioned here.

AB – That is funded in the current year. Which is why you wouldn't see it in there.

BB – The widening of this and putting in sidewalks on one side is funded in this year's budget?

AB – Yes. That's one that was from the Stipe a couple years ago and it was approved with last year's budget to start the engineering of it.

BB – This would be a good conversation for our next public works meeting. The other thing is I don't believe that that project that has been identified so far does not include any lighting.

AB – Correct.

BB – So what I'm trying to impress upon is that you've got funding in this year's budget to at least make some improvements, and that obviously won't be done by the end of year. Extending into next summer and that those funds will transfer forward. But what I'm trying to say is, we want the City, you as a city manager, and Jacobs as managing public works to determine this as a priority; I understand it has to be done in steps. Also, the Public Works Committee agrees that lighting needs to be included in this project.

PIW – Thank you Mr. Chairman. So, we have these projects that are identified as economic development and those really originate from both the staff, the city management and the Council to ask us to do those. And those come in phases. Sometimes you will put a number out there, but you really need to do preliminary engineering to know that that number has some reality to it. We will continue to add more language here to make this a better communication tool. So, are there any questions on these? They're all number one for economic development purposes in terms of priority.



PtW – Does that mean those totaling up to the \$540,000 that we actually have that in the budget, and that all those items are going to get done? Or is that \$540,000 subject to change? Where inside the subcategories, priority should be 12345? So that if there's only \$300,000 available, then we start with number one and two but 3, 4, & 5 don't happen. That was where I was going with the priority thing.

PIW – I get what you're saying. I think that's where we sort of pull this together that the total amount in fiscal year 21-22 in the General Fund is \$1.6 million and we've laid out priorities that total about \$1.19. So, there's additional dollars there and that in theory you could say "I want you to spend more (or less)". I think that's the kind of feedback you guys are looking for, right?

JF – Then we need to know how much is available.

BB – What we'd like to see in moving forward is as you develop this, (and in finalizing the transportation system plan) it might behoove you to tie those priorities into the street fund so that we know that you completed the transportation study. Your priorities may not always line up for fiscal reasons but at least if you say this was priority #3, or this was a highlighted item in our transportation fund completed on X date, we would be able to see that you're bringing out that evaluation. Tying these moving forward would be a great tool to have.

(Continued discussion)

BB – Another question I have, and I realize we're looking at the entire budget but to me the Chip seal and crack filling is an operational expense; that should be done every year, but shouldn't it be part of a different budget? Like pavement maintenance is an operational expense that should be built into your budget every year not in the capital improvements.

AB – I think I agree with you on that and maybe moving forward change it even in this budget.

PIW – I think that there is a difference between regular maintenance and capital maintenance but point well taken. We can isolate capital maintenance.

(Continued review of the CIP list)

PIW – Vehicles, which in the future we will structure differently.

BB – I do like the idea of having a separate sheet for vehicles. *(inaudible - multiple conversations)*

PIW – So rather than going down through here. Do you have any questions?

JF – Yes, a 10-yard dump truck for a quarter of a million bucks?

CM - That cost comes from MetroQuip and is fully equipped with Peterbilt chassis, 10-yard dump box, stainless steel standard box, the plow, plow mount, etc. *(inaudible - multiple conversations)*

JF – Why not buy used?

CM – That was the issue. We bought #205 in 2009 I believe from ACHD. It was a used dump truck, we had to rebuild the engine right off the bat, the bed was shot we had to weld steel plates in the bed. We are having engine problems with it now and we've had it towed twice this winter.

BB – So you're saying that this is a truck you bought used? And you haven't been very successful in buying a used piece of equipment. The cost savings in comparing buying a used truck and a new one is that you haven't realized the savings between the two is what you're saying?

JG – Who chose to buy that truck in particular? Because it sounds like it just wasn't gone through very well. I don't want to attack anybody here, I'm just saying that I buy lots of used equipment, and I know what I'm looking at. I do agree with Jackson, that a city of our size can buy used equipment but pull resources within Jacobs to make a smart purchase on something used versus what we bought, sight unseen. Sounds like to me no homework was done and that's why a lemon was purchased.

JF – I think I could buy three good ones for this price.

JG – I do see the merit in there's more than just a dump truck here, but if all you're telling us is "hey we bought a 10-yard dump truck for \$1,000,000". It's going to spark these questions that everybody's asking because it's so vague.

BB – I think what would help is to list the implements and include more narrative. *(inaudible)*

CM – Agreed. They're not a standard dump truck; I can break it down to what things cost.

PIW – I just have a question from a process standpoint. This is setting like a budget target. It would be difficult for us to line up all the used pieces of equipment and have that quote hold through this whole budget process and then execute right? So, when we go and actually buy this stuff and we come back before the Council, right?

AB – Unbudgeted items or anything over \$50,000.

KO – Yes, anything over \$50,000 goes to the Council. If it's budgeted less than \$50,000, then it doesn't have to go to the Council.

PIW – I'm just thinking through the mechanics of getting a used quote that will be valid through this whole process. At some point it needs to be a rough number, and it will be subject to all kinds of final approval, right? What are your thoughts on how you'd like us to go through the mechanics of this?

BB – I think that Jacobs needs to do the best job and be the best steward they can with City Resources. I think it behooves them to look at the cost of used equipment and new equipment and determine what's in the best interest of the City long term moving forward. I think from my standpoint as a Public Works Committee member I want the city to do the best job possible with the resources that they have through Jacobs. I don't think it hurts to get some good used pricing and do a little research and say "hey, we think it's in the best interest of the city to purchase a new truck versus a used one or vice versa because this is what we've discovered".

JF – I think to answer his question though, why don't you just call the County Road district, or Nyssa or Fruitland? They go through the same process and they buy used. The County has roads clear to the Nevada border. And they just bought one for about \$58,000 last year; they do the same type of things we do.

JG – One question I had about the Vacon truck is that truck that's being replaced, is it so far gone now that it's not even being kept around for spare or backup for the new one?

CM – No, it will be turned in. We have a smaller unit for a backup. But just to kind of answer your question, the Vacon is 10 years old, the debris tank is rusting through, and the supplier actually came over to look at truck. He made the recommendation to replace it versus trying to repair.

PIW – That's all we have on CIP Chairman.

BB – I want to thank Jacobs and the City for the amount of work that went into this. This is definitely an improvement. Not that it was perfect, obviously. We had a lot of comments, but it's definitely a step in the right direction. It would be nice at the end of the process to get a copy of this.

PIW – We appreciate that, and I'd like to make one comment is that as we go through the year, I think we'd like to keep coming back and revisiting the comments that we've heard. Then try to offer solutions to those comments to improve that.

JG – I would like to make a comment because I'm new. I do want to say thank you for actually answering questions today versus previous meetings that I've attended.



Next Step – Budget Committee Wed., Feb. 3rd

City Budget Committee Review and Approval Period

February 23rd thru March 11th

FINAL APPROVAL – CITY COUNCIL April 20th



ADJOURN

THE MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. FOX SECONDED BY MR. WOODCOCK TO ADJOURN: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVED:

Signature

Date

(Bernie Babcock, Chairman / Scott Wilson, Vice-Chairman)

DRAFT