CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
October 8, 2024

The scheduled meeting of the Ontario City Council was called to order by Mayor Deborah Folden at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 2024, in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Council members present were Deborah Folden, Susann Mills, Ken Hart, and John Kirby. Eddie Melendrez, Sam Baker, and Penny Bakefelt were excused.

Staff present were Dan Cummings, Tori Barnett, Corinna Hysell, Marshall Pierce, Al Haun, Andy Wood, Casey Walker.

The meeting was recorded, and copies are available at City Hall.

AGENDA

This Agenda was posted October 4, 2024. Copies of the Agenda are available from the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website www.ontariooregon.org.

HART moved, KIRBY seconded, **TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.** Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-out; Melendrez-out; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 4/0/3.

CONSENT AGENDA

HART moved, MILLS seconded, **TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA, WHICH CONSISTED OF A LIQUOR LICENSE APPLICATION: SELECT PLAYERS, LLC; AND A LETTER TO SISTER CITY OSAKASAYAMA, JAPAN, WITH CITY COIN.** Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-out; Melendrez-out; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 4/0/3.

Councilor Kirby read the letter to Osakasayama into the record:

The City of Ontario, Oregon, United States of America, would like to recognize the special relationship created fifty years ago between Ontario and her Sister City Osakasayama, Japan. This special relationship has allowed citizens from both countries to travel and experience the hospitality, generosity, and goodwill offered to travelers by both Ontario and Osakasayama. To commemorate this occasion, the City of Ontario presents this 100th Anniversary coin that was designed in celebration of Ontario's centennial. The coin is marked as celebrating 1883 as our date of establishment; however, it was later discovered the correct year of incorporation was 1884. The two sides of the coin signify different things. One side is a relief of the State of Oregon, whose territory initially occupied most of the Pacific Northwest. Once statehood was given, Oregon was provided a definition of boundaries, with Ontario's location noted on the far eastern border. The other side of the coin memorializes a Conestoga wagon that carried the possessions of pioneers traveling the Oregon Trail on their way to the Oregon Territory. Ontario is located near the original route of the Oregon Trail, a trail that allowed for the migration of the pioneers from the eastern states out to the wild, wild west. This coin is presented to you by two City Councilors from Ontario , as well as the son of one of the original / sponsors of the Sister City relationship. It is our sincere hope that the friendship and goodwill established by this relationship will continue to prosper.
Respectfully, Deborah K. Folden, Mayor of Ontario

OLD BUSINESS

City Camera System Upgrade
Dan Cummings, City Manager, presented.

City staff had been working on options to improve city security cameras. The existing security camera system contract with Day Wireless would expire November 10th, with a two-week notice (October 25th). The city budgeted $150,000 in the Enterprise Camera Fund and an additional $13,651.00 in the Airport Camera Fund for a total of $163,651.00 for replacing/upgrading and adding new cameras to the system. The existing cameras were out of date and did not give the total protection the city needed to combat theft and vandalism, as well as the protection of city employees, vehicles, and infrastructure.

The city also needed new body cameras and updated software for the protection of the city police officers, and for the safety of the public. The City Council asked staff to look into reducing the proposed security camera system to allow for some of the budgeted funds to go towards the needed body camera system.

At the August 27, 2024 City Council meeting, staff made a presentation to the Council on the body camera needs, as well as the security system needs. The Council voted (see motion below) and authorized staff to put out a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the body camera system. Staff was currently in the process of putting the RFP together. Motion: *"MELENDREZ moved, MILLS seconded, THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE REQUEST TO BEGIN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PROCESS FOR A BODY-WORN CAMERA SYSTEM, WHICH IS CLOUD-BASED AND HAS THE ABILITY TO REDACT SENSITIVE INFORMATION PURSUANT TO LAW. Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-yes; Melendrez-yes; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 6/0/1".*

During that same meeting, OPD Lt. Jason Cooper made a presentation to the Council, outlining three options for the security camera system, which addressed the Council request. Lt. Cooper stated for all three options being presented, they were locked into the five-year plan for $42,737. However, for the remaining funds from the initial $150,000, there were three options:

A: Option #1 would defer the camera improvement program to the next fiscal year, and pay just the mandatory five-year licensing subscription for $42,737. They could then redirect the remaining funds towards the body-worn camera project for $107,263.

B: Option #2 would be the mandatory licensing lor $42,737, an upgrade/replacement of half the system cameras for $43,112, defer the remaining cameras and airport cameras to the next fiscal year's budget process, and to redirect the remaining funds toward the body-worn camera project for $64,151.

C: Option #3 would be the mandatory licensing for $42,737, an upgrade/replacement of half the system cameras for $43,112, complete the airport camera expansion project for $13,651, defer the remaining cameras to the next fiscal year budget process, and to redirect the remaining funds toward the body-worn camera project for $50,500.

Mr. Cummings stated staff supported Option #1, because it provided time to obtain bids for the body cameras. Also, he and Lt. Cooper had met with another firm, who they were seeking a quote from for the camera system, and possibly, before the contract expired, there might be another option for the cameras. The cameras themselves belonged to Verkada, and they could not be used with another system. If the city selected a different firm, all the cameras would have to be replaced. He also wanted to personally speak with Verkada. He didn't like the city being strung out with a system that could potentially go away and with those cameras not belonging to the city, the city would have to purchase a whole new system anyway. He believed they'd be meeting with this other company later in the week, and hoped to get a quote from them. Based on that information, the Council made the following motion: *"HART moved, BAKEFELT seconded, THE CITY COUNCIL GIVE STAFF AUTHORITY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH OPTION #1, AND IF STAFF CHOSE A DIFFERENT PATH, THEY WOULD NEED TO COME BACK BEFORE COUNCIL FOR A CHANGE FROM OPTION #1. Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-yes; Melendrez-yes; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 6/0/1."*

Following the guidelines from the City Financial Policy, staff contacted different firms and requested written proposals; three proposals were received. Bid data summarized below:

Vendor #1: Day Wireless, Boise: $104,420.00 using Verkada manufacturing cameras that **cannot** be used with any other system, with a one-year service agreement. (Cloud based cameras)

Vendor #2: Alpine Alarm, La Grande: $90,617.80 using Verkada manufacturing cameras that **cannot** be used with any other system, with a one-year service agreement. (Cloud based cameras)

Vendor #3: Avidity Solutionz, Ontario: $68,367 using Open Eye manufacturing cameras that **can** be used with many other systems, with a one-year service agreement. (Cloud based cameras)

Avidity Solutionz was not only the lowest responsive bidder, but their cameras and systems could be used with any other provider. Staff requested only one-year contracts in order to have the ability to change service providers if staff was not satisfied with the service. Avidity Solutionz also provided a proposal for a mixed system of cloud-based and NVR-based cameras, which gave the city the ability to lower the overall cost of the system now, as well as when the city added more cameras. In the process of researching this project, as it was more than staff wanted to spend, Avidity provide a solution, in that they included a bid for a mixture of cloud based cameras and NVR based cameras. NVR-based was where they tied into a box and recorded to it, so all the memory wasn't stored in the cameras. That bid came in at $54,684 (see hand-out), which was about $10,000 more than was budgeted, like the $42,000 just for the contract without placing any cameras. For the best money, it was to go with Avidity, for the additional $10,000, still leaving the $107,000 +/- for the body cameras. That way, staff would replace all the cameras. With the new system, if that's the option the Council selected, the evidence room, when it had been remodeled, there were ten cameras there, which was a stand-alone system. To connect that with the proposal, it was a cost of $18,000+/- to connect those cameras to their system. On the hand-out presented that night, he had asked that provider for a cost to connect their system to ours, basically reusing the cameras. Just for getting hooked-up was an additional $2,800. Or, what was recommended was a rack system, for another $4,500. He was not convinced the city needed the rack, but that was up to the Council to decide. The first proposal was to go with Avidity with replacing all the cameras and connecting them all later, or, if they wanted to connect them now, then the not to exceed number would be the $60,500, which left $103,151 to go towards the body cameras.

Timing was of the essence as the existing contract expired near the end of October, so a decision was needed.

HART moved, MILLS seconded, **THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH AVIDITY SOLUTIONZ FOR THE UPGRADING OF THE EXISTING CITY SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $60,500.** Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-out; Melendrez-out; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 5/0/2.

NEW BUSINESS

Apron Expansion Project – COAR Grant

Andy Wood, Airport Manager, presented.

The Ontario Municipal Airport needs additional apron parking space for larger aircraft as growth at the airport has increased. This project would consist of the expansion of approximately 6,500 square yards of the large aircraft parking apron. The apron would be designed to meet the requirements of TDG-2A, and would allow for three additional parking spaces for larger aircraft.

The Airport Committee, city staff, and City Engineers JUB have been working to find additional funds for the Apron Expansion Project at the airport, which currently cost $1,000,704, an increase above the original estimated budget of $750,000. The funds for the original estimate would be provided from three entities: FAA @ 90% for $675,000; the State of Oregon @ 9% for $67,500; and the City of Ontario @ 1% for $7,500. However, when JUB and city staff attended the bid opening in April 2024 for the project, the bids came in higher than originally estimated. Due to those results, staff worked to find additional grant funds to cover the additional cost portions of the project.

The estimated total project cost was now $1,000,704, which would be funded through an FAA Grant for $900,633; a COAR Grant for $90,000; with the city adding the remaining $10,071. Currently the Fiscal Year 2024-2025 city budget had $8,000 budgeted for the project match. The additional costs would require $2,071 in additional funding. There was leftover funding in the Airport Gravel Project budget that could be utilized for this needed match increase. To stay on schedule, the Council should approve this project with the COAR grant as soon as possible, which would allow construction to begin mid-October 2024, with a completion in the Spring, 2025.

Councilor Mills verified that of the $1,000,704, the city was responsible for $10,071, correct, for three new landing pads?

Mr. Wood stated that was correct.

Councilor Hart stated he had sent an email to Mr. Wood and Mr. Cummings asking some questions on this project, and asked that those be answered in this forum.

Mr. Wood stated they looked at the return of value from last summer's earnings received. There were 70,000 gallons of Jet-A fuel sold through the FBO, in July and August, for a value of $6,300, which was set aside. Above that, the corporate apron earned around $5,800 this year, which came from tie-down fees, commercial usage fee, and the flowage fees for fuel that was brought onto the airport, not through the FBO. In that timeframe, the airport could see $5,500-6,000 of income was coming in because of usage on the corporate apron. Corporate jets contributed to more than just the airport because they were usually here for a few days, staying at hotels, eating in restaurants, and conducting their business. Large, heavy aircraft currently had no landing fee, but that was under review by the Airport Committee. Worse case, they should be able to recoup a significant amount of funding through the fees that had been applied that year, as well as what they could apply for the landing fee, too. Looking at corporate jets within that same summer period, one corporate jet landed, but there was no fuel to fill him up, so he left for Boise. That was a regular customer the airport had every year, so that was disappointing.

Councilor Hart stated he had taken a tour with Andy, where they spoke with an individual, "JT", and they talked about landing fees, and, wanting to be mindful of the local folk who had planes in hangars, but the corporate jets, and he assumed that when that corporate jet went to Boise and landed, he didn't land for free. He was looking for ways to continue to generate additional income. JT noted pilots wouldn't blink at paying a landing fee. It would take some investment, and some type of camera to capture information on the plane, and some type of billing mechanism for billing automatically. They'd all heard him say before, oh there's another $10K from the General Fund that could have been used for something else, and yes, it matched or leveraged other money, but leveraging additional money so other people could park corporate planes at the airport, didn't always benefit Ontario. He would support this action, with an eye towards that the city was going to work on seeing about implementing some landing fees, especially on the larger planes, who would probably be more than willing to reimburse the city. He thanked Mr. Wood for the follow-up on his email questions.

Mr. Cummings stated they were also looking at, to avoid running people off, the landing fee could be that if someone fueled up in Ontario, the landing fee could be reduced or removed. But, no fuel, pay the landing fee. The cameras could pick up the tail number, but they were researching the cost of developing the program to track that number, put it in a database, so staff would know how many times the aircraft landed, and then send an invoice out automatically. All that information would come back to the Council.

MILLS moved, HART seconded, **THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE APRON EXPANSION PROJECT, TOTALING $1,000,704.00. THIS INCLUDES A MATCH INCREASE OF $2,071.00 TO A TOTAL $10,071.00, THE FAA COMPANION GRANTS EQUALING $900,633.00 AND ODAV COAR GRANT OF $90,000.00 AND ALLOWING THE CITY MA AGER TO SIGN ALL RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE APRON EXPANSION PROJECT.** Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-out; Melendrez-out; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 4/0/3.

HAND-OUTS

Monthly Department Stats
Public Works, Fire & Rescue, Police, Code Enforcement: September 2024

CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS, AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

- Councilor Hart stated he hoped staff was continuing to work on what a possible fuel tax might look like, and deciding at what election they would go for, having that discussion with staff to say if they did raise the money, what would they use the funds for, and then convince the Council that was something to move forward on, and then work backwards to what election it would be.

  Mr. Cummings stated he had met with Public Works, and they were working on a plan to figure out what streets they would propose to use the money for. They were putting together a CIP, of sorts, to base the fuel tax on. Once they knew what projects needed to be done, not only the projects to be fixed, like road repair, but also to ensure they were funding to keep them maintained, too. The proposal that would go before the citizens would show if they voted for a fuel tax, here were the projects that would be done, as well as the maintenance. He hoped to have that to the Council in the next few months. He'd like to hear how the public felt about such an action. He'd like to get the citizens talking about it, to see if they'd even support such a thing.

- Councilor Hart stated an article in the Idaho Statesman read that Boise was moving forward on installing cameras at their stop lights as a safety issue. He hoped that staff here was working on something similar to get some numbers together for the Council, to see if that was something the city could do here in Ontario, to help with chronic red light running and the safety hazard that caused.

  Mr. Cummings stated that process had started. He had Chief and the two Lieutenants researching the pros and cons, and hopefully were getting some costs put together. He asked them to look at the lighted intersections only for now. Those were the ones with the most traffic violations. People were running full on red lights, not just yellow lights, and it was getting very scary. That information would be brought back to Council.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session: ORS 192.660(2)(d)
An executive session was called at 6:29 p.m. under provisions of ORS 192.660(2)(d) to provide a Labor Negotiation update. The Council reconvened into regular session at 6:38 p.m. No action was taken as a result of the executive session.

ADJOURN

HART moved, KIRBY seconded, **THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED**. Roll call vote: Mills-yes; Baker-out; Hart-yes; Bakefelt-out; Melendrez-out; Kirby-yes; Folden-yes. Motion carried 4/0/3.

ACCEPTED:

Deborah K. Folden, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder