



Utilities Commission
Commission Meeting

Minutes

April 6, 2021
8:30 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Brian Ball	City Engineer	Present	
Richard Dzik	Safety Service Director	Present	
Mathias Orndorf	Director of Public Utilities	Present	
Keith Burley	Alternate Member	Present	
Elizabeth Doolittle		Present	

Others in attendance: Tammy Woods, Council Representative; Ken Griffith, Assistant Director of Public Utilities; Chad VanSickle, Diversified Engineering, Inc.; Bob Pepalis, Mount Vernon News; Lindsay Hoar, Recording Secretary

MINUTES APPROVAL

- Utilities Commission - Commission Meeting - Mar 2, 2021 8:30 AM

Ms. Doolittle was not present during the minutes approval.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [4 TO 0]
MOVER:	Keith Burley, Alternate Member
SECONDER:	Mathias Orndorf, Director of Public Utilities
AYES:	Ball, Dzik, Orndorf, Burley
AWAY:	Doolittle

ADJUSTMENT JOURNAL

March Adjustments Unavailable

Will be available during the May meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

505 W, Vine Street - Dan Gibson

Mr. Dzik spoke to Mr. Gibson about his sewer lateral. He indicated that there were roots growing through his lateral from a neighboring property.

Mr. Gibson was not present for the meeting.

Proposed Development Plan for Gilchrist Estates Subdivision

Mr. Ball introduced the Engineering firm and turned it over to Mr. VanSickle. The newer version of the maps are attached to the agenda.

Mr. VanSickle explained that he sent a later development plan showing the waterlines and the proposed sanitary sewer for the proposed development for Gilchrist Estates. We have different phases filled out in the plans. The north section is a condo development area, that will be in the yellow hatching. That will probably be the later phase. Right now they're focusing on the entrance off of Gilchrist and doing that first green phase to get started on that development. We'll be tying into the existing waterline on Gilchrist and coming off of there, extending the waterline up to the edge of our property there. What we plan to do is run behind the curb with the waterline and providing services off the main line. Sanitary wise, we have the tie in down in the end of the Phase 1. The existing sanitary in the low spot down in the valley where that will be our connection or tie in for the initial phases. We are looking at re-routing a section of that to make it match up with our lot lines a little better. Coming off of that and feeding Phase 1 and the rest of the subdivision there. Mr. Ball mentioned in an email that you guys do not like the lift stations. We have one low area in the back in Phase 4 that we showed a lift station and we were looking at it this morning. We can probably do a gravity section through that back section; it's going to be 20-23 feet deep for about 500 or 600 feet. If that works, probably a cheaper alternative to do that than to do a lift station. If that will work for you guys, we'll just have a deep section of 20-23 feet deep for about 500 or 600 feet. Otherwise, we'd have to rearrange the subdivision and lose some lots to stay up in elevation to make that work. That's probably not good for the development.

Mr. VanSickle shared a proposal on the deeper section.

Mr. Ball said he sees Mr. Orndorf nodding and that they're in agreement, they would prefer the deeper section over the lift station.

Mr. VanSickle showed where they had the proposed lift station and where the deeper section would be.

Mr. Ball asks if it creates any challenge tying in the homes.

Mr. VanSickle said yes, it's definitely going to be deep.

Mr. Ball asks if they'd go ahead and build the part in green to service the homes and have the part in yellow be the main. Or would you try to tie the laterals into the yellow part.

Mr. VanSickle said he thinks at this point you'd probably just do the yellow.

Mr. Ball said that's fine.

Mr. VanSickle said he doesn't think we want to duplicate the sewer out there. That would be pretty expensive.

Mr. Ball said we'd prefer the deeper sewer. The pump stations are a huge up front expense and a perpetual nightmare.

Mr. VanSickle said what we were thinking was it was going to be a smaller lift station, a package deal. But yes, obviously the upfront expense of \$50,000.00 - if we have to do that versus going deep, it's probably cheaper to go deep than go the lift station. We can make that happen. I don't know if you want us to revise these plans before Thursday.

Mr. Ball said Thursday is the Planning Commission. Let's go through and see if we have any questions first. One concept we brought up was we have some on again, off again interest in development east of Upper Gilchrist. The question would be, as they're approaching their station 100 on their primary, they're shallowing up for obvious reasons. They get full service to their phase 1 but then the question is looking at having a deeper sewer from their tie in point with the existing would provide potential service for this future development. It may also be a path to eliminate the two pump stations the county has on their properties. That's something to think about as a commission. This is our next best option for eliminating those other pump stations, have them put the first 1500 feet in at a flatter slope.

Mr. VanSickle said maybe not even that much. Maybe the first 800 feet or so. Once you start to get down towards that valley you really start dropping fast. Maybe it's only 700 or 800 feet that you may have to deepen up. It looks like the two parcels you mentioned, one is almost directly across - northeast of our interest there, that parcel looks like it's higher elevation than we are. Seems like they'd be able to come out of that lot/parcel and be able to tie into what we have, or close to it.

Mr. Ball said as you go to the southeast corner of that parcel, it starts to roll back to Coshocton Road. There is a ridgeline sort of mid-point in that parcel. If it was something where around your station between 900 and 600, if that was just put in a little flatter, we'd want to do a little exercise to think about if we could service those two parcels with a reasonable adjustment to your work, that would make everything a lot easier for future and existing developer.

Mr. VanSickle said it's going to cost more to lower that sewer down. Is that something that we would negotiate? How would that work?

Mr. Ball said yeah, I think so. The folks across the street have an interest in developing; their biggest hang up is really wastewater. I think we'd look at creating some kind of a partnership. We'd probably start by reaching back out to the parcel owner to see if they would want to participate in your sewer improvement project, financially. We would also see

if this would function to eliminate our other pump station and at that point, I would offer a discussion of the city participating financially. If it's feasible for us to eliminate a pump station, that's a perpetual savings for us with a small increment of costs to your folks during construction.

Mr. VanSickle asked where the pump station is that Mr. Ball is talking about. Is it south of our proposal?

Mr. Ball said would be southeast. If you look at the parcels I sent you, it's behind the county jail. I can send you a diagram of where it is. I don't know what the depths and stuff are. We can correspond on the low point of the pump station and do a quick feasibility check.

Mr. VanSickle said they could definitely take a look at it. If we get some information, we'll take a look, see how the elevations look and see what we need to do to tie that in.

Mr. Ball said the worst-case scenario is if we can't get it tied in we might be able to just reroute our pump station discharge to a lesser elevation. It's one of those things that we've a lot of problems with the length of the discharge line and things like that. Let me ask a question, what size sanitary pipe are you looking at.

Mr. VanSickle said they haven't really sized it yet. I would imagine it's going to be at least 8". We haven't sized it yet so we'd have to look at that.

Mr. Ball said he doesn't know what size it is now at the site. It appears to be 8", changes to 10" down at the State Institute property.

Mr. VanSickle confirmed that it was 8" there in their development.

Mr. Ball said yes, in your development it's all 8".

Mr. VanSickle said we're kind of stuck with that.

Mr. Ball said that a thought too, if we needed a larger size going over the Upper Gilchrist Road for the future, that's something we should think about. If we need to think about having you upsize that.

Mr. VanSickle asked where it turns to 10".

Mr. Ball said it's on the state property. If you have your USGS map, it's the first building that's on the state property. There's a small tributary creek and it switches to 10" right by that first building to the northwest of your property where you're designing.

Mr. VanSickle said that'd be a group effort to upsize from there up to our development. At least we could upsize our portion now.

Mr. Ball said yeah, if it needed to be 10" in your section through your section, that could be

done and then the future work could be done later if we needed to. You're really only probably 1,000 feet or so from your property lines where it goes to 10".

Mr. Burley has questions about stormwater and what the look was there, if you had any comments, Brian.

Mr. Ball said we're looking at water, wastewater, stormwater. My understanding from the initial conversation, the developers would like to build the stormwater system and then take the option in our city code, turn over the stormwater ponds with proper easements and the city would maintain those and then act as an HOA basically. Have a surcharge to the development to permanently maintain those ponds.

Mr. VanSickle said we were showing the basins to be within a conservation or utility easement area that would have restrictions on it. Those would be turned over to the city to maintain.

Mr. Ball said if it's \$6 a residential unit when these are completed, they would pay that and then we would come up with a measurement for costs to maintain these conservation areas, basins. Then there would be a local assessment for the folks to create a reserve account and then the mowing and maintenance for our Street/Stormwater Department to take care of those, just like a ditch petition.

Mr. Burley said the code is there to do that but really none of the rest of that, correct.

Mr. Ball said the draft copy has been sent to our lawyer for review and he has not had a chance to review it yet. We're in the development of the rules and regulations for this type of action but we have not, as a commission, adopted those yet.

Mr. Dzik ask if there was any other conversation.

Mr. Ball said the question is, do we want to make a motion to generally adopt their concept with some amendments or make a motion to enter a development agreement. I didn't know what your thoughts are.

Mr. Dzik said it works for him. Do we typically need a motion from the commission before we go to Municipal Planning?

Mr. Orndorf said we haven't really done it before. Normally it just goes through Engineering and Safety Service Director. They just give me the plans to look at after it's pretty much a done deal.

Mr. Ball said this one is probably a little different now that we have the Stormwater Utility and their intent from the beginning is for us to maintain the ponds. I think that's where we would have a little more action from the beginning. What we're saying is we're willing to take over the utilities and enter an agreement for development. There's some details that need to be worked out. This is preliminary, so they're not listing material types and sizes and

things that still need to be worked out. I would make a motion that the utility commission, aka the Director would be authorized to enter a development agreement for the utilities at this project, assuming there's no pump station.

- Updated Proposed Development Plan
- Motion That the Utility Commission, aka the Director, Would Be Authorized to Enter a Development Agreement for the Utilities at This Project, Assuming There's No Pump Station.

Mr. Burley was excused from voting due to Ms. Doolittle being present.

Mr. Dzik generally agrees. He thinks it would be good if we could get the commission to speak to the utility plan, whether it involves stormwater or not, before Municipal Planning. That could help that process out.

Mr. Ball said yeah because as we get to Municipal Planning, they're going to be focused on a whole array of things, the least of which would be utilities. I think by saying that we support the concept and we are willing to take over the stormwater management, that's going to be a concern. Some of these areas the stormwater management goes into abeyance shortly after the developer turns over the property. I think that will support the case and give our planning commission more comfort at this goes forward.

Mr. Dzik spoke with Mr. Broeren this morning. He expects that after this month his new attorney will be able to take over his Tuesday arraignments. He intends to be at all of our commission meetings so I'll ask him to give us an update on the rules and regulations for stormwater.

Mr. VanSickle said we'll take that pump station out of our plans and we'll send you back another copy.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Brian Ball, City Engineer
SECONDER:	Mathias Orndorf, Director of Public Utilities
AYES:	Ball, Dzik, Orndorf, Doolittle
EXCUSED:	Burley

OLD BUSINESS

Westgate Trailer Park Reimbursement Agreement

Mr. Ball said we are in the process of making an application for an Ohio EPA revolving loan program. We have one in progress for the Wastewater Plant. We're learning rapidly as we go. The one we've put in now would be for next year. For the Westgate Trailer Park we basically have a form of an agreement because the EPA requires it in the application. We have a letter from Joe Badalamenti agreeing to participate in the project at both the Westgate

and the trailer park north of Westgate. We have that in writing; I've sent those to Rob. We're a little backlogged until Rob can get freed up to formalize all the terms that we will need. We're proceeding to work through the design of the water system and again the EPA. My understanding is we would get low interest and/or principal forgiveness by eliminating the Westgate as a water system. I don't know the exact benefits that we would have with the EPA but we do know they're highly motivated to eliminate these other water systems and have us take over. We've got to get rights of entry, we've got to get easements. There's a lot of real estate work that needs to be done. Hopefully, as Rob gets freed up he can work with Lacie to get through the real estate process.

Mr. Burley said the agreement parts about making sure we've got cost recovery on the engineering portion so far. Even if it doesn't go through we still have a mechanism.

Mr. Ball said Rob feels we're properly authorized by City Council. It will probably be Rob, myself and Terry Scott will craft a draft version of this for the commission's review. I need Rob to take the first run at that. Joe is highly motivated to take care of this problem. I know we're taking a little bit of a risk up front but it's something that he really needs to take care of.

Mr. Dzik said it sounds like both of these agreements came in relatively recently, didn't they. I know we were waiting on the Hazen Rules and Regs.

Mr. Ball questioned what he meant by both agreements.

Mr. Dzik asked if we had someone draft the agreements for us, at least the ones that are on Stormwater.

Mr. Ball said for the trailer park we had Giles Law Firm do a title search and get some of the background information that Rob wanted to write the agreement. He has a tax assessment, somehow related to the sewer that is near paying off and some other assessments that we were trying to get some information on. We got all of that to Rob. We just need to sit down with him.

Rules & Regulations

Mr. Ball said Hazen has drafted a set of Rules and Regulations. Those were transmitted directly to Rob because of the active litigation around stormwater ponds and so Rob needs to review those first before we can make those available to the public. He has not had time to do that.

Mr. Orndorf said to clarify those were Stormwater Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Ball said yes, the Stormwater Rules and Regulations because again, we asked Hazen to transmit those directly to Rob because of the pending litigation and the repercussions of that. A draft document could be confusing to the court so we want to make sure that's vetted properly through Mr. Broeren before it becomes a public document.

Mr. Burley said he still has updated rules and regulations for Water and Wastewater that need looked at. I marked up a copy of that after our last rate increase and I think it's probably a good time to relook at it.

Mr. Ball agrees.

Water Rate Study

Mr. Ball said we are trying to launch this. We have farmed that out to Emily McKinley. Mr. Scott has been busy with Union negotiations and other things. She's been trying to get that started. We have not got that actually launched yet. We keep moving it every day on the calendar but it is coming.

Mr. Dzik said so the commission knows, I want to be able to bring by early to mid-summer, whatever the rate study suggests our future water rates should be to the commission. By mid or end of summer I'd like to be bringing that to council. We did start early. We brought it up and started discussions last month. I think we've given us enough runway here to hit that target.

Mr. Ball said he thinks so. She's gotten familiar with the spreadsheet and I've asked her to do a deeper dive, similar to what we did with Wastewater. We did find with several reviews, there were some errors and they're probably due to some of the rules and regulations have changed since 2003. There have been some amendments with how we deal with Clinton Township. The way the Wastewater model was set up in 2003, we were just copying it and moving it forward in time but we did not account for where the money was going and the different multipliers correctly. We fixed that. The other thing Mr. Orndorf and Mr. Scott are trying to do is actually tag the financial account number in the model so when you look at our monthly balance sheets you can see how that correlates to the model. That's something we started in the Wastewater model we didn't get finished. We're actually giving Emily some extra tasks than just plugging in a couple years of financial data and re-crunching it, we're going to do an audit of the model and also make it easier because Mr. Orndorf and I understand it pretty well and Mr. Scott and I understand it. But obviously, Mr. Orndorf is going to retire, the next person needs to be able to pick it up and be able to understand how the money flows without a lot of process of understanding the model. That's our goals.

Pittsburgh Avenue Waterline

Mr. Dzik said he doesn't think we're ready for a recommendation yet today but I assume that we'll be meeting quite a bit about the Pittsburgh Avenue Water Line.

Mr. Ball suggested starting from a strategic perspective. I had a really good meeting with Tim Ross yesterday who's Bob Gibbs' District Manager. We have a stimulus package coming to us sometime within the next two months that's heavily weighted towards infrastructure. It has COVID wrapped around it. The other thing is they're actively working in Congress on another stimulus package that is even more weighted towards infrastructure and they feel that sometime, probably June or July, we'll have more information on that. What I think the Pittsburgh Avenue Water Line leads us to is we need to look at our portfolio of projects and rank those. And look at if we receive a significant amount of stimulus money, where we would want to spend that. We had a little work session to digest the concept of how we would grade water systems extensions, one versus another. We've created some worksheets to look at benefits cost ratios and user participation, how do we look at service availability.

Mr. Burley said he thinks looking at an economic model is pretty eye opening. I think it's

good to have that structure. I'm real encouraged with the work session we had. I think part of that's understanding what other development opportunities are and what makes economic sense, is really good.

Mr. Dzik said he thinks there's couple of issues. I think maybe over time, we as a commission should settle on maybe some standard principles that we have. I think there's been a lot of discussion amongst commission members about the water service availability charge. I think to Mr. Burley's point, there are economic realities and then are political realities. Both have to be accounted for. I think we're all in alignment that we can't really embark on trying to find exceptions to water service availability charges that think they're a necessary part of the utility and how we fund extending services. Brian and I have talked; there may be a value in having a brief committee meeting at some point in the next few months with Council to lay out why we charge water service availability, how the City of Mount Vernon takes a bit of a softer approach by letting all that money go toward future tap fees. I also think when we talk about a water line anywhere in this area we need to recognize that the main purpose of this water line is the improve supply to our industrial park. Yes, it does go through an unincorporated part of the city but we really do need to ensure that our businesses have the reliable services they need. I think we need to find a solution to this and I think more discussion over time will help us do that.

Mr. Ball said a lot of our consultants and folks have been off for Easter break last week. I did have a phone call with Mr. Bob McNutt who is one of our guru experts in water systems. Mr. Ball forwarded a link to everyone on the commission, it's a worksheet that he had done for water systems, extensions for a town and it shows he calculated the cost of water softener, salt, electricity, the cost of drilling a well. This gives you a range of expense and then compare that to having city water. That worksheet is something we didn't have to pay for because Bob had done that for a previous customer. The cost may be a few years old. His work is all relative to the same year. That's something I think will be helpful to add to our analysis. The feel I got was some of these projects, if we had some grant money or some federal aid, it really moves the needle on the benefit cost. I was going to do some more research. The Core of Engineers, I am sure, has standards on those benefit to cost scenarios. We'll keep working on it. We did get a letter out to the folks on Pittsburgh Avenue with a return postcard. I think we're going to go ahead and blanket the area between Columbus Road, Pittsburgh and Harcourt to just gauge that entire neighborhood's interest in water service availability, giving them sort of a non-commitment and also putting us at a caveat of potential federal aid that may be coming. We want to prioritize extensions where people want water and go from there.

Mr. Dzik said this is one of those other kind of standards that we need to think about as a commission. I think we've asked council, what's the breaking point. At percentage of people in a certain area that want water, do we actually move forward with delivering water? My personal opinion is 51%. Does anybody have any thoughts on how many customers agree to want water at which point we start seriously considering a project?

Mr. Burley said he thinks it all depends on what kind of other financial help you get. That's totally what swings the project. If there's more grant money available then that becomes less and less of an issue. From my looking at the models, really the grant money drives the project season even close to a system expansion requirement. If it becomes a deliverability

issue, say to the industrial park, that's a harder economic number to put against it.

Mr. Dzik said his point was all economics being the same, it obviously makes economic sense. Let's remember with the fact that there's a water service availability charge, participation is essentially 100%. It's not the number of customers that are actually connecting that's necessarily running the economics. So that's the question, I think council would be less likely to embark on a project with 20% of people in the area actually want to connect versus I'd say a strict majority.

Mr. Burley said the water service availability charge, if we let them use that to pay against their tap fee that really doesn't kick in for twenty years. While they're paying the money, we don't really see the income from that so the water service availability charge doesn't really swing the economics on the project.

Mr. Ball said one good point that Mr. Bob McNutt brought up is your lot length. If we're looking at a 51% of participation with 100 foot lots versus an area with 40 foot lots, you got a lot more customers. I think Mr. Burley had brought this up. It's looking at customer density also. Pittsburgh's a little bit challenging because we're not going to have very many customers on the north side of the water line but in the first two blocks off of Harcourt, you're creating that backbone that then connects you with the other neighborhood. Bob's done some pretty deep dives on this. Bob's willing, if we want to set up a special meeting, he's willing to be a question/answer person where we can ask him what he's seeing in other water systems.

Mr. Burley said that's where that economic model starts to show the density in how it helps the project in terms of (inaudible).

Ms. Doolittle said she has to agree with Mr. Burley's comment that it has to do with cost recovery and other funds available. Even is 49% of people want to connect, if there's large grant money available to make the project offset costs, then it's still worth pursuing. I think participation is important but also cost to the city and availability of other funds is hugely important.

OTHER

1006 West Gambier Street

Mr. Griffith said we got the approval to step in there and do the lateral ourselves. We had Brian Stafford show up and he was there a week and a half ago. He installed the new service lateral for 1006 so that's completed. They put a new sanitary sewer tap on; the old one was broken.

Mr. Burley said he understood even though we initially authorized it, the homeowner actually paid directly to Stafford, is that correct.

Mr. Griffith said he didn't hear if he paid Stafford directly for that. I did get an invoice back from Stafford, we did pay for that up front - we had a purchase order in place. We got the invoice back from Stafford. Asked Mr. Ball is he's supposed to pay that back to us.

Mr. Ball said he had heard that he had paid somebody for it.

Mr. Orndorf said somebody has already paid for it and it was not the city. It was either a homeowner or it was a relative of the homeowner.

Hillside Apartment

Mr. Orndorf said the new meters have been installed. I had called the owner of the property up

there and let them know that the one unit would be higher because the leak was actually after the meter. He's going to have a higher bill on that unit that has that leak. I gave him as much information as I had and it's up to them. They're paying for that leak now.

Mr. Burley asked if Mr. Orndorf had the billed versus produced. Has that changed any?

Mr. Orndorf said he did not have time to do that. This is shut-off week. I did get shut-off numbers for you today. I have not had time to go over the output and what we actually billed for. I'm going to guess there's not a long of change. The leak up at Hillside is being metered now but it is not big enough to account for the water that's being lost.

Mr. Burley asked if there was anything on shut-offs that we should now.

Mr. Orndorf said we're actually down to 99 today which is 1.3%. Not sure why but it's always nice to see a number below 100.

Mr. Dzik asked if that is about normal to where we were before the pandemic.

Mr. Orndorf said no, that is actually less. We're normally real close to 2%. About 120 - 140 depending on which cycle we're coming up on.

Owens Corning Letter

Mr. Griffith said he's revised that, it's ready to send out. I'll have that out here today or by the end of the week.

Mr. Dzik asked Mr. Griffith to give an explanation on what the letter is all about.

Mr. Griffith said it's really just reassuring them that we are moving forward. Things that we're looking at as far as the hydraulic modeling. What we're trying to put in to place so that when we do move forward with the reservoir or even potentially in the future, that we can provide them more. We want to keep them in the loop so they know what we're doing, they know that we are actively working.

Mr. Dzik asked how many times in the past have they really had a lack of water. Obviously when we were testing things for the reservoir and we had those major leaks on Gambier, they lost water service but is that an abnormality or have they lost it in the past as well.

Mr. Orndorf said the main thing with them is when we the hydrant flushing out in the area, it drops the pressure below where they need it to be. We've done a lot better between the Fire Department and the Water Department whenever we're out there flushing, giving them some notice. There for a while it was getting done and they weren't getting notified and they would see that fluctuation. As soon as they see that pressure going down then they have to make a decision to do that shut down, which costs them large amounts of money.

New Gambier Reservoir

Mr. Burley asked if we are under a compliance deadline.

Mr. Ball said not yet. We do have a letter from the EPA listing items that need to be taken care of. It's not yet mandated.

Mr. Dzik asked if we'd awarded the first half of that project.

Mr. Ball said the contract has been awarded but we have not signed a contract yet. Lacie is working on getting the Oak Street and Catherine Street contract finalized today and then I've asked her sometime this week to start making the contract books. We've been short staffed so those things have been taking a lot longer. We've had a preparatory meeting with the contractor. We've gone over the concepts with what we want. The contractor would like us to get the

contracts signed because they're facing cost adjustments because of material shortages. We're trying to get that out this week.

Mr. Dzik said he thinks the pace has been fine.

Mr. Ball said we have the same contractor at Oak Street and the reservoir. Their preference was to do Oak Street first. We're obviously working through some other things that we need to do so our preference was to have them do Oak Street first. Also, that'd give us some time to get our computer modeling and some things done. I think we're on track, we just want to be able to assure the contractor that the valves and some of the more expensive items need to be ordered because we don't really know how long those will take to get. We know we're going to have to change the valves. If we get the contract signed, we'll get the contractor buying the pieces we know we need and those may take several months to get anyway.

Wastewater Treatment Plant

Mr. Burley asked for a status.

Mr. Ball said we had a round of questions in prep for the EPA revolving loan, by taking EPA's money we have an enormous amount of paperwork obligation. Travis with CEC had sent a large list of requests to Jason, Mr. Orndorf and myself. I believe we have satisfied the requirement for that information. I haven't had a chance to call Travis this week to double check that he has everything that he needs.

Mr. Orndorf said he received an invoice from him stating that he had everything.

Mr. Ball said we had to get financial records, a large quantity of information. So that is progressing, we're not quite to the point of making the final application. We do not have the plans finalized. But some good news, with all of our council meetings and things, we've gained some regional attention and some large construction contractors have been calling me and we're going to set up some preliminary tours for some of the larger folks that do Wastewater Plant work. We'll give them an early look at the plant. We don't really have a final answer on what we're going to build but we are going to start courting our contractors early as we can so hopefully we get better prices and get their interest. The more comfortable our bidders are the more likely we'll get better pricing. We want to start that process as soon as we can.

Non-Residential ERUs

Mr. Burley said we've got a little bit of a deadline for July 1st for updates to the non-residential ERUs and I didn't know where we were in that process.

Mr. Ball said that is completely on hold until we have another staff person in Engineering. We have a new person hired and they are going to spend a couple of weeks in training learning about the Wastewater Plant and then we are going to phase them in to take over that position where they were doing part time locates, part time Wastewater. As soon as we can work through our backlog, we'll go back and start working on Stormwater ERUs again.

Mr. Burley asked if we had any review/requests that we should specifically act on by July 1st.

Mr. Ball said we had one person ask for a credit for their retention pond. We have not taken action on that yet. I don't believe that they have all the required documents but again we've put all of that stuff on hold.

Dry Creek and Delano Run

Mr. Ball said we are very successful at this Clean Water Act 319(h) program. We have three sites under construction. We have \$300,000.00 of EPA money that's being put into our utility system right now. The question for this is would we be interested in creating master plans for Dry Creek and Delano Run. By doing that we would have 90%+ of the city under an approved EPA watershed master plan. The first plan we have which is Armstrong Run and the main stream Kokosing. The D&R, Heather Daugherty and myself, we wrote the plan with the assistance of Bob Gabell. Took us a couple of years to do it. I don't know that we have the staff to write two more plans but we do have a really good template. So the question is, is this something the commission will support later this summer, doing additional master planning and if we did that our partners with Civil and Environmental Consultants could help us write these two plans for around \$29,000.00. If we authorize this today it's going to stay on hold with a lot of the other stormwater stuff until we get the staffing to help take care of it. We could get the contract in place. Basically my last conversation with the EPA, it's really hard to get this plan approved but once you get the plan approved it's not that hard to get the projects funded and for every \$2 we spend we get \$3 from the EPA. This is a great program. I'd make a motion to hire CEC to help us develop two more stormwater master plans for the city.

Discussion on continuing virtual meetings until at least May meeting.

- Motion to Hire Civil and Environmental Consultants to Develop a Watershed Plan for Drycreek and the Delano Run Sub-Watershed Area, Delano Also Includes Center Run.

Mr. Dzik said he got into this when he was at the 911 center with EMA. They develop a lot of plans at EMA because having those plans opens it up for funding. I think it's a no brainer for me that let's get the plans done and hopefully we'll have an opportunity in the future to fund those plans.

Mr. Burley said his concern is with Engineering - it just takes more things; I'm not sure it's the most pressing.

Mr. Orndorf said these plans are actually specific for each of those items that you actually talked about, Dry Creek and Delano Run.

Mr. Ball said yes, Delano and Center Run are in the same. It would cover from Main Street all the way to the Wastewater Plant, both sides of the Kokosing River. The plan we have now covers Main Street to the Tilden Avenue bridge area. The Armstrong Run covers the northwest quadrant of town. The projects we'd specifically list could then be funded by the EPA. If you remember our computer modeling for the stormwater utility, really we need to be charging \$10 per ERU and so we're assuming large grant proceeds every year to catch up our deficit. This is just part of that master plan. To Mr. Burley's point, yes, I can write these plans. It is a lot of time. By out sourcing this we would just be giving them projects and then doing technical review. We would hold off on starting this until I'm able to get the billing system and the credits and the demos back being processed. This would be a lower priority compared to some of the things we have on the backlog now. It takes time to get the contract signed and all of that stuff can just be in progress.

Ms. Woods said once you have these plans, they sit on the shelf for when you need them but they don't grow outdated. You spend the money and then you can use them in the future, right?

Mr. Orndorf asked how long they are good for.

Mr. Ball said they are approved until amended. With the plan we have now, we had the short-term project list and we have mid-term and a long-term project list. The plan that exists for Armstrong Run includes the complete replacement of the levy system from Main Street to Tilden Avenue. If at some point the federal government decided to come help us that's an approved plan where we could get money from the EPA, the DNR, the Core, the Muskingum Watershed, the Department of Transportation. So there's some real stretch goals in that plan. The other thing we've used this plan for is justification of the relocation of Route 13. When I met with Congressman Gibb's staff yesterday, we mentioned we have an approved Watershed plan that in essence endorses the project. He was very impressed that we have a letter or support from the DNR for a transportation project from the beginning. In that case we have a very rare endorsement that most transportation projects do not have. In a lot of ways this can put us ahead of our other folks in competition for federal money. The plan does not expire and it can be amended if we want to add projects later. I think it's low risk and we'll try to keep it at a minimum time from the department.

Mr. Orndorf asked if Mr. Ball looked at his revenues in stormwater so far.

Mr. Ball said Terry won't give him those. I've got them from the Street Department.

Mr. Orndorf said there's not a lot in stormwater yet. I know that there's other purchases that we need to make on stormwater so even if this is approved we may have to put this off for quite a while until there's actually the money to fund it.

Mr. Ball said one thing on stormwater we did do, we met with the billing office staff and we sent some letters out to the folks that were unaware and have yet to pay their first bill. We're going to do another round of checking to see how that letter worked.

Mr. Dzik asked Mr. Ball what the time commitment is on his staff when this is contracted out.

Mr. Ball said they would get the ODNR to review it. Our effort would really be giving them a list of projects that we want to include in the plan. They're really only looking at probably two reviews. We have a good template that's been approved. I would not likely be out there doing the biological habitat assessment like I did on the first one. Probably looking at (inaudible) days or so between now and August.

Ms. Doolittle asked for the motion to be rephrased.

Mr. Ball said we would be asking to hire Civil and Environmental Consultants to develop a

watershed plan for Drycreek and the Delano Run sub-watershed area. The Delano also includes Center Run.

RESULT: **APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER: Brian Ball, City Engineer
SECONDER: Mathias Orndorf, Director of Public Utilities
AYES: Ball, Dzik, Orndorf, Doolittle
EXCUSED: Burley

ADJOURN

- Adjourn Motion

Mr. Dzik made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Ball second and the meeting was adjourned.

RESULT: **ADJOURNED ES MOTION [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER: Richard Dzik, Safety Service Director
SECONDER: Brian Ball, City Engineer
AYES: Ball, Dzik, Orndorf, Doolittle
EXCUSED: Burley

Rick Dzik, Chairman

Lindsay Hoar, Recording Secretary