

<b>Infrastructure Advisory Committee (IAC) Meeting Summary</b>		April 9, 2012	
		3:00- 5:00	
		City of Bend, Boyd Acres Training Room	
Committee Chair	Frank Turek	Note taker:	Adele McAfee
<b>In Attendance:</b>			
Committee Members: Andy High, Casey Roats, Nancy Loveland, Ray Auerbach, Frank Turek James Gattey			
Committee Member Absent: Tom Stutheit			
COB Staff: Tom Hickmann, Jeff England, Paul Rheault, Jon Skidmore, Sonia Andrews,			
<b><i>Meeting Summary</i></b>			
Agenda item:	Extra Strength Charge	Presenter:	Jon Skidmore
<p><b>Discussion:</b> City of Bend, Business Advocate, Jon Skidmore, opened the meeting with a recap of the discussion at the previous IAC meeting regarding the Extra Strength Charge (ESC). The charges are inequitable with only 15 businesses paying with Deschutes Brewery paying 50%- 60% of the overall fund.</p> <p>Council directed staff to work with business community and come up a new and improved program not based on the consumption of water but based on the output and strength of waste.</p> <p>Staff is recommending the ESC Resolution suspending the ESC program for 15 months to implement a new program.</p> <p>IAC Committee Chair Frank Turek opined the charge is not legally defensible because not all the businesses are being charged.</p> <p>Mr. Skidmore answered a question from committee member Jim Gattey, stating the resolution would give a good-will gesture to the businesses that are currently paying the ESC until an equitable and fair program can be established.</p> <p>City of Bend Public Works Director Paul Rheault stated the ESC is bringing in annually approximately \$120,000. The study included identifying what processes at the plant were treating extra strength and the associated costs of those processes.</p> <p>City of Bend Finance Director Sonia Andrews explained if the program is not suspended the city would need to charge an additional 200 businesses an outdated formula. She said there is a problem identifying these businesses.</p> <p>Mr. Gattey expressed his concerns that during the suspended period of time the cost of processing the extra strength will fall on the rate payers.</p> <p>Ms. Andrews stated during the suspension, in addition to the data collection and analysis, a stakeholders group will be formed and agree on the policy.</p> <p>Mr. Gattey pointed out that the make-up of the stakeholders group are made up of individuals who would heavily impacted by this policy. Ms. Andrews said that there are only three members who work in the industry that would be impacted.</p> <p>Mr. Rheault said that the plan would include giving businesses a sample billing so they could determine the impact.</p> <p>Mr. Gattey expressed concern the resolution does not stipulate an appeal process.</p> <p>Mr. Turek offered that the resolution before the committee is to create the stakeholder group and suspend the program. During the implementation of the program the businesses creating the extra strength will be charged more therefore, theoretically the residential rate could go down.</p> <p>Mr. Gattey raised his concern that there is no time limit. This clause was removed by the BEDAB Committee. Committee member Ray Auerbach opined that the purpose of suspending the program is to make it more equitable. He said it is unlikely that staff would re-establish a program after it has been identified as being inequitable.</p>			

Mr. Turek stated the discussion is getting to the policy side. The IAC committee should provide the technical expertise.

A discussion ensued on elements and timelines that could be included in the future resolution.

Mr. Rheault would like to see a clear cut policy on how the program is going to go forward at the end of the suspension. An implementation program that shows the real numbers and an opportunity for businesses to assess if they would like to invest in private pre-treatment .

Committee member Nan Loveland said that whoever is in charge of the stakeholder committee should know in six months whether the committee will come up with a policy during the given time period. If they are unable to reach a decision then the committee should be replaced.

Mr. Gattey basic concern is the IAC was formed with it members having a broad range of expertise and to make recommendations on various programs. The IAC committee asked for additional information and was informed that a new committee will be reviewing the policy. Ms. Loveland opined that this a political reaction to lessons learned on the Surface Water Improvement Project.

Mr. Gattey thinks the IAC should be charged with this task.

Mr. Turek stated he sees the process with staff developing the technical data on strength with category information. The IAC could agree or not agree with the data presented. The IAC decision would then go to the stakeholder committee to present the decision on the hard data. Council would then make a decision based on the recommendations of both committees and the finance and technical recommendations of city staff.

Mr. Skidmore added that council would have the additional perspective of how this policy would impact the business community.

Mr. Gattey opined that the IAC should deal with technical issue and not policy even though there are times they overlap. He thinks the IAC role has changed, other members did not agree.

Mr. Rheault shared an email from the City Manager encouraging staff to partnership with the community instead of being defensive by community questions and input to City policies. Mr. Rheault said this is the direction we are headed and there will be more outreached on these kinds of decisions.

Mr. Skidmore would like to go back to the council with a general consensus that the IAC agrees with the concept of the ESC committee. The IAC discussed how and in what format the "recommendation" should be brought back to the council. The IAC agrees with the concept. Mr. High would like to include a date for the ESC committee to complete their charge. A discussion of the resolution language regarding timeframe ensued.

Mr. Roats made a motion for the IAC to send two representatives to the ESC Committee. Frank Turek will represent the technical expertise and Mr. Gattey will represent a Bend resident. Mr. Auerbach seconded. Motion passed.

Mr. Turek restated salient points of the discussion restating that the IAC is in agreement of forming the committee. The resolution should include a "fail safe" that a decision should be made by July 1, 2013.

Agenda item:	<b>Sewer Resolution (Draft)</b>	Presenter:	<b>Tom Hickmann P.E.</b>
<b>Discussion:</b> The sewer resolution is not ready to hand out because it is still in legal review.			
The Resolution is to reflect the council's change of direction regarding the CIP following the protocol established with the water. The intent is to lay out the reasoning for scaling back and set out the direction to staff.			
The committee would rather hear about the resolution in its entirety so it can be properly vetted by the IAC. The committee reminded staff that the committee did not discuss the water resolution and read it for the first time on the website.			
The committee would like to provide a recommendation			
Agenda item:	<b>Collection System Master Plan</b>	Presenter:	<b>Tom Hickmann</b>
Discussion: Mr. Hickmann updated the IAC on the approach of the Collection System Master Plan (CSMP). These plans are typically done by professional staff and the public does not weigh-in. The city has elected to do a different approach by getting public input on the options. After there are agreements on the options, staff will come up with the operational components. All components drive the models.			
The IAC will be the technical arm of the stakeholder group.			
The RFP will stipulate the consultant address areas where there are known problems. The next step would be looking at the system as a whole.			
The Chamber will be asked to put the list together for the stakeholder group. April 14 <sup>th</sup> the CSMP will come back to the IAC when the details have been worked out.			
A discussion ensued regarding the selection of the consultant and the specialized modeling work.			
Mr. Turek raised concerns on CSMP technical merit and how a non-technical stakeholder group could follow without a lot of time devoting to educating this group.			
The resolution will be presented at the next IAC meeting			
Agenda item:	<b>LT2 Letter from the State</b>	Presenter:	<b>Tom Hickmann P.E.</b>
Discussion: The state responded to the city's request of an extension by requesting the city address by addressing two issues : 1) financial – addressing affordability and 2) identify the robust measures the city will put in place while in the interim phase when the city is out of compliance			
The City will identify the "robust" measures to the state to make sure we are on the right path.			
A discussion ensued regarding the content of the of City's response to the State.			

Meeting adjourned at 5:05PM