

Session 21-08, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:44 p.m. on May 26, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD

ABSENT: MEMBER BARNWELL (EXCUSED)

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to amend the agenda to add discussion of the report to Council under pending business for discussion and review.

ENGBRETSSEN/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO ADD THE DRAFT REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL UNDER PENDING BUSINESS.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was no further discussion on the motion as amended.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for May 26, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes of May 26, 2021.

SLONE/VENUT- SO MOVED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

Mike Parrish, Senior Mechanic, Public Works Department, spoke to the Task Force on the inadequacies of the Mechanic's Shop for Public Works. He provided a brief history with the City of Homer and briefly outlined the required needs for the maintenance and repairs for most of the City owned equipment.

Mr. Parrish facilitated questions on the following topics:

- Upcoming or pending purchases of equipment that will be too large for the shop
- Safety issues and lack of work space necessary to conduct the repairs
- Capability of the existing shop area to be expanded is not viable due to the existing layout being constrained by the vehicle access required to reach the animal shelter and Water Treatment

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

- A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Criteria for Evaluating Strategies
 - a. Criteria Scoresheet

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Public Works Director Keiser to speak to her memorandum.

Ms. Keiser reported that she reviewed the Task Force comments from the last meeting and using those comments as a guideline added criteria to address public perception, redefined criteria related to timeliness, provided clarification on the criteria. She further noted that she reevaluated the ranking scale to apply a higher number to allow more distinction between the different categories.

Discussion on the following ensued:

- Under the Cost Benefit Analysis how is the cost actually weighted versus the benefit
 - o Using the Risks and Mitigation spreadsheet as a guideline for understanding the benefits of a particular mitigation strategy
 - o A traditional cost benefit analysis was not done using scientific means but more of an intuitive approach using the risk hazard analysis that the Task Force compiled
 - o The data is not available to perform an actual cost benefit ratio analysis
 - o It could be delineated as a probable costs would be worth the probable benefits
- Under Timeliness how is a high score taking action important
 - o Similar to the Cost Benefit, seeking ambiguity since there is a risk
 - o Not enough available data to compute said risk
 - o Some constraints but there are windows of opportunity that could be taken advantage of
 - o Importance is reflective on the worth of the benefit
 - Example of purchasing land now since it may not be available if time elapses
- Additional narrative is required

- Including a separate paragraph to address the facility has been outgrown and that the city does not do a regular analysis on needs and if the current facilities will meet the needs going into the future
- Additional paragraph to include the information that addresses the inefficient and aging infrastructure while reviewing the tsunami risk.
- Criteria two redefined and applied to the strategies
- Chart needs to be revised for clarification and ease of understanding by the public and Council
- Timing because importance when a decision is made by Council on the probability
- Preference of having Council weigh in on the obsolescence over tsunami inclusion in their report
- Requested in the Scope of Work mitigation strategies were to have a cost applied to them
 - o Doing nothing still has a cost applicable
 - o Lock, Stock & Barrel costs are provided in CIP page and costs could be provided for the other two strategies
- Ranking Scale includes the Community as a beneficiary
 - o Strategy may benefit the department but not the Community
 - o Efficiency in serving the public and department safety
- Scale numerator
 - o Using only three numbers
 - o Applying a range of numbers
 - This might allow for more nuance
 - o Remove numbers altogether since it may be construed as arbitrary
 - Low, medium and high
 - Range of numbers and words
 - Explaining the range of numbers if asked by the public and using words how to determine the total score
- Scoring
 - o Mitigation solely based on Tsunami risk versus obsolescence
 - o Timing is effected when you cannot determine when a tsunami event may occur versus obsolescence
 - o Revised the language in criteria two
 - Recommend creating another criteria to address obsolescence versus tsunami risk to be transparent
 - Criteria 2A and Criteria 2B

ENGBRETSSEN/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION STRATEGIES TABLE TO INCOUDE PART A AND PART B WITH PART A REFERRING TO TSUNAMI RISK AND PART B REFERRING TO OBSOLESCENCE.

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold wanted to emphasize that a narrative would be included in the report on how the scoring was determined for each of the strategies presented. She noted that they have had or included in the discussion but it needs to be reflected in the report for the benefit of others.

Member Slone commented that it would also present justification for Part A and Part B and provided as an example the Limp along Plan.

B. Draft Report to City Council for Review and Discussion

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and requested Deputy City Clerk Krause to provide some input on the document.

Deputy City Clerk Krause reported that she reviewed the minutes from the meetings, the information from the resolution and memorandum submitted to Council. She included the information that was reviewed by the Task Force. She strongly noted that this was a draft and will include information in the memorandums from tonight.

Ms. Krause addressed the photo that was used in on the report reflected Seward after the 1964 earthquake. She then recounted watching a show recently which depicted a tsunami hitting Santa Monica and made her realize that there was more to a tsunami impacting the city as a whole other than the Public Works Facility. She noted something that was not discussed was the water leaving causing additional destruction to the Public Works Facility.

Chair Aderhold stated that if the photo is used to have a title and give credit to the photographer.

Member Slone commented that the lines 84 through 87, he believed this was the most crucial paragraph in the document. Assuming Council approves there is a risk, which would then bring them to their recommendations. He recommended expanding a bit more in that section to bring those two points together.

Chair Aderhold agreed that the sentence should be included in the cover memo with the recommendations.

Ms. Keiser acknowledged that she was supposed to draft up the next steps but then asked how comments on the document should be presented to Ms. Krause.

Ms. Krause recommended the following in regards to submitting corrections and additions to the draft report:

- Mark up the document with changes or additions and return to her
- Submit changes via email noting the line numbers on each change
- Deadline for submitting changes is no later than the 8th so it can be included in the packet
- She has a process in mind on how each of the members recommendations will be shown/presented in the report
- If a section of the report should be included in the cover memo that should also be submitted as well for the next meeting so a draft of the memorandum can be included for the next meeting.

Member Slone stated that it would be appropriate to include a general statement to introduce the other argument of obsolescence into the memo then include more in the report to Council.

Member Keiser will include Member Slone's points in the revision to her memo.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Memo from Public Works Director Re: Functional Inefficiencies of Existing PW Campus

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Keiser to review the memorandum.

Member Keiser provided a recap of the information provided by Mr. Parrish and summary of the information included in the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen requested an explanation of what a Vactor truck actually was then asked for clarification on the personnel who worked in the water and sewer department would stay at the existing facility.

Member Keiser explained that they would keep a supply of essential supplies since most of their rolling stock is vehicles which could be moved relatively easy. They do not have an intensive investment in tools that the mechanics have. Same issue with Parks Department as their supplies are not as critical. There are beneficial uses for the existing facility.

Member Engebretsen noted that that information would be relevant to include in the report to Council.

Member Keiser provided additional detail information in regards to tools and supplies for those departments that would be working out of the existing facility in other safe locations. She then addressed the funding for the Fuel Depot that has been allocated and that it is not included in the cost estimate for a new Public Works Facility. She will verify that for the next meeting.

Member Keiser stated that during inspection of the fuel tanks it was determined that there was corrosion and it would not pass inspection when the next inspection is due. She then address the question that the new fuel depot is not expected to cost more than \$300,000 and it will be above ground.

Chair Aderhold commented on pointing out that there are two buildings that are in use at the HERC facility and that the section regarding the fuel tanks should be re-worded to address the corrosion with regards to cathodic protection and the tanks.

There was a brief discussion on inclusion of DEC and clarification of the inspection report on the fuel tank condition.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

- A. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
- B. PWCTF Meeting Schedule
- C. Draft Risks, Evaluation, & Mitigation Spreadsheet
- D. 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Project Sheet - New Public Works Facility

Chair Aderhold reviewed the informational items.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented on it being a good meeting and looking forward receiving the comments and recommendations for the draft report.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Keiser thanked everyone and noted she had her work cut out for her for the next meeting.

Member Slone thanked Deputy City Clerk Krause and Member Keiser for all their ongoing efforts to help resolve these issues.

Member Venuti expressed her appreciation for all the information brought to them by Deputy City Clerk Krause and Member Keiser.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 14, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: _____