

Session 21-06, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:35 p.m. on April 14, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS ENGBRETSSEN, ARGUETA, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, AND BARNWELL

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

A worksession was conducted on April 21, 2021 and the Task Force worked on drafting the Memorandum to City Council.

### **AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

VENUTI/BARNWELL - MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for April 14, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2021.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

### **VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS**

### **REPORTS**

### **PENDING BUSINESS**

- A. Probable Risks Table & Report
- Draft Memorandum to City Council
  - Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and requested a motion to adopt the memorandum.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO ADOPT THE MEMORANDUM.

The Task Force members reviewed the draft memorandum and made the following minor corrections:

- Line 3 added the word "Campus" before Task Force
- Line 31 footnote should be in Line 24
- Line 32 last word "is" should be "are"
- Line 55, delete "wasn't" and add "were not" after personnel
- Line 71, capitalize the words Task Force
- Include the inundation map as an attachment so Council will be able to review what they are talking about
- Remove the site locations, A-D since the Task Force has not talked about locations
- Shorten the scenario titles to Scenario 1 -9
- The order the attachments to the memorandum, the map or maps can be first or second attachment

Chair Aderhold briefed Member Keiser and Member Slone who arrived at the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Member Barnwell recommended that they use map two which zooms in on the public works facility noting that the map one focuses on whole town.

Discussion ensued on the map that Member Barnwell created from the Tsunami Report information and the scenarios that would actually affect the Public Works facility. Argument was presented that the map reflects all the scenarios and it was agreed that since their focus was on the existing public works campus the maps should reflect only those scenarios that would impact the facility.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO INCLUDE THE INUNDATION MAP DEPICTING TWO SCENARIOS TO THE MEMORANDUM.

VENUTI/KEISER MOVED TO INCLUDE THE INUNDATION MAP CREATED BY MEMBER BARNWELL AND THAT THE MAP REFLECT THE TWO SCENARIOS THAT AFFECT THE FACILITY AND FURTHER AMEND THE MAP TO REMOVE THE PROPOSED SITE LOCATIONS A-D.

A brief discussion on the motions on the floor ensued providing clarifications that two scenarios only shown on the inundation map.

VOTE. (Secondary Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Further discussion clarifying the map attachment to the memorandum would contain.

VOTE. (Primary Amendment.) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Further discussion ensued on changes to the memorandum regarding the following:

- Line 55, when speaking about opportunity costs, is this currently part of the designated function or would it be included in the emergency response plan
  - o This would be included in the emergency response plan and would be on an as needed basis, example was provided that Public Works personnel could assist the police department in getting the word out in another section of town or assist Port & Harbor in evacuating from the Spit in lieu of relocating their equipment.

Chair Aderhold confirmed there was no further discussion and called for a vote to adopt the memorandum to Council as amended.

VOTE. (Main as amended) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Short & Long Term Mitigation Costs**

- Memorandum from Member Engebretsen
- Prioritized Mitigation Strategies and Relative Costs Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and noted the items in the memorandum from Member Engebretsen and opened discussion.

Member Barnwell requested some additional input on the conundrum presented.

Member Engebretsen explained that there is a question on how much detail does City Council want from the Task Force. The resolution requested a dollar amount should be listed for the risks but then there are opportunity costs where we can be using our dollars smarter and wiser if we are using our people smarter. So that lends to the question of how much detail and which direction you want to go.

Member Venuti stated that City Council reviews a budget and I believe understands the salary and how it spreads over multiple departments. She did not believe that they had to put a cost to personnel labor.

Member Engebretsen expressed some of the struggle on how much detail on costs for each mitigation strategy and the best way to present that information.

Member Keiser noted that it was this very discussion with her staff on what kinds of supplies should they stockpile and where to put them, what machines should they think about putting someplace else.

They discussed the possibilities and there were some minor things that could be done but the long and short of it is the buildings are in the wrong place, and all our stuff is on the wrong place. So they did not really pursue specific mitigations but it would be a good exercise to go through as a demonstration to show that they reviewed all possibilities.

Ms. Keiser provided the example of the Fuel Depot and that there is some funding put aside for it but if they look to relocate that there is an added cost of upwards \$300,000 to \$400,000. Then proceeded to state that if you review the mitigation strategies in increments you will end up with a large dollar amount whether it is done all at once or step by step. However, step by step you may be all over the town and therefore adding costs. She still supported going through that exercise of demonstrating that.

Further discussion on the estimation of costs would be conducted similar to other projects that Public Works does but the bigger question is, where are you going to put it?

Member Venuti stated that you do not want City Council to expend the time to go through each amount, from a council perspective the information needed is what is the most important to move, possible sites and what is the cost. She advocated that they present a bigger picture and suggested sites.

Chair Aderhold noted that Member Argueta needed to leave the meeting and wanted to allow him some input before leaving the Task Force.

Member Argueta stated that this has been his introduction to the workings of local government and a very valuable process and experience. As far as the work on the Task Force he stated that it was clear that the Public Works facility needed to be moved, not only to mitigate the tsunami hazard but just to be able to function and serve the city as the population grows, and it is a critical component to the infrastructure of the city as pointed out by Ms. Keiser.

Member Argueta departed the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Discussion continued on the best path forward for pinning down specific costs with the following topics raised or points made:

- Using two scenarios, low risk or initial response and long term response or scenario
  - o Generalized costs
  - o Complex interactions lend to the impossible task of listing all costs involved
- Urgent issue is the equipment and repairs to that equipment
  - o This makes up 75% of the Public Works facility
    - Mechanic Shop requires the specialized big ticket costs
    - The remaining building is nominal cost in comparison
  - o Sand and Gravel stockpiles could remain on existing site plus other low commodity items
- There are limited choices in regards to the facility move all of it or none of it
- Make the recommendation and Council can start working on this funding while bonding may not be the best direction
  - o This project is on the CIP and could be updated with the information from the Task Force
- Instead of completing a cost table, they make the recommendation to relocate the whole facility and consideration on the next step of where are they going to put it

- They need to tell the story, there will need to be a narrative to explain the process on how the Task Force reached their recommendations
  - Including the timeline for the project to commence, sooner rather than later
  - Costs related to the mechanics shop and equipment shed is majority of project
  - Replacement of the Fuel Island due to the corrosion should be completed before the facility and how should that be accomplished
- Public Works Five Year Capital Improvement Plan includes modest \$50,000 to develop a strategic plan and conceptual layout
- Acquire property before it gets too expensive or is no longer available, the opportunities are shrinking, number of large parcels available is shrinking and we should take the funding available for the fuel island and buy property.
  - There are options available such as establishing a fleet account for fuel purchases, installing fuel tanks on pickup trucks to fuel other equipment
- Three major cost areas for this proposal which would be more acceptable to the public and City Council
- Should start incrementally by buying property then move the facilities when the opportunity arises and funding is available
- Support expressed for moving to a single location and sooner rather than later starting with a strategic plan
  - Summarizing the options and what is going to be moved
    - Relocate the entire facility \$12 million cost not palatable to the city
    - Limp Along Plan – do what we need to do to keep operating
    - Long Term Incremental Plan – Move things as funding and opportunity presents

Member Slone proposed to review the three options then focus on the long term incremental plan especially purchasing a property.

Commissioner Barnwell expressed his support for moving the facility as a whole, purchasing property as soon as possible as well as creating a strategic plan for the project. He believed that it needed to be analyzed sooner rather than later on a location and a strategic plan would layout the timeline.

Member Slone questioned offering a motion on what they were just discussing, limp along plan, incremental or lock stock and barrel focusing on the necessity of acquisition of land and including it in the report to Council.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED THAT THE THREE SCENARIOS LIMP ALONG PLAN, LONG TERM INCREMENTAL PLAN AND THE LOCK STOCK AND BARREL MOVEMENT PROPOSALS BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH EMPHASIS ON PURCHASING SUITABLE LAND AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

A recommendation to bring suggestions for property to purchase was made but it was determined that should be done in separate motion.

Further discussion ensued on including these recommendations in addition to the chart that the three options would be used as a narrative, and the cost chart and other learned information would be attached as backup.

It was noted that Public Works Director Keiser would be required to provide the information regarding the 85% of the campus being the crucial part and the remainder comes along for the ride.

Member Barnwell requested the motion to read.

Deputy City Clerk Krause read the motion as she had it for the record.

Member Slone provided clarification on long term incremental development, noting that better verbiage could be applied as appropriate. He added that this was also be included in the report to City Council.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO HAVE MEMBERS PROVIDE PROPERTY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT MEETING TO DISCUSS LOCATION AND COST.

Discussion ensued on additional information that is needed to be able to shop for land. It would be best to perform a review before they go looking at land such as the following criteria:

- Size, how many acres
- What kind of configuration would work
- Does it have to be a big square, rectangular, could it be tear drop shape
- What type of topography is acceptable

Member Venuti stated she wished to pull her motion from consideration.

Member Slone supported that request and pulled his second.

Further discussion included the following points:

- Establishing criteria such as location to city hall and or other city facilities
- Rank the parcels of land based on the criteria established

Deputy City Clerk Krause responding to Chair Aderhold that the correct action would be to vote down the motion.

VOTE. NO. SLONE, BARNWELL, VENUTI, ADERHOLD, ENGBRETSSEN, KEISER

Motion failed.

Chair Aderhold invited Member Slone to speak.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED THAT MEMBERS ENGBRETSSEN AND KEISER PRESENT A REPORT AT THE NEXT MEETING OUTLINING THE CRITERIA NECESSARY REQUIRED FOR A SUITABLE PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS TO BE SUPPLEMENTED THEREAFTER BY A GIS REPORT.

Member Engebretsen and Member Keiser agreed to meet at 10am on Thursday, May 6, 2021.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UANNIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Slone inquired if there was additional professional services that Ms. Keiser may need to speak with such as an Architect or Engineer.

Member Keiser responded that would be helpful to refine some of the layouts that has been provided by the former Public Works Director and it would also assist in determining what type of property they would be looking at, she then noted that they do have some funding that would pay for professional services such as this.

Member Engebretsen stated that additional information would be very helpful.

Member Slone asked if a motion of support would be beneficial.

Member Keiser responded that it would be helpful to have the endorsement.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED TO ENDORSE THAT PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR KEISER SEEK PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OF AN ARCHITECT TO THE LIMIT THAT AVAILABLE FUNDING ALLOWS TO DETERMINE THE VARIABLES FOR A NEW PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS.

There was no additional discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was a brief discussion on the upcoming actions and deliverables for the next meeting as follows:

- Bringing back the draft of a document listing the three options proposed by member Slone as All in One, Incremental and Limp Along
- Site Selection Criteria and Discussion with an Architect

#### **INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS**

- a. Inundation Maps
- b. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
- c. Approved Task Force Meeting Schedule – Revised April 15, 2021

#### **COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE**

**COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF**

Deputy City Clerk Krause stated that she will be on vacation in June and complimented the Task Force on getting a lot done tonight.

**COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE**

Member Barnwell offered his offices to Member Slone and stated it was a great meeting.

Member Keiser requested clarification on the next meeting date.

Chair Aderhold echoed the sentiments of a great meeting and announced the next meeting date.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 12, 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: \_\_\_\_\_