## Stevensville Town Council Meeting Agenda for THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 2021 7:00 PM

NVPL Community Room - 208 Main Street

The Town of Stevensville live streams Town Council meetings on our website at http://www.townofstevensville.com/meetings

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Public Comments (Public comment from citizens on items that are not on the agenda)
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Approval of Bi-Weekly Claims
a. Claims \#16783-\#16815
6. Administrative Reports
a. Airport
b. Community Development
c. Finance
d. Fire Department
e. Parks \& Recreation
f. Police Department
g. Public Works
7. Guests
8. Correspondence
a. Resignation of Councilmember Patrick Shourd
b. Resignation of Town Attorney Scott Owens
9. Public Hearings
10. Unfinished Business
11. New Business
a. Discussion/Decision: 2021 Water System Preliminary Engineering Report
b. Discussion/Decision: American Rescue Plan Act Infrastructure Funding Priorities
c. Discussion/Decision: Special Event and Alcohol Use Permit for Bikers Against Bullies Event
d. Discussion/Decision: Request a Variance to Town Code to Remove 2 Large Maple Trees Belonging to the Town of Stevensville
12. Executive Report
13. Town Council Comments
14. Board Reports
15. Adjournment

## Welcome to Stevensville Town Council Chambers

We consider it a privilege to present, and listen to, diverse views.
It is essential that we treat each other with respect.
We expect that participants will:
$\checkmark$ Engage in active listening
$\checkmark$ Make concise statements
$\checkmark$ Observe any applicable time limit
We further expect that participants will refrain from disrespectful displays:
$\times$ Profanity
$\times$ Personal Attacks
$\times$ Signs
$\times$ Heckling and applause

## Guidelines for Public Comment

Public Comment ensures an opportunity for citizens to meaningfully participate in the decisions of its elected officials. It is one of several ways your voice is heard by your local government. During public comment we ask that all participants respect the right of others to make their comment uninterrupted. The council's goal is to receive as much comment as time reasonably allows. All public comment should be directed to the chair (Mayor or designee). Comment made to the audience or individual council members may be ruled out of order. Public comment must remain on topic, and free from abusive language or unsupported allegations.

During any council meeting you have two opportunities to comment:

1. During the public comment period near the beginning of a meeting.
2. Before any decision-making vote of the council on an agenda item.

Comment made outside of these times may not be allowed.
Citizens wishing to speak during any public comment period should come forward to the podium and state their name and address for the record. Comment may be time limited, as determined by the chair, to allow as many people as possible to comment. Comment prior to a decision-making vote must remain on the motion before the council.

Thank you for observing these guidelines.

File Attachments for Item:
a. Claims \#16783-\#16815





All Bank Accounts
*.. Over spent expenditure

## Claim


$06 / 08 / 21$
$15: 59: 39$

Amount

$$
\begin{array}{r}
10,431.66 \\
\$ 125.94 \\
\$ 213.04 \\
\$ 1,892.30 \\
\$ 24.49 \\
\$ 2,803.52 \\
\$ 8,224.20 \\
\$ 396.26
\end{array}
$$

1000 GENERAL
101000 Cash - Operating
2230 AMBULANCE
101000 Cash - Operating
2394 BUILDING CODE ENFORCEMENT
101000 Cash - Operating
2820 GAS APPORTIONMENT TAX
101000 Cash - Operating
2940 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
101000 Cash - Operating
5210 WATER
101000 Cash - Operating
5310 SEWER
101000 Cash - Operating
5610 AIRPORT
101000 Cash - Operating



File Attachments for Item:
b. Community Development

## MONTHLY REPORT

## Building Department

May 2021


Prepared by Tim Netzley, Building Official

File Attachments for Item:
d. Fire Department

## Activity Report - May 2021

## Calls for the Month of May: 58

Calls for Stevensville Town: 21
Calls for Stevensville Rural: 36
Mutual Aid: 1

Medical Response: 50
Fire Calls: 6
Motor Vehicle Crash: 2
Total Calls: 58

## Calls for the Year to Date: 302

Calls for Stevensville Town: 99
Calls for Stevensville Rural: 198
Mutual Aid: 5

Medical Response: 241
Fire Calls: 40
Motor Vehicle Crash: 21
Total Calls: 302

File Attachments for Item:
e. Parks \& Recreation

##  <br> Town of <br> STEVENSVILLE <br> PARKS \& RECREATION <br> June 10, 2021 Report to Council

## Here is what's happening in your parks:

Lewis and Clark Park:

- As new parts come in, fixing the areas of the bathrooms that were vandalized, working to get them opened back up
- Grass mowing and irrigating


## River Park/River Park Trail:

- Two new metal garbage cans that fit liners
- Hope to prevent excess illegal dumping
- Bob Lewis memorial, planted 4 new apple trees
- Put up 6 ft no climb fencing and irrigating trees

Father Ravalli Park:

- Changed out two sprinklers on north end of park
- Working with Park Board to finalize beautification project
- New play structure will be ordered shortly


## Events:

- Memorial Day Event at Veterans Park
- Bob Lewis Memorial at River Park
- Planted apple trees and ordered a memorial plaque
- "Party in the park for Bob" fundraiser 6/4/2021

Pool:

- Finalized 2021 schedule
- Started registering people for swimming lessons
- Lifeguards enrolled in Lifeguard Training Classes (Certified by 6/5/2021)
- Early season maintenance and repair may push pool opening date back from 6/7/2021 (Lessons start 6/14/2021 and we are confident it will be open by then)

Other:

- Mowing parks weekly
- Working with Park Board to update Creamery Garden Park amenities
- Looking into new picnic tables and lighting
- Working with Garden Club to prepare Living Legacy Plant Garden for the third-grade class
- 4 pavilion rentals in May
- Parks Maintenance new hire starts 6/7/2021

Sincerely,
Bobby Sonsteng
Parks and Recreation Director

File Attachments for Item:
f. Police Department

# TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT 

June 10, 2021

## MONTHLY REPORT: May 2021 - Police Activity Report

In May 2021, all SPD officers completed training focusing situational and tactical awareness. The training consisted of room entries for possible hostile situations and felony traffic stops. During the month of April, we maintain an increase in call volume as well as vehicle traffic increase. Officers completed a felony arrest for an assault with a weapon. Multiple misdemeanor citations have been issued as well. An increase in training tempo has been established to provide the citizens of Stevensville with highly capable officers, who are ready to respond to all types of law enforcement encounters.

PROACTIVE POLICING \& CALLS FOR SERVICE:

| PERSONNEL <br> WORKLOAD | MONTH OF <br> March | MONTH OF <br> April | MONTH <br> OF May | YEAR TO <br> DATE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PATROL | 74 | 59 | 95 | 333 |
| Calls for service | 10 | 8 | 24 | 51 |
| Traffic Citations | 37 | 38 | 26 | 162 |
| Traffic Warnings | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| Arrests | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INVESTIGATIONS | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Robbery/Homicide | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Assault | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Sex Crime | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |
| Burglary / Theft | 1 | 3 | 1 | 17 |
| Fraud | 2 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Suspicious Incident | 3 | 7 | 0 | 15 |
| Disturbance/PFMA | 6 | 2 |  |  |
| SPD AGENCY <br> ASSISTS |  |  |  |  |
| Ravalli County S.O | 2 |  |  |  |

File Attachments for Item:
g. Public Works

# TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE PUBLIC WORKS ACTIVITY REPORT <br> May 2021 

## UTILITIES REPORT

|  | Water Production |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| This Month | Last Month |  |
| Gallons Produced | $20,938,000$ | $15,929,000$ |

- Monthly and weekly reports to the state
- Monthly Meter Readings
- Unread Meters: 48
- Jetted 2 sewer lines

|  | Wastewater Treatment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gallons Treated | This Month | Last Month |
|  | $5,640,000$ | $5,155,706$ |

- State Reports and EPA, weekly samples taken
- Press
- Pressing an average of 6,000 gallons per day, up from 3,000 gallons per day, currently transitioning to drying beds resulting in reduced energy costs


## OTHER

- Extensive maintenance on WWTP, switched bioreactors and serviced diffusers, serviced mixed liquor return pumps
- Failure of Blower \#2, inspected and sent to factory for rebuild, time frame for return 7-10 business days
- Assisted with maintenance jobs at airport
- Completed leak testing and repair of kiddy pool, eliminated 30K gallons leakage per month
- Started Fire Hydrant testing and flushing protocol, all maintenance being logged per ISO recommendations
- Started $5^{\text {th }}$ and Park sidewalk and paving project with JAG Contractors
- Mowing of Parks and cemeteries in full swing, concentrated effort for Memorial Day with Parks and DPW
- Reconditioned road and parking area at River Park, added more trash cans and planted Apple trees for Memorial, and removed deadfalls from area
- Gravesite repair and resod due to winter damage
- Investigated 3 potential water leaks, all on consumer side of meters, assisted homeowners with troubleshooting and repair
- Seasonal change out of Main Street banners
- Identified quantifiable tasks and Key Performance Indicators with My Sidewalk team and starting to integrate into operations
- Ongoing meter replacements
- Normal town trouble calls
- Hired seasonal position to assist with all DPW tasks

File Attachments for Item:
a. Resignation of Councilmember Patrick Shourd

| From: | Patrick Shourd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:53 PM |
| To: | Brandon E. Dewey; Paul Ludington; Jaime Devlin; Dempsey Vick; Jenelle Berthoud; |
|  | Robert Underwood |
| Subject: | Resignation |

Mayor Dewey, Stevensville Town Council members, Administrative staff,

This e-mail is to inform you of my intent to resign from my position as a Council member for the Town of Stevensville as of June 10, 2021. While I value the role as a Councilmen my primary obligations will always reside with my family. Recent findings regarding a close family members health have forced me to realign my priorities to support the ones dearest to me. I have appreciated the opportunity to serve the people of Stevensville.

Best Regards,

Patrick Shourd

## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | Correspondence |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: | Brandon Dewey |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Mayor |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: |  |
| Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: | 06/10/2021 |
| Agenda Topic: | Resignation of Councilmember Patrick Shourd |
| Backup Documents Attached? |  |
| If no, why not? | Approved |
| Approved/Disapproved? | $06 / 10 / 2021$ |
| If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: |  |
| Notes: |  |

File Attachments for Item:
b. Resignation of Town Attorney Scott Owens 206 Buck Street

May 19, 2021

Mayor Brandon Dewey
Council President Dempsey Vick
Councilmember Jaime Devlin

Councilmember Patrick Shourd
Councilmember Paul Ludington

VIA: Email to: brandon@townofstevensville.com dempsey@townofstevensville.com jaime@townofstevensville.com patrick@townofstevensville.com paul@townofstevensville.com

## Re: Letter of Resignation

Mayor / Councilmembers:
Please accept this letter as formal notification that I will not be renewing my contract as the Town Attorney on July 12, 2021.

The term of my current contract is set to expire on July 12, 2021. As you all may know, my family relocated from Missoula to Helena within this last year. Despite my relocation, I have been able to continue my duties as the Town attorney with some leniency towards travel granted by the Mayor, City Court, and the Councilmembers. At this time, I have formally accepted a general counsel position for a Helena-based company and will no longer be able to provide services for the town. As I am in transition, I intend to finish my current contract thereby allowing time for the Town to seek new representation.

It has been an honor getting to know all of you and thank you for the opportunities you have provided during my time serving as your Town Attorney! Please let me know if I can provide any other assistance during this time of transition.

Sincerely,


## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | Correspondence |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: | Brandon Dewey |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Mayor |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: |  |
| Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: | $06 / 10 / 2021$ |
| Agenda Topic: | Resignation of Town Attorney Scott Owens |
| Backup Documents Attached? | Yes |
| If no, why not? | Approved |
| Approved/Disapproved? | $06 / 10 / 2021$ |
| If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: |  |
| Notes: |  |

## File Attachments for Item:

a. Discussion/Decision: 2021 Water System Preliminary Engineering Report

## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | New Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: | Brandon E. Dewey |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Mayor |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: | 06/10/2021 <br> Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: <br> Engineering Report |
| Agenda Topic: | Yes |
| Backup Documents Attached? | Approved |
| If no, why not? | Agenda Communication and the PER will be provided in <br> the updated meeting packet on 6/8 Preliminary |
| Approved/Disapproved? |  |
| If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: |  |
| Notes: |  |

TOWN COUNCIL
Agenda Communication

## Other Council Meetings

## Exhibits <br> A. PER Draft from HDR

This agenda item provides Council with the ability to provide input on the Draft Preliminary Engineering Report.

## Background:

HDR Engineering has completed the draft of the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) for Stevensville's water system. The PER provides the current status of the Town's water system and gives guidance on future improvements that will be needed as the community grows.

The Town Council has the opportunity to review the draft document and provide input to HDR on the report.

Board/Commission Recommendation: $\qquad$ Applicable - $\boxtimes$ Not Applicable

## Alternative(s):

## MOTION

I move to:


## Stevensville, Montana

Preliminary Engineering Report
Water System
Ravalli County, Montana
June 8, 2021
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## Executive Summary

## Provide a summary of why the study was done and briefly describe the alternatives considered, the preferred alternative, the estimated total cost, the net cost per user based on proposed funding plan, and any other pertinent conclusions.

Considering the planning period of 2020-2040 and the influence of population growth on existing infrastructure for the Town of Stevensville, it has been determined that implementing additional water storage, replacing key distribution mains, and upgrading SCADA will increase the efficiency, security, and dependability of the existing drinking water system. Existing rate programs and leak remediation efforts have prepared the town well to implement these recommendations. This report can also serve to assist the application process for newly available ARPA funding

## Project Planning

### 1.1 Introduction

The Town of Stevensville (Town) completed a comprehensive Water System Improvements Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) Update in 2009. A phased approach to water system improvements was outlined in the 2009 PER, including metering, a new well field, decommissioning of the Water Treatment Facility, and distribution system improvements. The purpose of this document is to update the 2009 PER with a focus on the Phase IV Storage System Upgrades. Phase IV of the approach consists of storage system improvements and was previously deferred due to a lack of reliable metering and leakage data. This data has recently been better quantified and consequently it is the intent of the Town to proceed with Phase IV of the project.

This report follows the 2019 Uniform Application for Montana Public Facility Projects, $12^{\text {th }}$ Edition, which includes the Uniform Preliminary Engineering Report for Montana Public Facility Projects outline provided by the State of Montana. Guidance language provided in the outline will be presented at the beginning of each pertinent section in bold italics. Additional sections have been added to this report as necessary to provide information or clarity on specific items related to the Stevensville water system. All $11 \times 17$ figures are included at the conclusion of the chapter for easier viewing. This outline of the final compiled report is organized as follows;

Executive Summary
Chapter 1 - Project Planning
Chapter 2 - Existing Facilities
Chapter 3 - Need for Project

Chapter 4 - Alternatives Considered
Chapter 5 - Selection of an Alternative
Chapter 6 - Proposed Project (Recommended Alternative)

Chapter 7 - Conclusions and Recommendations

### 1.2 Location

Provide scale maps and photos of the project planning area and any other existing service areas including legal and natural boundaries and a topo map of the service area.

The Town of Stevensville is located in the Bitterroot Valley, in the northern portion of Ravalli County, approximately 29 miles south of the City of Missoula in western Montana. The Town is situated on a valley plain bounded on the west by the Bitterroot Mountains and on the east by the Sapphire Mountains. After Hamilton, it is the second largest of 10 communities within Ravalli County. The Town is situated on the east side of the Bitterroot River and east of US Highway 93. The Town is located at $46.5095^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$, $114.0962^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ (Figure 1-1).

Figure 1-1. Location of Stevensville, MT


The planning area for this study encompasses the present Town limits and unincorporated county areas to the northeast, east, south, and the "Wye" area to the west across the Bitterroot River. The planning area includes those areas east and south of the existing Town Limits where growth is occurring now and is expected to continue during the planning period and where there is sufficient land to support that growth. The planning area also includes the 1-mile planning area that encompasses the Wye area and potential annexation areas highlighted in Map 4 in the 2016 Stevensville Growth Policy, included below as Figure 1-2. Appendix A includes a study done by HDR in 2019 that explored the feasibility and cost for the town to annex the Wye area.

Figure 1-2. 2016 Growth Policy Planning Areas


### 1.3 Environmental Resources Present

Maps, photos, or narrative descriptions of environmental resources present in the planning area that affect design. Past review information can be used here.

As part of the 2009 PER, information on the environmental resources present in the planning area were collected, and anticipated impacts to the resources were summarized in the Uniform Environmental Checklist (UEC), included as Appendix C. This information was taken into account for the Water System PER Project's UEC. In addition, a narrative summary of the proposed projects was submitted to local, regional, state and federal agencies for comments on the project. This information was used to determine if any environmental resources will be impacted by the project. Potential impacts, along with any mitigation measures where pertinent, are discussed in the following subsections. A copy of the updated, project-specific UEC, accompanying narrative and agency comments received are included in Appendix C.

## Historical and Archeological Resources

Saint Mary's Mission, located at the end of $4^{\text {th }}$ Street in the Town of Stevensville, was the first Catholic mission in the northwest and the first permanent white settlement in Montana. The mission was established in 1841 by Father Pierre DeSmet, who came to the Bitterroot Valley in response to requests for "Black Robes" by various Native American tribes of present-day Montana and Idaho. The mission complex includes the chapel/residence, Father Anthony Ravalli's log house and pharmacy, Chief Victor's cabin and the Native American burial plot. All buildings have been restored to the 1880 era and are furnished with items built by Father Ravalli, Montana's first medical doctor. Chief Victor's cabin is restored as an Indian museum. Nearby DeSmet Park was dedicated in 1991 to commemorate the $150^{\text {th }}$ anniversary of the establishment of St. Mary's Mission.

Also included in the complex is the Stevensville Museum. This facility features the early growth and development of the Bitterroot Valley with displays of artifacts, pictures and information panels regarding the history of the American Indian population (the Salish Indians), the Lewis and Clark Corps of Discovery expedition through the valley in 18051806, the arrival of Father DeSmet in 1841, the establishment of the earliest mission in what is now Montana, the development of Fort Owen as one of the earliest trading posts and the history of Stevensville itself.

The historic Catholic mission complex and Fort Owen will not be impacted by the activities associated with the subject project. The response from the State's Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to the Environmental Checklist regarding this PER is included in Appendix C. It indicates a low likelihood of significant impact to both archaeological and historical resources for the proposed projects since virtually all actions will be conducted in previously disturbed areas.

## Fish, Wildlife and Endangered Species

During the preparation of the UEC, the database of the Montana Natural Heritage Program was researched for the presence of sensitive animal, fish or plant species within the planning area. No conflicts relative to the proposed projects were noted.

The response received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, USDI indicated that there are three (3) threatened species that may occur in the Planning Area, namely, the Canada Lynx, the Bull Trout and the Bald Eagle. In addition, the Gray Wolf, considered to be a nonessential experimental species introduced into the area, and the Yellow-billed Cuckoo, a candidate threatened species, may also occur in the area. The response indicated that, considering the nature, scope and location of the project, this agency does not anticipate adverse impacts to any federally listed threatened, endangered, candidate or proposed species or critical habitat.

## Agricultural Land

The planning area includes many agricultural parcels. The principal agriculture activities conducted within the planning area are the raising and pasturing of livestock, primarily cattle and horses, and hay cropping on irrigated lands. The upcoming upgrade and expansion of the Town of Stevensville's water system will permit nearby agricultural lands to be developed as residential or commercial use. Overall, higher density development on lands provided with municipal level facilities will require less of the available land area and will ultimately serve to reduce impacts on agricultural lands throughout the general area.

The improvements proposed by this PER are replacements or upgrades to existing facilities and do not directly impact agricultural lands or uses.

## Surface Waters, Floodplains and Wetlands

The improvements proposed by this PER do not impact any surface waters, floodplains or wetlands. All work will be conducted away from surface waters, outside of the 100year flood zone and away from area wetlands.

## Groundwater

Groundwater under the Planning Area is known to be plentiful and generally of good quality. The near surface waters are seasonal and supported by summer irrigation of integral and surrounding pasture lands and hayfields.

Water quality testing of Stevensville's municipal drinking water supply both from the infiltration gallery and from the wells had not indicated any persistent or recurring water quality issues.

### 1.4 Population Trends

US Census or other population data for the service are for at least the past two decades if available. Base population growth around concentrated growth areas for project growth period.

Historical population growth is shown in Table 1-1. Stevensville grew rapidly in the 1990's at a rate of $2.7 \%$ annually, slowing to just over $1 \%$ annually in the 2000's. The Stevensville 2020 population is approximately 2,182 people ( 931 households with 2.3 people per household, see footnote in table below).

Table 1-1. Historical Population Growth

| Year | Stevensville Population | Increase Over Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1990 | 1,221 | - |
| 2000 | 1,553 | $27.2 \%(2.7 \%$ annually $)$ |
| 2010 | 1,809 | $11.8 \%(1.1 \%$ annually $)$ |
| 2020 | $2,182^{1}$ | $17.1 \%(1.7 \%$ annually $)$ |

${ }^{1}$ U.S. Census Bureau (2019). American Community Survey 5-year estimates. Retrieved from Census Reporter Profile page for Stevensville, MT http://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US3071200-stevensville-mt/. These estimates have a margin of error which is why the total population estimate doesn't match the number of households multiplied by the persons per household precisely.

B
Towns in Ravalli County experienced a $27 \%$ growth rate over the decade from 1990 to 2000, and $20 \%$ for 2000 to 2010. Similar to the Town of Stevensville, Ravalli County as a whole showed an increase from 2000 to 2010 of $11.5 \%$ growth.

### 1.4.1 Population Projections

The Town's 2016 Growth Policy Update offers population projections as described below.

As depicted in Figure 1-3, the State of Montana's Census and Economic Information Center (CEIC) provides county level population projections, produced by Regional Economic Models, Inc. In the absence of local level projections provided by CEIC, three scenarios were created, projecting Stevensville's population 20 years into the future. One projects Stevensville's future population using Ravalli County growth rates (provided by CEIC); one projection applies Stevensville's average annual growth rate between 1990 and 2000 (2.72\%), and the final projection applies Stevensville's average annual growth rate between 2000 and 2014 (1.8\%).

The Ravalli County growth rate, projects Stevensville's total population increasing by $11 \%$ between 2014 and 2036 - the smallest increase of all projections. The other two projections show more significant growth. The 1990-2000 growth projection estimates Stevensville's population to increase by 80\% over the next 20 years, while the use of recent growth rates (2000-2014) estimates Stevensville's population to increase by $48 \%$. For this PER update, a range of population growth projections were completed as shown in Table 1-2 and 1-3 below.

Figure 1-3. Growth Policy Population Projections


Source: Montana Census and Economic Information Center, as presented in the 2016 Growth Policy

Table 1-2. Population Growth Sources and Comparison

|  | Population (\# of people) |  |  |  | Annual Growth Rates (\% growth per year) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | $\begin{aligned} & 1990-2000 \\ & 10-\mathrm{yr} \text { Base } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2000-2010 \\ & 10-\mathrm{yr} \text { Base } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1990-2010 \\ & 20-\mathrm{yr} \text { Base } \end{aligned}$ | Source Growth Rate |
| MT.gov Rate | - | - | - | 2,048 | - | - | - | - |
| HDR Water Rights Report for Lolo, MT | - | - | - | - | 3.29\% | 3.29\% | 2.46\% | 2.47\% |
| HDR Water Rights Report for Hamilton, MT | - | - | - | - | 2.64\% | 2.64\% | 2.06\% | 3.0\% |
| 2016 Growth Policy | 1,221 | 1,553 | 1,809 | - | 2.72\% | 2.72\% | 2.72\% | 2.11\% |
| 2012 HDR Wastewater PER for Town | 1,221 | 1,553 | 1,809 | - | 2.72\% | 2.72\% | 2.72\% | 1.10\% |
| US Census Data | 1,288 | 1,665 | 1,832 | 2,025 | 2.93\% | 2.93\% | 2.72\% | - |
| 2009 PCI Water PER for Town | 1,221 | 1,553 | - | - | 3.7\% | 3.7\% | 2.72\% | 2.38\% |
| ACS 2018 Survey | 1,288 | 1,665 | 1,832 | 2,193 | 2.93\% | 2.93\% | 2.72\% | - |
| Averages | 1,248 | 1,598 | 1,821 | 2,089 | 2.99\% | 1.57\% | 2.59\% | 2.21\% |

Table 1-3. Population Growth Rate Comparison

| Year | Average Annual Growth Rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (YYYY) | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 \%}$ |
| 2020 | 2,182 | 2,182 | 2,182 |
| 2030 | 2,410 | 2,707 | 2,932 |
| 2040 | 2,661 | 3,359 | 3,941 |

Since Stevensville has seen $2.18 \%$ growth, on average, over the last decade, this population growth rate was chosen to base water demands on. This matches up well with the middle range population projection from the 2016 Growth Policy Update (the 2000-2014 growth rate), and the average of the various sources examined in Table 1-2. Growth trends indicate future growth of the Town is expected to be primarily towards the east and south where there is available suitable land for development.

### 1.5 Community Engagement

Describe the utility's approach used to engage the community in the project planning process.

The Town of Stevensville holds regular city council meetings to discuss public or private projects and provides citizens with information regarding proposed and completed public or private development or infrastructure projects online at, townofstevensville.com.
Resources to educate the community or communicate with the utility are readily available on the website as well.

This PER and the recommended projects will be presented to the public by the Town of Stevensville upon completion of the draft and final versions of the PER.

## 2 Existing Facilities

### 2.1 Location Map

Provide a map and a schematic process layout of all existing facilities. Identify facilities no longer in use or abandoned. Include photos of existing facilities.

The water system map is included as Figure 2-1.
Figure 2-1. Existing System


### 2.2 History

Indicate when major system components were constructed, renovated, expanded or removed from service. Discuss any failures and their cause. History of applicable violations.

The following historical information regarding the water system was taken from the Stevensville, Montana 2016 Growth Policy Update prepared by Land Solutions, LLC and Professional Consultants, Inc.

The Town of Stevensville's original water supply was constructed in 1909 with over 6.2 miles of 4 ", 6 " and 8 " wooden water pipe and a small concrete reservoir located between Mill Creek and North Swamp Creek. The Town appropriated five cubic feet per second (CFS) from North Swamp Creek that fall, and the \$20,035 construction cost was paid with a voter approved bond. Water rates were set in December 1909 at $\$ 1.00$ per residence and $\$ 1.50$ for restaurants and saloons per month. Livery barns and hotels were charged $\$ 3.00$. Although the wooden pipe is no longer in use, sections of the 8 " main still remain under Middle Burnt Fork Road.

In the 1930s, an infiltration system was constructed that gathers shallow groundwater from below the surface of the fields between Mill and North Swamp Creeks. Initially, a total of 8,134 linear feet of drainage pipe was installed generally parallel to North Swamp Creek with the intent of capturing and routing subsurface flow down to the municipal reservoir. Originally the raw water collected

In the 2000's, Stevensville's water system was upgraded from a shallow infiltration gallery and surface water treatment to deep groundwater wells. from the subsurface infiltration system was delivered to a large concrete storage tank at the water treatment plant site, and then piped to Town in an 8" wooden pipe. The wooden main was abandoned in about 1936 when the cast iron pipe was installed.

With Stevensville's water system improvement projects completed in the late 2000's, the Town transitioned from the shallow groundwater infiltration gallery, surface water treatment plant and shallow wells in Town to a consolidated well field with deep well groundwater sources. The recommended upgrades in the 2009 PER were implemented except for additional storage, which this PER explores. The upgrades included a variety of water main interconnections and an upgrade to a 10 " PVC pipe to connect the water tank to the system. A map of the recommended and implemented changes from the 2009 report are depicted in Appendix D.

### 2.3 Condition of Existing Facilities

Describe present condition, suitability for continued use, adequacy of current facilities, conveyance and storage capability. Describe capacity, compliance, and overall energy consumption.

Today the system includes five wells, one 430,000 gallon concrete storage tank, three Pressure Reducing Valves (PRVs), 5.6 miles of watermain, 90 fire hydrants, and approximately 814 connections. Table 2-1 below summarizes water system information.

Table 2-1. Existing Facility Characteristics

| System Component | Metric | Value | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approximate Connections | Meters | 814 | 2020 value |
|  | Customers Served | 2,035 | Assuming 2.5 persons per connection. |
| Wells | Well 1 Flow | 175 gpm | GWIC Well \#: 243996 |
|  | Well 5 Flow | 550 gpm | GWIC Well \#: 272191 |
|  | Well 6 Flow | 585 gpm | GWIC Well \#: 272196 |
|  | Well 7 Flow | 270 gpm | GWIC Well \#: 244440 |
|  | Well 8 Flow | 185 gpm | GWIC Well \#: 272197 |
| Tank | Diameter | 110 feet | - |
|  | Max Water Depth | 6 feet | Bottom of tank at 3,542.50' |
|  | Volume | 430,000 gallons | $5 \%$ allocated to dead storage. |
| Other Components | Fire Hydrants | 90 Hydrants | - |
|  | PRVs | 3 valves | Assumed 60 psi setting. |
|  | Miles of Water Mains | 5.6 miles | Does not include service piping. |

## Storage

The system is served by a single, 430,000 gallon concrete tank located near the intersection of Middle Burnt Fork Road and South Burnt Fork Road, at elevation 3,542.50 feet. The tank is 110 feet in diameter with a total water depth of 6 feet and passed DEQ inspections in 2004 receiving a baffling factor of 0.2 based on a peak flow of 900 gpm . It is connected to the rest of the water system via 5,400 linear feet of 10 -inch PVC main. The Town has identified the need for additional storage per recommendations from the last water PER in 2009.

## Supply

Water is supplied by five wells. Well No. 1 is located near the intersection of Main Street and Highway 203 whereas Wells No. 5-8 are located at the new well field near Alex Ln. and Middle Burnt Fork Rd. In April 2021, the Town notified HDR that well 1 is not operating and does not contribute to the water supply and the future use of well 1 is undetermined.

The Town replaced the pumps and motors of well 8 in 2018. In March, 2019, one of the well field pumps failed and HDR conducted a well pump evaluation and found that the well field pumps are affected by sand and it was recommended that a hydrogeologist perform an analysis to determine remediation measures. In response to the completed analysis, wells 5, 6, and 7 received new pumps and motors in 2019 and the well field is now fully operational.

## Distribution

The Town's distribution system saw recent upgrades as recommended by the 2009 PER. Since then, further information on the system in regard to leaks, GIS, and modeling has been gathered. All data analysis was conducted using provided GIS data which quantifies certain characteristics for the system, but a large proportion of information is missing. Generally, distribution along and near Main Street and in older residential areas is the oldest. Table 2-2 summarizes pipe material types and quantity, Table 2-4 shows an estimation of water distribution age, Table 2-3 summarizes the most recent water meter data from 2015.

Table 2-2. Water Distribution Characteristics

| Diameter (in.) | PVC (ft.) | DIP (ft.) | CIP (ft.) | Unknown (ft.) | Totals (mi.) | \% Diameter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | - | 3 | - | 343 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 189 | 2 | 3,792 | 226 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 3,648 | 10 | 5,145 | 442 | $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 4,513 | 6 | 735 | 98 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 3,655 | 0 | 158 | 14 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 5,003 | 1 | 8 | 0 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 8 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 1,915 | - | - | - | $\mathbf{0 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 \%}$ |
| Totals (mi.) | $\mathbf{3 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 6 6}$ |  |
| \% Material | $\mathbf{6 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 \%}$ |  |  |

Table 2-4. Estimated Pipe Age

| Age | \% Length of <br> System |
| :---: | :---: |
| $<10$ | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0 - 2 0}$ | $18 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 3 0}$ | $7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 4 0}$ | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{> 4 0}$ | $20 \%$ |
| Unknown | $39 \%$ |

Table 2-3. Water Meter Connections and Data

| Water <br> Line/Meter Size | Connections | EDU <br> Multiplier | 2015 EDUs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3/4 inch | 742 | 1 | 739 |
| 1-inch | 43 | 1.79 | 73.39 |
| 1.5-inch | 19 | 4 | 80 |
| 2-inch | 3 | 7.14 | 21.42 |
| 3-inch | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| 4-inch | 0 | 28.57 | 0 |

## Leakage

The Town of Stevensville has made a concerted effort to install water meters; in 2009 an estimated $69 \%$ of the system was metered with significant improvements made since.
Table 2-5 shows the monthly results of this comparison from January 2016 to June 2018.

Table 2-5. Water Leak Data

| Month | Metered Water (gal) | Produced Water (gal) | Produced vs. Metered (gal) | \% of Non-Revenue for Water |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan-16 | 3,925,870 | 10,461,000 | 6,535,130 | 62\% |
| Feb-16 | 3,627,980 | 9,819,000 | 6,191,020 | 63\% |
| Mar-16 | 4,094,780 | 10,141,000 | 6,046,220 | 60\% |
| May-16 | 8,318,530 | 16,893,000 | 8,574,470 | 51\% |
| Jun-16 | 16,456,200 | 25,919,000 | 9,462,800 | 37\% |
| Jul-16 | 16,339,740 | 27,163,000 | 10,823,260 | 40\% |
| Aug-16 | 18,040,810 | 26,403,000 | 8,362,190 | 32\% |
| Sep-16 | 10,414,330 | 18,965,000 | 8,550,670 | 45\% |
| Oct-16 | 5,382,270 | 13,124,000 | 7,741,730 | 59\% |
| Nov-16 | 4,270,330 | 11,210,000 | 6,939,670 | 62\% |
| Dec-16 | 3,805,010 | 12,486,000 | 8,680,990 | 70\% |
| Jan-17 | 4,743,450 | 13,595,000 | 8,851,550 | 65\% |
| Feb-17 | 3,647,772 | 12,079,000 | 8,431,228 | 70\% |
| Mar-17 | 3,854,500 | 12,389,000 | 8,534,500 | 69\% |
| Apr-17 | 4,052,170 | 11,924,000 | 7,871,830 | 66\% |
| May-17 | 8,982,400 | 18,671,000 | 9,688,600 | 52\% |
| Jun-17 | 13,616,950 | 22,702,000 | 9,085,050 | 40\% |
| Jul-17 | 19,949,680 | 33,724,000 | 13,774,320 | 41\% |
| Aug-17 | 23,788,000 | 33,177,000 | 9,389,000 | 28\% |
| Sep-17 | 12,089,550 | 22,652,000 | 10,562,450 | 47\% |
| Oct-17 | 8,361,880 | 15,273,000 | 6,911,120 | 45\% |
| Nov-17 | 4,484,640 | 12,558,000 | 8,073,360 | 64\% |
| Dec-17 | 4,059,260 | 13,323,000 | 9,263,740 | 70\% |
| Jan-18 | 4,031,750 | 13,773,000 | 9,741,250 | 71\% |
| Feb-18 | 4,052,470 | 11,586,000 | 7,533,530 | 65\% |
| Mar-18 | 3,592,660 | 13,636,000 | 10,043,340 | 74\% |
| Apr-18 | 3,953,210 | 13,944,000 | 9,990,790 | 72\% |
| May-18 | 9,147,650 | 19,745,000 | 10,597,350 | 54\% |
| Jun-18 | 10,426,840 | 22,557,000 | 12,130,160 | 54\% |

An increase in metering water has improved the Town's understanding of water use and loss. In 2019, an analysis was conducted to estimate water losses. The metered water used was compared to the water produced. The Town's operations staff recently isolated the 110 foot diameter concrete water tank and monitored the surface elevation to determine if the tank was leaking. The surface elevation dropped 0.3 feet ( 21,327 gallons) over a 3 hour and 43 minute time period which equates to a leak of 96 gallons per minute.

In an effort to locate leaks, a leak detection survey for the Town of Stevensville was conducted in September 2018, by American Leak Detection. The leak survey tested 155 areas and found 11 leaks including six service line leaks, two irrigation line leaks, one curb stop leak and two main leaks.

## Compliance and Quality

A sanitation survey in October, 2019 found no deficiencies in the system and the current water source has met federal and state regulations since 2017. Water quality reports from 2017-2019 and well logs can be found in Appendix $\qquad$ .

### 2.4 Financial Status of any Existing Facilities

Info regarding current rate schedules, annual O\&M cost, other CIP, and tabulation of users by monthly usage categories for the most recent typical fiscal year. Provide status of existing debts and required reserve accounts.

The Town of Stevensville has been preparing for their future upgrade needs in recent years including scheduling four annual rate increases adopted in 2015 and completing wastewater and water capital improvement plans. Current user rates and estimated connections from 2015 can be found below in Table 3-1. A usage charge of $\$ 1.85$ per 1,000 gallons applies to water use that exceeds the usage allowance for each meter size.

Table 2-6. Current Water Rates

| Water <br> Line/Meter Size | Monthly Rate | Connections | EDU <br> Multiplier | 2015 EDUs | Usage <br> Allowance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3/4-inch | $\$ 14.75$ | 742 | 1 | 739 | 3,000 gallons |
| 1-inch | $\$ 26.40$ | 43 | 1.79 | 73.39 | 5,370 gallons |
| 1.5-inch | $\$ 59.00$ | 19 | 4 | 80 | 12,000 gallons |
| 2-inch | $\$ 105.31$ | 3 | 7.14 | 21.42 | 21,420 gallons |
| 3-inch | $\$ 236.00$ | 0 | 16 | 0 | 48,000 gallons |
| 4-inch | $\$ 421.41$ | 0 | 28.57 | 0 | 85,710 gallons |

[^0]The Montana Department of Commerce target water rate for this community is $\$ 37.73$ per month. For $3 / 4$ inch connections, the Town will be below the target rate by a factor of 2.57. Additionally, Stevensville's Median Household Income (MHI) is $\$ 32,337$, making their water bill about 0.5 percent of their median household income. Adoption of the rate increase program, and associated rate variance program, shows the Town has been proactive in preparing for their upcoming needs for water infrastructure while accommodating citizens who require lower rates.

The rate increases have allowed the Town of Stevensville to operate with a healthy cash balance for water upgrades. There was approximately $\$ 1,600,000$ cash on hand, at the end of fiscal year 2020. Financial analysis of the water utility determined that if funding is acquired as described above, the entire Phase IV Water Storage Improvements Project could be completed and a healthy cash balance could be maintained without further rate increases. In addition, the Town could complete the other water improvement projects scheduled in the Town's capital improvement plan.

### 2.5 Water, Energy, or Waste Audits

Discuss water, energy, and/or waste audits which have been conducted and the main outcomes.

Leak detect efforts and water quality have been previously discussed. No other water, energy, or waste audits have been performed.

## 3 <br> Need for Project

Describe concerns and include relevant regulations and correspondence from/to federal and state regulatory agencies and include copies of correspondence.

To inform project need, hydraulic analysis of the distribution was conducted using WaterGEMS software and the original distribution model created during the 2009 PER. An updated water model from the 2009 PER was developed in conjunction with this report to include the following updates:

- As-built data and locations for residential development and well locations
- Updated pump curves for booster station and well pumps
- Updated elevation data for new development and Stevi Wye area
- Improved water demand distribution based on water service/parcel location
- Proposed infrastructure for the Wye area

Throughout this section, reference to this model and methods specific to its improvement will be highlighted as reasoning behind each project need.

### 3.1 Health, Sanitation, and Security

## Historical Risks

In the 2009 PER conducted by PCI , health and safety issues regarding the surface water turbidity and treatment plant adequacy were defined but are now assumed to be of no risk to the public because all mentioned entities are not in use or have been abandoned. On 10/2019, annual water quality testing found no deficiencies in the system and the current water source has met federal and state regulations since 2017. Water quality reports from 2017-2019 and well logs can be found in Appendix $E$.

## Distribution

As per the recommendations of the 2009 PER, the Town has increased metered connections and has improved distribution supply, capacity, and leaks. This has helped in reducing the health and safety risks associated with previous capacity and distribution issues. The aforementioned leak detection survey found six service line leaks, two irrigation line leaks, one curb stop leak, and two main leaks. These leaks hinder fire flow capability, put chlorine and orthophosphate into the groundwater, and potentially introduce bacterial contamination into the distribution system. Continued improvement of distribution capacity, metering, and leaks will improve system fire flows and mitigate contamination of the distribution system and groundwater. 2016 fire flow tests included in Appendix F and modeled water system pressures and velocities align with MDEQ Circular 1 requirements for system pressure and velocities. System pressures and velocities were evaluated in the hydraulic model using the updated demand information and met MDEQ Circular 1 recommendations.

## Storage

As stated in the 2009 PER and serving as the primary purpose for this report, the existing storage tank is not adequate to meet MDEQ's current water storage requirements. MDEQ Circular 1 states the following;

Storage facilities must be sufficient, as determined from engineering studies, to supplement source capacity to satisfy all system demands occurring on the maximum day, plus fire flow demands where fire protection is provided.
a. The minimum allowable storage must be equal to the average day demand plus fire flow demand, as defined below, where fire protection is provided.
b. Any volume less than that required under a. above must be accompanied by a Storage Sizing Engineering Analysis, as defined in the glossary. Large non-residential demands must be accompanied by a Storage Sizing Engineering Analysis and may require additional storage to meet system demands.
c. Where fire protection is provided, fire flow demand must satisfy the governing fire protection agency recommendation, or without such a recommendation, the fire code adopted by the State of Montana.
d. Each pressure zone of systems with multiple pressure zones must be analyzed separately and provided with sufficient storage to satisfy the above requirements.
e. Excessive storage capacity should be avoided to prevent water quality deterioration and potential freezing problems.

Due to the Town's efforts, enough data has been compiled to accurately size a water tank to replace or supplement the existing one and meet ISO fire flow and peak demands for the planning period.

This need aligns with Goal \#4.3 in the 2016 Growth Policy: Water Storage Capacity is Increased. The action item associated with this goal is to "Identify a preferred location for a new water storage tank or reservoir and apply for grant funding to construct new water storage facility."

## Supply

As previously mentioned, a new well field has been installed to increase water supply to the public with recent pump repairs and well analysis to improve operation and longevity. The system has reported no recent water quality issues and has been in compliance since 2017 after the minor violations mentioned in section 3.5.

## Fire Flow

Needed fire flow (NFF) requirements were recently informed via correspondence with the town on 4/1/2021 and can be found in Appendix G. The updated NFF of $3,500 \mathrm{gpm}$ for areas along Main Street were also designated by CSO in the 2009 PER (see Appendix H). The updated model was run to determine available fireflow under 2020 and 2040 average day demand (ADD). Available fire flow met updated NFF values while conforming to MDEQ Circular 1 pressure requirements in all cases except for the same problem areas along Main Street which would need to multiple hydrants to meet the required flow as depicted in Figure 3-1 below.

Figure 3-1. Areas with Inadequate NFF Values under 2020 ADD and 2040 ADD


### 3.2 Aging Infrastructure

Describe the concerns and indicate those with the greatest impact. Describe water loss, inflow, infiltration, treatment or storage needs, management, adequacy, inefficient designs, and other problems. Describe any safety concerns.

## Historical Risks

In the 2009 PER conducted by PCI, health and safety issues regarding the 8 " cast iron main were defined but are now assumed to be of no risk to the public because it has been abandoned.

## Distribution

As summarized in Table 2-4, a large portion of the system has an unknown age or age greater than 40 years. Efforts to fix leaks and replace aging distribution system components have reduced issues resulting from aging infrastructure. Further monitoring, metering, and leak repair will continue to improve these issues.

## Storage

Recently, the Town found the tank to be leaking at a rate of 96 gpm . The tank is about 50 years old having received a lid in 1979. The last 2004 inspection deemed the tank as safe but fixing leaks or replacing the tank would save a significant amount of water and improve system capacity.

## Supply

As it has aged, Well No. 1 has had issues with sand, decreasing capacity, and growth potential. Its future use is undetermined.

## Fire Flow

Distribution system upgrades installed per recommendations by the 2009 PER have improved fireflow capacity. Calculated available fire flow from the updated water model reflect that the designated $3,500 \mathrm{gpm}$ fireflow required along Main Street cannot be met. The designated $3,500 \mathrm{gpm}$ fireflow was determined in 1996 and could be re-evaluated by a qualified agency. The 6 -inch water main on Main Street could be upsized to a 12 -inch water main to replace aging infrastructure and potentially improve fire flow.

### 3.3 Reasonable Growth

Describe the reasonable growth capacity that is necessary to meet needs during the planning period. Facilities proposed to be constructed to meet future growth needs should generally be supported by additional revenues. Consideration should be given to designing for phased capacity increases. Provide number of new customers committed to this project.

## Historical Risks

In the 2009 PER, population growth projections and increased water demand and fireflow requirements prompted the recommendation for increased storage capacity. This report and analysis build on the 2009 analysis with updated population projection data and its effect on water demand, storage, and the distribution system in general.

## Distribution

In the 2009 model, demand was applied evenly across all nodes in the system, which would potentially misrepresent flow in areas of higher or lower demand. New development has increased water demand and the extent of the distribution system. Development and demand changes have been incorporated into the updated model. The additional distribution needed to serve the Wye area was also added to the model per guidance from the 2019 annexation study included in Appendix A.

Water demand at each node in the model was updated to include leak demand and better represent areas with potentially higher or lower water demand. This was done by quantifying demand for nodes based on the number of parcels, or representative service connections, they were surrounded and multiplying that by a gallons per parcel factor.

## Storage

Using monthly water production data (July 2015-June 2018) and population data per the analysis in section 2.4, an estimation of projected water demand was calculated to determine additional water supply and storage needs. Table 3-1 below summarizes key findings, use in gallons per capita per day (gpcd), and leak data in million gallons per day (MGD).
Table 3-1. Key Population Growth and Water Use Values

| Metric | Values |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Projected Annual Growth Rate |  | $2.18 \%$ |  |
| Avg. Daily Unaccounted for Water |  | 0.3 MGD |  |
| Water Use Designation | Residential | Commercial | Total |
| Average Day Demand (ADD) | 114 gpcd | 34 gpcd | 148 gpcd |
| Max Day Demand (MDD) | 250 gpcd | 47 gpcd | 297 gpcd |

[^1]
## Supply

The new well field provides adequate supply for projected water demand through 2040. Though Well No. 1 currently serves as a supplementary source, a replacement well near chlorine and orthophosphate infrastructure could benefit supply and capacity in the long term. Replacing Well No. 1 could improve capacity and supply and decrease contamination risks. Generally increasing supply could supplement storage in efforts to meet fire flow demands. Table 3-2 highlights projected water demand over time and its influence on supply accounting for the well with the largest flow out of service (firm capacity) per MDEQ Circular 1 requirements.

Table 3-2. Projected Water Use and Supply

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { (YYYY) } \end{aligned}$ | Population (\# of people) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ADD } \\ & \text { (MGD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MDD } \\ & \text { (MGD) } \end{aligned}$ | Unaccounted for Water (MGD) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Firm } \\ & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { (MGD) } \end{aligned}$ | Remaining Supply under ADD (MGD) | Remaining Supply under MDD (MGD) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 2,182 | 0.32 | 0.65 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.08 | 0.75 |
| 2021 | 2,230 | 0.33 | 0.66 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.07 | 0.74 |
| 2022 | 2,279 | 0.34 | 0.68 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.06 | 0.72 |
| 2023 | 2,328 | 0.34 | 0.69 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.05 | 0.71 |
| 2024 | 2,379 | 0.35 | 0.71 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.05 | 0.69 |
| 2025 | 2,431 | 0.36 | 0.72 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.04 | 0.68 |
| 2026 | 2,484 | 0.37 | 0.74 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.03 | 0.66 |
| 2027 | 2,538 | 0.38 | 0.76 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.64 |
| 2028 | 2,593 | 0.38 | 0.77 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.63 |
| 2029 | 2,650 | 0.39 | 0.79 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.01 | 0.61 |
| 2030 | 2,708 | 0.40 | 0.81 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 1.00 | 0.59 |
| 2031 | 2,767 | 0.41 | 0.82 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.99 | 0.58 |
| 2032 | 2,827 | 0.42 | 0.84 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.98 | 0.56 |
| 2033 | 2,889 | 0.43 | 0.86 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.97 | 0.54 |
| 2034 | 2,952 | 0.44 | 0.88 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.96 | 0.52 |
| 2035 | 3,016 | 0.45 | 0.90 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.95 | 0.50 |
| 2036 | 3,082 | 0.46 | 0.92 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.94 | 0.48 |
| 2037 | 3,149 | 0.47 | 0.94 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.93 | 0.46 |
| 2038 | 3,217 | 0.48 | 0.96 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.92 | 0.44 |
| 2039 | 3,288 | 0.49 | 0.98 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.91 | 0.42 |
| 2040 | 3,359 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.3 | 1.70 | 0.90 | 0.40 |

[^2]
## Fire Flow

Current NFF values and projected growth indicate a need for increased water storage to meet MDD and fire flow requirements for the 3-hour fire flow time and emergency storage required per MDEQ Circular 1 for 3,500 gpm. Figure 3-2 depicts typical water storage allocations recommended per MDEQ Circular 1.

Figure 3-2. Typical Storage Allocations


Table $\qquad$ below summarizes the changes in emergency storage required through 2040 for a 3-hour, 3,500 gpm NFF. Table 3-3 summarizes total storage needed if the current tank is used to supplement storage or if a new tank/s is implemented.

Table 3-3. Emergency Storage Balance through 2040

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { (YYYY) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NFF } \\ \text { (GPM) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Total NFF Volume (Gallons) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MDD } \\ & \text { (Gallons) } \end{aligned}$ | Unaccounted for Water (Gallons) | Firm Well Capacity (MGD) ${ }^{2}$ | Emergency Storage Needed (Gallons) | Current Emergency Storage (Gallons) ${ }^{1}$ | Additional Storage Needed (Gallons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 3,500 | 3 | 630,000 | 81,183 | 37,124 | 212,400 | 535,907 | 301,000 | 234,907 |
| 2025 | 3,500 | 3 | 630,000 | 90,448 | 37,124 | 212,400 | 545,171 | 301,000 | 244,171 |
| 2030 | 3,500 | 3 | 630,000 | 100,754 | 37,124 | 212,400 | 555,477 | 301,000 | 254,477 |
| 2035 | 3,500 | 3 | 630,000 | 112,213 | 37,124 | 212,400 | 566,937 | 301,000 | 265,937 |
| 2040 | 3,500 | 3 | 630,000 | 124,975 | 37,124 | 212,400 | 579,698 | 301,000 | 278,698 |

[^3]Table 3-4. Approximate Emergency and Proposed Tank Storage Volumes

| Metric | Supplemental Storage <br> (Gallons) | New Storage <br> (Gallons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional Emergency Storage Needed | 278,698 | 579,700 |
| Assumed Equalization/Operational Volume (25\%) | 125,000 | 250,000 |
| Dead Storage (5\%) | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| Proposed Tank Volume | $\mathbf{5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |

## 4 Alternatives Considered

### 4.1 Water Storage

Per section 4.3 above, water tank storage alternatives are listed below in Table 5-1.
Table 4-1. Water Tank Alternatives

| Tank Alternative | Tank Type | Location | Size (gallons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Rehab Existing Tank | Current Location | 430,000 |
|  | Additional Storage | Next to Existing Tank | 500,000 |
| 2 | Rehab Existing Tank | Current Location | 430,000 |
|  | Additional Storage | Wye Area | 500,000 |
| 3 | Rehab Existing Tank | Current Location | 430,000 |
|  | Additional Storage | Airport | 500,000 |
| 4 | Rehab Existing Tank | Current Location | 430,000 |
|  | Additional Storage | Elevated Tank | 500,000 |
| 5 | New Tank | Current Location | 500,000 |
|  | New Tank | Wye Area | 500,000 |
| 6 | New Tank | Current Location | 500,000 |
|  | New Tank | Airport | 500,000 |
| 7 | New Tank | Current Location | 500,000 |
|  | New Tank | Elevated Tank | 500,000 |
| 8 | New Tank | Current Location | 1,000,000 |
| 9 | New Tank | Wye Area | 1,000,000 |
| 10 | New Tank | Airport | 1,000,000 |
| 11 | New Tank | Elevated Tank | 1,000,000 |

### 4.1.1 Design Criteria

For water storage alternatives considered, water surface elevations for existing or alternate locations for existing or new water tanks should match existing conditions or be re-calibrated to maintain appropriate operation. Before new tank implementation, it is recommended that a thorough hydraulic analysis is conducted to ensure appropriate water surface elevations are estimated especially in the case of new tank locations. An in depth tank site study is recommended to identify tank locations that have appropriate geotechnical and hydraulic characteristics.

### 4.1.2 Map

Figure 4-1 below depicts areas with similar elevations to the existing water tank that could contain a new water tank. These depicted areas are rough estimates and a tank site study would be required before tank implementation.

Figure 4-1. Potential Areas for a Water Tank


### 4.1.3 Environmental Impacts

A new water storage tank and associated distribution could disturb areas of undeveloped land but, generally, environmental impacts of water tanks are negligible. The tank site study previously mentioned would be required to investigate environmental impacts and required permitting.

### 4.1.4 Land Requirements

Water storage tanks require relatively small amounts of land, but associated distribution could require additional right-of-way (ROW) acquisition. A more in depth tank site study would better define land and ROW requirements.

### 4.1.5 Potential Construction Problems

Potential construction problems with a new tank would likely be influenced by tank location. The condition of the current tank could require more complex rehabilitation methods if the condition is poor.

### 4.1.6 Sustainability Considerations

## Water and Energy Efficiency

Rehabilitating or replacing the existing tank would improve water efficiency by fixing the current leak from the tank. For new tank alternatives, modeling water tank levels and their relationship to pumping intervals could be used to improve pumping time and frequency, therefore improving energy efficiency.

## Green Infrastructure

Further tank site examination and tank design could highlight opportunities for implementing green infrastructure.

### 4.1.7 Cost Estimates

See section 6.5 for a cost estimate for water storage based on the recommended alternative.

### 4.2 Water Distribution

Significant improvements have been made to the distribution system as recommended by the 2009 PER and due to leak remediation efforts. Further water leak analysis and repair is recommended to improve the water distribution system. Prioritizing the oldest and smaller-diameter pipes could improve the distribution system in a more efficient way since many large diameter improvements have been made recently per the 2009 PER recommendations.

It is recommended that the 6 -inch main along Main Street be upsized to a 12 -inch water main in order to improve fireflow in the inadequate NFF area and potentially fix unknown leaks in the older pipe.

Distribution associated with the Wye Area can be found in the Annexation Report and Medical Facility report in Appendices $\qquad$ and $\qquad$ . 12-inch distribution would be associated with a new tank site but would require further analysis before implementation.

### 4.2.1 Design Criteria

All distribution system changes should be modeled to confirm that changes allow the system to meet distribution system requirements per MDEQ Circular 1.

### 4.2.2 Map

Figure 4-2 below depicts the 4 and 6 -inch main to be replaced with 12 -inch main as well as the smaller-diameter, older water mains that could be prioritized.

Figure 4-2. Potential Distribution System Improvements


### 4.2.3 Environmental Impacts

Replacing existing distribution lines would likely not have large environmental impacts whereas new distribution lines for a new tank site or Wye area expansion could have environmental impacts by disturbing undeveloped land.

### 4.2.4 Land Requirements

Replacing existing distribution lines would likely not have additional land requirements whereas new distribution lines for a new tank site or Wye area expansion could require acquisition of additional ROW.

### 4.2.5 Potential Construction Problems

Dewatering during replacement or construction of existing or new water mains would likely be required. Other potential construction problems could arise based on sitespecific geotechnical variations.

### 4.2.6 Sustainability Considerations

## Water and Energy Efficiency

Replacing existing distribution mains could improve leaks, therefore improving water efficiency. Low-friction material for new or replacement water mains could improve system flow compared to high-friction materials allowing for a potential in energy savings. During new or replacement distribution design prioritizing leaking pipes would improve water efficiency quicker.

## Green Infrastructure

Green infrastructure options for water implementation could be investigated further during the design process

### 4.2.7 Cost Estimates

Appendix A highlights costs of Wye area distribution requirements. See section 6.5 for a cost estimate for distribution system cost based on the recommended alternatives for the existing system.

### 4.3 SCADA

Upgrading current SCADA infrastructure related to drinking water to match the SCADA used for the town's wastewater infrastructure is recommended as it would improve overall water operations and control integration.

### 4.3.1 Design Criteria

Further investigation into the existing water and wastewater SCADA design metrics and controls would inform the requirements for transitioning the system onto one primary control platform.

## 5 Selection of an Alternative

Further feedback from the town is being taken into account before a water storage alternative is selected. A tank site study could affect water storage alternative selection as well.

It is recommended that the town replace the 4 and 6 -inch water main on Main Street mentioned in this report with a 12-inch main to increase fire flow and potentially improve leaks.

SCADA upgrades for the water system to match the wastewater SCADA platform is recommended.

### 5.1 Life Cycle Cost Analysis

For water storage alternatives, capital costs are typically the highest costs associated. Routine inspections on water storage tanks is typically required and other operation and maintenance activities may be required periodically.

For water distribution alternatives, capital costs are typically the highest costs associated. Distribution system improvements may benefit from regular valve exercising or other maintenance programs but are generally a low-maintenance component of the system.

### 5.2 Non-monetary Factors

Acquiring town feedback in regard to preferred water storage tank sites and social impacts associated with the tank alternative and other alternative impacts is necessary to determine the selected alternative.

## 6 Proposed Project

### 6.1 Preliminary Project Design

### 6.1.1 Storage

As mentioned in section 4.1, a tank site study is recommended to determine appropriate tank siting and final water storage alternatives and their associated design metrics.

### 6.1.2 Distribution Layout

As mentioned in section 4.2, a tank site study and further town feedback regarding the Wye area development would inform design for new distribution system layout.
Replacing existing water distribution with new, larger-diameter water main would likely re-use existing pipeline alignments and ROW.

### 6.2 Project Schedule

A preliminary project schedule can be found in Table 6-1 below. Generally, the schedule accommodates new funding sources and feasible construction times for the area.

Table 6-1. Potential Proposed Project Schedule

| Time of Year |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Summer 2021 | Tank Siting Study, SCADA analysis, and distribution system |
| recommendations. |  |

### 6.3 Permit Requirements

Permit requirements regarding water storage and distribution will likely be determined by tank location which would be determined by the aforementioned tank siting study.

### 6.4 Sustainability Considerations

See sections 4.1 and 4.2 in regard to water storage and distribution system sustainability considerations.

### 6.5 Total Project Cost Estimate (Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost)

The tank siting study would inform a more detailed cost estimate for the chosen location(s) and alternative but an estimate for a 1,000,000-gallon water tank has been provided below in Table 6-2 for context.

Table 6-2. Potential 1 MG Tank Cost

| Item | Qty. | Unit | Unit Price (\$) |  | otal (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division \# 1 - Special Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Purchase, Site Prep, and Permits | 1 | LS | 265,000 |  | 265,000 |
| Division \#2-Site Work/Tank |  |  |  |  |  |
| Concrete | 880 | CY | 600 |  | 528,000 |
| Reinforced Steel | 66 | SY | 2,200 |  | 145,200 |
| Engineered Gravel Fill | 1,150 | SY | 30 |  | 34,500 |
| Waterproofing | 660 | SY | 150 |  | 99,000 |
|  | Subtotal Construction |  |  | \$ | 1,071,700 |
|  | Contingency |  | 20\% |  | 214,340 |
|  | Engineering |  | 20\% |  | 214,340 |
|  | Total Estimated Cost |  |  | \$ | 1,500,400 |

Table 6-3 below provides a cost opinion for replacing the 4 and 6 -inch water main along Main Street.

Table 6-3. Cost Opinion for Distribution Improvements

| Item | Qty. | Unit | Unit Price (\$) |  | al (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division \# 1 - Special Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Conditions, Mobilization, and Permits | 1 | LS | 43,700 |  | 43,700 |
| Division \# 2 - Site Work |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12" Water Main | 2,900 | LF | 70 |  | 203,000 |
| 12" Isolation Valve | 6 | EA | 4,000 |  | 23,200 |
| Fire Hydrants | 6 | EA | 7,200 |  | 43,200 |
| Water Service Connection | 30 | EA | 1,800 |  | 54,000 |
| Asphalt Resurfacing | 700 | YD ${ }^{2}$ | 95 |  | 66,500 |
| Water System Tie-In | 2 | LS | 6,000 |  | 12,000 |
|  | Subtotal Construction |  |  |  | 445,600 |
|  | Contingency |  | 20\% |  | 89,120 |
|  | Engineering |  | 20\% |  | 89,120 |
|  | Total Estimated Cost |  |  |  | 623,900 |

Table 6-4 below provides a cost opinion for upgrading SCADA infrastructure so the water system matches the wastewater system SCADA.

Table 6-4. Key Population Growth and Water Use Values

| Item | Qty. | Unit | Unit Price (\$) | Total (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Head End Software/Upgrades/Communications |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering and Programming | 1 | LS | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Construction | 1 | LS | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Software | 1 | LS | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Well Field |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering and Programming | 1 | LS | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| Construction | 1 | LS | 46,000 | 46,000 |
| Generators and ATS | 1 | LS | 17,000 | 17,000 |
| Tank Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Engineering and Programming | 1 | LS | 14,000 | 48,000 |
| Construction | 1 | LS | 20,000 | 46,000 |
|  |  | Tota | stimated Cost | \$ 265,000 |

### 6.6 Annual Operating Budget

### 6.6.1 Income

As mentioned in section 2.4, the town has saved the appropriate funds for this project per advisement from the 2009 PER. Recently, funding has become available through the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and could provide additional funding for the water tank and distribution system improvements. Table 6-5 and Figure 6-1 below depict and summarize the potential available funding from ARPA to supplement current town funds.

Figure 6-1. ARPA Funding Structure
Water \& Sewer Infrastructure Funds


Table 6-5. ARPA Funding Scenarios

| ARPA Funding Scenario | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| House Bill | $\$ 327,806$ |
| Treasury | $\$ 501,669$ |
| Town Funds | $\$ 1,600,000$ |
| Potential Competitive Grant | $\$ 1,976,252$ |
| Total Potential Funds | $\$ 4,405,727$ |

## 7 Conclusions and Recommendations

Considering the planning period of 2020-2040 and the influence of population growth on existing infrastructure for the Town of Stevensville, it has been determined that implementing additional water storage, replacing key distribution mains, and upgrading SCADA will increase the efficiency, security, and dependability of the existing drinking water system. Existing rate programs and leak remediation efforts have prepared the town well to implement these recommendations. This report can also serve to assist the application process for newly available ARPA funding.

## File Attachments for Item:

b. Discussion/Decision: American Rescue Plan Act Infrastructure Funding Priorities

## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | New Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: | Brandon E. Dewey |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Mayor |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: | 06/10/2021 <br> Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: <br> Agenda Topic: <br> Backup Documents Attached? <br> If no, why not? <br> Approved/Disapproved? <br> If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: |
| Notes: | Approved |

TOWN COUNCIL
Agenda Communication

Agenda Item: Discussion/Decision: American Rescue Plan Act Infrastructure Funding Priorities

Other Council Meetings
Exhibits
A. ARPA Presentation for Montana

This agenda item provides Council with the ability to provide input on priorities for funding opportunities from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) regarding infrastructure.

## Background:

The Town of Stevensville will be receiving substantial funding from ARPA for COVID-19 response and recovery as well as infrastructure improvements. The Town Council has received the PER for the water system and is being asked to provide guidance to the administration on the priorities to consider as funding comes available.

Board/Commission Recommendation: $\square$ Applicable - $\boxtimes$ Not Applicable

## Alternative(s):

## MOTION

I move to:

## American Rescue Plan Act 2021

PUB. L. NO 117-2

HOUSE BILL 632


Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds

The American Rescue Plan provides $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 0}$ billion dollars in emergency funding for state, local, territorial, and Tribal governments to remedy this mismatch between rising costs and falling revenues.

- \$195 billion for states;
- \$130 billion for local governments;
- $\$ 20$ billion for tribal governments; and
- $\$ 4.5$ billion for territories


## Local Governments

-Counties

- Cities
- Non-Entitlement Units - local governments serving a population under 50,000.
Funds


## Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds

$\checkmark$ Support urgent COVID-19 response efforts to continue to decrease spread of the virus and bring the pandemic under control
$\checkmark$ Replace lost revenue for eligible state, local, territorial, and Tribal governments to strengthen support for vital public services and help retain jobs
$\checkmark$ Support immediate economic stabilization for households and businesses
$\checkmark$ Address systemic public health and economic challenges that have contributed to the inequal impact of the pandemic
$\checkmark$ Flexibility for each government to meet local needs-including support for households, small businesses, impacted industries, essential workers, and the communities hardest hit by the crisis. These funds can also be used to make necessary investments in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure.

## Water \& Sewer Infrastructure Funds


U.S. Treasury Local Fiscal Recovery Funds


State of Montana
Minimum Allocation Grants
\$150 Million
Gas Tax Allocation


State of Montana Competitive Grant Program \$25 Million Max

## Water \& Sewer Infrastructure Funds

\$463 Million

- \$150 Million (Minimum Allocation Grants)
- \$10 Million (Regional Water)
- \$43 Million (Long Range Planning Bills)
- \$11.5 Million (Administration)
\$177 Million Remaining for Competitive Grants


## ARPA MINIMUM ALLOCATION GRANT PROGRAM

APPLICATIONS DUE:
July 15, 2021 - January 1, 2023

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:
Defined by Gas Tax
Allocation

DNRC Review

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS:
Water \& Sewer Infrastructure

Infrastructure Advisory
Commission Approve

GRANT LIMITS: \$150 million divided by Gas

Tax Allocation

Awarded by the Governor

## MATCH REQUIRED

Lesser of:
One-to-one matching funds
$25 \%$ of the local ARPA funds
(Treasury)

## ARPA - HB 632 Minimum Allocation Grant

Cities and Towns

| Cities \& Towns | Minimum Allocation Grant \$150.0 Million |  | Cities \& Towns | Minimum <br> Allocation Grant \$150.0 Million |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALBERTON | \$ | 88,369 | FROID | \$ | 86,486 |
| ANACONDA | \$ | 901,982 | FROMBERG | \$ | 96,370 |
| BAINVILLE | \$ | 110,585 | GERALDINE | \$ | 103,391 |
| BAKER | \$ | 422,400 | GLASGOW | \$ | 591,794 |
| BEARCREEK | \$ | 32,376 | GLENDIVE | \$ | 863,866 |
| BELGRADE | \$ | 1,373,285 | GRASS RANGE | \$ | 43,717 |
| BELT | \$ | 113,344 | GREAT FALLS | \$ | 8,505,069 |
| BIG SANDY | \$ | 182,739 | HAMILTON | \$ | 796,751 |
| BIG TIMBER | \$ | 372,616 | HARDIN | \$ | 647,557 |
| BILLINGS | \$ | 15,607,145 | HARLEM | \$ | 174,762 |
| BOULDER | \$ | 281,644 | HARLOWTON | \$ | 240,314 |
| BOZEMAN | \$ | 6,779,360 | HAVRE | \$ | 1,472,412 |
| BRIDGER | \$ | 172,938 | HELENA | \$ | 5,193,903 |
| BROADUS | \$ | 132,200 | HINGHAM | \$ | 59,527 |
| BROADVIEW | \$ | 54,446 | HOBSON | \$ | 84,971 |
| BUTTE | \$ | 5,162,543 | HOT SPRINGS | \$ | 160,569 |
| CASCADE | \$ | 165,266 | HYSHAM | \$ | 96,439 |
| CHESTER | \$ | 220,795 | ISMAY | \$ | 33,323 |
| CHINOOK | \$ | 285,847 | JOLIET | \$ | 109,301 |
| CHOTEAU | \$ | 447,566 | JORDAN | \$ | 123,728 |
| CIRCLE | \$ | 188,046 | JUDITH GAP | \$ | 58,388 |
| CLYDE PARK | \$ | 93,830 | KALISPELL | \$ | 3,554,001 |
| COLSTRIP | \$ | 396,271 | KEVIN | \$ | 82,113 |
| COLUMBIA FALLS | \$ | 877,186 | LAUREL | \$ | 1,098,308 |
| COLUMBUS | \$ | 425,641 | LAVINA | \$ | 64,287 |
| CONRAD | \$ | 502,084 | LEWISTOWN | \$ | 1,135,907 |
| CULBERTSON | \$ | 195,428 | LIBBY | \$ | 573,492 |
| CUT BANK | \$ | 539,323 | LIMA | \$ | 91,311 |
| DARBY | \$ | 141,728 | LIVINGSTON | \$ | 1,354,722 |
| DEER LODGE | \$ | 607,125 | LODGE GRASS | \$ | 100,138 |
| DENTON | \$ | 93,671 | MALTA | \$ | 406,654 |
| DILLON | \$ | 723,832 | MANHATTAN | \$ | 400,714 |
| DODSON | \$ | 51,581 | MEDICINE LAKE | \$ | 97,983 |
| DRUMMOND | \$ | 70,090 | MELSTONE | \$ | 55,392 |
| DUTTON | \$ | 103,602 | MILES CITY | \$ | 1,531,937 |
| EAST HELENA | \$ | 421,772 | MISSOULA | \$ | 10,107,938 |
| EKALAKA | \$ | 129,781 | MOORE | \$ | 82,342 |
| ENNIS | \$ | 214,133 | NASHUA | \$ | 112,561 |
| EUREKA | \$ | 291,031 | NEIHART | \$ | 36,344 |
| FAIRFIELD | \$ | 157,489 | OPHEIM | \$ | 61,263 |
| FAIRVIEW | \$ | 227,256 | OUTLOOK | \$ | 44,421 |
| FLAXVILLE | \$ | 37,313 | PHILIPSBURG | \$ | 242,319 |
| FORSYTH | \$ | 420,652 | PINESDALE | \$ | 181,799 |
| FORT BENTON | \$ | 409,748 | PLAINS | \$ | 213,436 |
| FORT PECK | \$ | 118,175 | Sub-Total | \$ | 81,516,252 |


| Cities \& Towns | Minimum <br> Allocation Grant \$150.0 Million |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLENTYWOOD | \$ | 360,282 |
| PLEVNA | \$ | 63,397 |
| POLSON | \$ | 919,764 |
| POPLAR | \$ | 159,548 |
| RED LODGE | \$ | 529,811 |
| REXFORD | \$ | 27,099 |
| RICHEY | \$ | 74,237 |
| RONAN | \$ | 372,955 |
| ROUNDUP | \$ | 447,329 |
| RYEGATE | \$ | 85,675 |
| SACO | \$ | 84,703 |
| SAINT IGNATIUS | \$ | 157,859 |
| SCOBEY | \$ | 273,783 |
| SHELBY | \$ | 790,045 |
| SHERIDAN | \$ | 145,051 |
| SIDNEY | \$ | 1,081,517 |
| STANFORD | \$ | 129,476 |
| STEVENSVILLE | \$ | 327,806 |
| SUNBURST | \$ | 163,547 |
| SUPERIOR | \$ | 197,163 |
| TERRY | \$ | 255,544 |
| THOMPSON FALLS | \$ | 319,951 |
| THREE FORKS | \$ | 436,023 |
| TOWNSEND | \$ | 364,188 |
| TROY | \$ | 187,116 |
| TWIN BRIDGES | \$ | 96,808 |
| VALIER | \$ | 224,916 |
| VIRGINIA CITY | \$ | 123,938 |
| WALKERVILLE | \$ | 224,842 |
| WEST YELLOWSTONE | \$ | 262,483 |
| WESTBY | \$ | 55,242 |
| WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS | \$ | 291,421 |
| WHITEFISH | \$ | 1,454,142 |
| WHITEHALL | \$ | 220,487 |
| WIBAUX | \$ | 169,915 |
| WINIFRED | \$ | 76,296 |
| WINNETT | \$ | 94,332 |
| WOLF POINT | \$ | 478,789 |
| Sub-Total | \$ | 11,727,477 |
| Total | \$ | 93,243,730 |


| Cities \& Towns | $\$$ | $93,243,730$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Counties | $\$$ | $56,756,270$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{\$}$ |

## Counties

| Counties | Minimum Allocation Grant $\$ 150.0$ Million |  | Counties | Minimum Allocation Grant $\$ 150.0$ Million |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEAVERHEAD | \$ | 1,295,908 | ROSEBUD | \$ | 1,035,265 |
| BIG HORN | \$ | 1,180,802 | SANDERS | \$ | 1,054,280 |
| BLAINE | \$ | 1,050,444 | SHERIDAN | \$ | 649,649 |
| BROADWATER | \$ | 552,124 | SILVER BOW | \$ | 348,380 |
| CARBON | \$ | 767,731 | STILLWATER | \$ | 848,550 |
| CARTER | \$ | 539,699 | SWEET GRASS | \$ | 434,934 |
| CASCADE | \$ | 1,787,464 | TETON | \$ | 865,736 |
| CHOUTEAU | \$ | 1,226,355 | TOOLE | \$ | 628,462 |
| CUSTER | \$ | 722,083 | TREASURE | \$ | 192,883 |
| DANIELS | \$ | 444,537 | VALLEY | \$ | 1,319,745 |
| DAWSON | \$ | 746,961 | WHEATLAND | \$ | 316,090 |
| DEER LODGE | \$ | 341,546 | WIBAUX | \$ | 259,307 |
| FALLON | \$ | 435,296 | YELLOWSTONE | \$ | 2,837,191 |
| FERGUS | \$ | 1,156,165 | Sub-Total | \$ | 10,790,471 |
| FLATHEAD | \$ | 4,370,157 | Total | \$ | 56,756,270 |
| GALLATIN | \$ | 3,094,662 |  |  |  |
| GARFIELD | \$ | 792,933 | Cities \& Towns | \$ | 93,243,730 |
| GLACIER | \$ | 1,047,584 | Counties | \$ | 56,756,270 |
| GOLDEN VALLEY | \$ | 292,967 | Total | \$ | 150,000,000 |
| GRANITE | \$ | 501,812 |  |  |  |
| HILL | \$ | 1,191,119 |  |  |  |
| JEFFERSON | \$ | 891,913 |  |  |  |
| JUDITH BASIN | \$ | 543,084 |  |  |  |
| LAKE | \$ | 1,580,667 |  |  |  |
| LEWIS AND CLARK | \$ | 2,380,376 |  |  |  |
| LIBERTY | \$ | 525,281 |  |  |  |
| LINCOLN | \$ | 1,835,890 |  |  |  |
| MADISON | \$ | 1,069,123 |  |  |  |
| MCCONE | \$ | 589,294 |  |  |  |
| MEAGHER | \$ | 433,287 |  |  |  |
| MINERAL | \$ | 521,172 |  |  |  |
| MISSOULA | \$ | 2,837,580 |  |  |  |
| MUSSELSHELL | \$ | 510,620 |  |  |  |
| PARK | \$ | 968,874 |  |  |  |
| PETROLEUM | \$ | 326,658 |  |  |  |
| PHILLIPS | \$ | 1,037,021 |  |  |  |
| PONDERA | \$ | 616,605 |  |  |  |
| POWDER RIVER | \$ | 593,773 |  |  |  |
| POWELL | \$ | 607,444 |  |  |  |
| PRAIRIE | \$ | 393,458 |  |  |  |
| RAVALLI | \$ | 2,461,952 |  |  |  |
| RICHLAND | \$ | 781,422 |  |  |  |
| ROOSEVELT | \$ | 921,957 |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total | \$ | 45,965,800 |  |  |  |

## ARPA MINIMUM ALLOCATION GRANT PROGRAM - REQUIRED MATCH

-What is your allocation under the Gas Tax Formula?

- ARPA Website - Table
- Example: Great Falls \$8,505,069
- Match MUST Equal Lesser Of:
- One-To-One = \$8,505,069

OR

- $25 \%$ of Local Fiscal Recovery Funds $=25 \%$ of $\$ 20,150,336=\$ 5,037,584$ - Use U.S. Treasury Website Allocation Tables. MT League of Cities and Towns.

To apply for the Minimum Allocation Grant, communities MUST pledge matching funds to meet the lesser of the values.

## ARPA COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM

APPLICATIONS DUE: July 15, 2021

ELIGIBLE
APPLICANTS: Local
Government
(HB 632)


Awarded by the Governor

## MATCH REQUIRED

Ranking will consider \% match


## Eligible Projects

To Make Necessary Investments in Infrastructure. A recipient may use funds to make investments in:

Clean Water State Revolving Fund and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund investments. Projects or activities of the type that would be eligible under Federal Water Pollution Control Act or Safe Drinking Water Act
*U.S. Department of the Treasury Interim Final Rule

## Necessary Improvements to Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Recipients may use this funding to invest in an array of drinking water infrastructure projects, such as

- building or upgrading facilities
- transmission
- distribution
- storage systems
- replacement of lead service lines
*U.S. Department of the Treasury - Interim Final Rule



## Necessary Improvements to Water and Sewer Infrastructure

Recipients may also use this funding to invest in wastewater infrastructure projects, including

- constructing publicly-owned treatment infrastructure,
- managing and treating stormwateror subsurface drainage water,
- facilitating water reuse, and

- securing publicly-owned treatment works

Covered period means:
March 3, 2021 - December 31, 2024.

## ARPA USE OF FUNDS

Funds must be obligated by December 31, 2024, any funds not expended to cover those obligations by December 31, 2026, must be returned to the Treasury.

Federal Funding Requirements - Fair Labor Standards, NEPA, AIS?
*U.S. Department of the Treasury - Interim Final Rule

## ARPA USE OF FUNDS - INELIGIBLE USES



Budget Stabilization, Rainy Day Fund, Reserve Account

May Not Use as State Match for Federal Grants


Pay Outstanding Debt


Other Infrastructure
*U.S. Department of the Treasury - Interim Final Rule

How Can We Apply?
arpa.mt.gov

pin

## Questions

Can we apply for both Minimum Allocation and Competitive Grants?

What money can we use for matching funds?

What if we are a water and sewer district?

What if my project is already started?

## Questions

Anna Miller
Deputy Administrator
Montana DNRC
406-444-6689
annam@mt.gov



## Entitlement Allocation Projections

| Entitlement City |  | Allocation | Dollar Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Billings | 16.40 | \$16,398,025 |
|  | Great Falls | 20.15 | \$20,150,336 |
|  | Missoula | 14.38 | \$14,382,211 |

Note: Estimates use FY2020 HUD data to identify populations eligible for assistance, and may not include localities that relinquished their CDBG allocation in that year. Funding to localities on this list would be reduced to the extent that such cities apply for and receive funding as a metro city under this proposal.

## Nonentitlement Allocation Projections



| Hysham town | 0.07 | \$73,604 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ismay town | 0.00 | \$4,600 |
| Joliet town | 0.16 | \$158,588 |
| Jordan town | 0.09 | \$93,458 |
| Judith Gap city | 0.03 | \$30,265 |
| Kalispell city | 5.95 | \$5,947,637 |
| Kevin town | 0.03 | \$32,928 |
| Laurel city | 1.63 | \$1,630,667 |
| Lavina town | 0.04 | \$40,434 |
| Lewistown city | 1.40 | \$1,404,529 |
| Libby city | 0.67 | \$672,847 |
| Lima town | 0.05 | \$54,961 |
| Livingston city | 1.89 | \$1,888,765 |
| Lodge Grass town | 0.11 | \$108,227 |
| Malta city | 0.45 | \$450,582 |
| Manhattan town | 0.46 | \$461,478 |
| Medicine Lake town | 0.05 | \$53,992 |
| Melstone town | 0.03 | \$26,633 |
| Miles City city | 2.00 | \$2,000,866 |
| Moore town | 0.04 | \$42,855 |
| Nashua town | 0.07 | \$69,488 |
| Neihart town | 0.01 | \$11,864 |
| Opheim town | 0.02 | \$20,096 |
| Outlook town | 0.01 | \$11,380 |
| Philipsburg town | 0.22 | \$223,475 |
| Pinesdale town | 0.24 | \$244,782 |
| Plains town | 0.28 | \$275,773 |
| Plentywood city | 0.42 | \$419,349 |
| Plevna town | 0.04 | \$35,591 |
| Polson city | 1.23 | \$1,225,119 |
| Poplar city | 0.20 | \$203,379 |
| Red Lodge city | 0.56 | \$557,599 |
| Rexford town | 0.04 | \$38,255 |
| Richey town | 0.04 | \$41,402 |
| Ronan city | 0.51 | \$512,322 |
| Roundup city | 0.45 | \$447,919 |
| Ryegate town | 0.06 | \$56,656 |
| Saco town | 0.05 | \$45,276 |
| Scobey city | 0.24 | \$241,392 |
| Shelby city | 0.73 | \$731,924 |
| Sheridan town | 0.18 | \$179,652 |
| Sidney city | 1.49 | \$1,494,597 |
| St. Ignatius town | 0.20 | \$200,474 |
| Stanford town | 0.09 | \$94,668 |
| Stevensville town | 0.50 | \$501,669 |
| Sunburst town | 0.08 | \$80,383 |
| Superior town | 0.21 | \$209,917 |
| Terry town | 0.13 | \$134,618 |
| Thompson Falls city | 0.35 | \$345,503 |
| Three Forks city | 0.50 | \$497,553 |
| Townsend city | 0.52 | \$521,039 |
| Troy city | 0.23 | \$233,402 |
| Twin Bridges town | 0.10 | \$100,963 |
| Valier town | 0.12 | \$117,670 |
| Virginia City town | 0.05 | \$52,298 |
| Walkerville town | 0.17 | \$171,420 |
| West Yellowstone town | 0.33 | \$333,155 |
| Westby town | 0.04 | \$37,286 |
| White Sulphur Springs city | 0.23 | \$225,412 |
| Whitefish city | 2.01 | \$2,008,372 |
| Whitehall town | 0.28 | \$278,436 |
| Wibaux town | 0.14 | \$143,334 |
| Winifred town | 0.05 | \$47,213 |
| Winnett town | 0.04 | \$44,792 |
| Wolf Point city | 0.66 | \$660,983 |

Note: Estimates use 2019 Census data to identify populations eligible for assistance, and do not include villages or other sublocal entities that may also qualify for funding. Projected amounts may be distributed to more nonentitlement governments than are listed in the breakdown to the extent that eligible nonentitlement governments have overlapping populations (for example, residents of a village government and town government in New York). What this means is that village AND town governments will be receiving a direct allocation of federal assistance, as intended by the legislation, but village amounts are not included because of the complications of calculating those amounts until a process is put in place to divvy up funds between overlapping governments.Identification of eligible governments and distribution of assistance across units with overlapping populations may reflect decisions made by the Department of Treasury and state governments.

| County Allocation Projections |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name | Allocation | Dollar Amount |
| Beaverhead County | 1.83 | \$1,833,351 |
| Big Horn County | 2.58 | \$2,583,138 |
| Blaine County | 1.30 | \$1,295,739 |
| Broadwater County | 1.21 | \$1,209,628 |

DRAFT - DATA OBTAINTED FROM THE MONTANA LEAGUE OF CITIES AND TOWNS - DIRECT TREASURY ALLOCATION

| Carbon County | 2.08 | \$2,080,048 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carter County | 0.24 | \$242,818 |
| Cascade County | 15.78 | \$15,780,435 |
| Chouteau County | 1.09 | \$1,092,874 |
| Custer County | 2.21 | \$2,211,348 |
| Daniels County | 0.33 | \$327,765 |
| Dawson County | 1.67 | \$1,670,438 |
| Deer Lodge County | 1.77 | \$1,772,647 |
| Fallon County | 0.55 | \$551,964 |
| Fergus County | 2.14 | \$2,143,079 |
| Flathead County | 20.13 | \$20,132,534 |
| Gallatin County | 22.19 | \$22,193,770 |
| Garfield County | 0.24 | \$243,981 |
| Glacier County | 2.67 | \$2,667,310 |
| Golden Valley County | 0.16 | \$159,228 |
| Granite County | 0.66 | \$655,336 |
| Hill County | 3.20 | \$3,196,970 |
| Jefferson County | 2.37 | \$2,370,188 |
| Judith Basin County | 0.39 | \$389,245 |
| Lake County | 5.91 | \$5,907,142 |
| Lewis and Clark County | 13.47 | \$13,465,909 |
| Liberty County | 0.45 | \$453,247 |
| Lincoln County | 3.87 | \$3,874,998 |
| McCone County | 0.32 | \$322,723 |
| Madison County | 1.67 | \$1,667,917 |
| Meagher County | 0.36 | \$361,123 |
| Mineral County | 0.85 | \$852,771 |
| Missoula County | 23.20 | \$23,195,684 |
| Musselshell County | 0.90 | \$898,542 |
| Park County | 3.22 | \$3,220,631 |
| Petroleum County | 0.09 | \$94,451 |
| Phillips County | 0.77 | \$766,854 |
| Pondera County | 1.15 | \$1,146,402 |
| Powder River County | 0.33 | \$326,214 |
| Powell County | 1.34 | \$1,336,273 |
| Prairie County | 0.21 | \$208,878 |
| Ravalli County | 8.50 | \$8,495,904 |
| Richland County | 2.10 | \$2,095,175 |
| Roosevelt County | 2.13 | \$2,134,158 |
| Rosebud County | 1.73 | \$1,733,276 |
| Sanders County | 2.35 | \$2,349,242 |
| Sheridan County | 0.64 | \$641,760 |
| Silver Bow County | 6.77 | \$6,771,549 |
| Stillwater County | 1.87 | \$1,870,007 |
| Sweet Grass County | 0.72 | \$724,768 |
| Teton County | 1.19 | \$1,192,173 |
| Toole County | 0.92 | \$918,518 |
| Treasure County | 0.13 | \$134,985 |
| Valley County | 1.43 | \$1,434,409 |
| Wheatland County | 0.41 | \$412,325 |
| Wibaux County | 0.19 | \$187,932 |
| Yellowstone County | 31.28 | \$31,283,142 |

Note: CDBG urban county adjustments use FY2020 HUD data to identify populations eligible for assistance, and may not include localities that relinquished their CDBG allocation in that year. County funding would be slightly altered to the extent that such cities apply for and receive funding as a metro city under this proposal.

## File Attachments for Item:

c. Discussion/Decision: Special Event and Alcohol Use Permit for Bikers Against Bullies Event

## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | New Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: | Brandon Dewey |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Mayor |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: | Discussion/Decision: Special Event and Alcohol Use <br> Permit for Bikers Against Bullies Event |
| Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: | Yes |
| Agenda Topic: |  |
| Backup Documents Attached? | Approved |
| If no, why not? | $06 / 10 / 2021$ |
| Approved/Disapproved? |  |
| If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: |  |
| Notes: |  |

Agenda Item: Discussion/Decision: Special Event and Alcohol Use Permit for Bikers Against Bullies, USA

## Other Council Meetings

Exhibits
A. Special Event Permit Application, Alcohol Use Request Form

This agenda item provides Council with the ability to approve the special event permit and alcohol use for the Bikers Against Bullies, USA.

## Background:

The Bikers Against Bullies and event coordinator Karl Kyer are requesting approval of a Special Event Permit for the Bikers Against Bullies Event scheduled for June 12, 2021. The Bikers Against Bullies Event will entail Covid Run Scavenger Hunt, DJ Music, Raffle, Drawings, Beer Garden and a meet and greet with the Stevensville Community.

## Board/Commission Recommendation: $\square$ Applicable - $\boxtimes$ Not Applicable

Alternative(s): Deny approval of the Special Event and Alcohol Use Permit for the Bikers Against Bullies Event scheduled for June 12, 2021.

## MOTION

I move to: approve the Special Event and Alcohol Use Permit for the Bikers Against Bullies Event scheduled for June 12, 2021. contact person：Karl Kier TELEPHONE：


ACTIVITY：Covid Run Scavenger Annt－Dj music，
and meet and greet with Strive community location requesting：Lewis＋Clark Park

DATE： $\qquad$ STARTING TIME： $3: 45^{3-4}$ ENDING TIME： $7: 15^{\circ} \mathrm{cm}$ ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE ATTENDING： 200

ALCOHOL USE？YES $X$ NO＿＿If yes please attach Alcohol Use Request Form HIGHWAY OR STREET CLOSURE？YES＿＿＿NO＿＿＿If yes，please attach MDOT Street Closure Permit REQUEST FOR BONFIRE？YES $\qquad$ NO X＿If yes，please attach Town Burn Permit IS OVERNIGHT CAMPING REQUESTED？YES＿＿ $\mathrm{NO}_{\perp} \chi_{\text {．}}$ DO YOU HAVE INSURANCE？YES $X$

NO $\qquad$
If yes please attach declaration page as proof of insurance for $\$ 1.5$ million as pursuant to Montana Statute M．C．A．2－9－108．

WILL SECURITY BE REQUIRED？YES $X$ NO $\qquad$ IF YES，PLANS FOR SECURITY：On－denty police
PLANS FOR CLEAN UP： $\qquad$
FEE：\＄ $\qquad$
＊＊｜f the event involves less than 1,000 participants，this application will be forwarded to the Mayor for final approval．If the event involves more than 1,000 participants，this application will be considered at the first Town Council Meeting after its receipt．The contact person will be notified of the Mayor or Council＇s decision the following day．＊＊If Council approval，a representative must attend the council meeting．


## TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE

## ALCOHOL USE REQUEST FORM

Applicant Name Karl Kyen Phone Number $406-777-1230$ Group/Organization Name Bikers Agaist Bullies
Describe Intended Alcohol Use (type, amount, commercial or private, etc.) Beer, Commercial Vendor.
$\qquad$
Has an Application to Use/Sell Alcohol been approved by the Montana Department of Revenue? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No. If yes, please provide a copy.
Describe the Plan to: 1. Contain the alcohol use to a restricted area. Roped off Beer Garda.

Describe the Plan to: 2. Prevent the sale or use of alcohol by minors. wrist Bauds ID Chec/2

Describe the Plan to: 3. Provide for the safety and security of event attendants and other citizens. Volenters check - D, Local Polses, Bent Contained tr e Boor Grardon?

Approved $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Denied $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Fee. $\$ 200$

Date Paid: $\qquad$

ABETTER-01
HBIGGERSTAFF

## CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.
IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must have ADDITIONAL INSURED provisions or be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

| PRODUCER |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Missoula Office |  |
| PayneWest Insurance, Inc. |  |
| P.O. Box 4386 |  |
| Missoula, MT 59808 59 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | INSURED |
|  |  |
|  | Bikers Against Bullies USA |
| 2935 Stockyard RD \#L3 |  |
| Missoula, MT 59808 |  |

COVERAGES
CERTIFICATE NUMBER:


THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.


DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required)

| CERTIFICATE HOLDER | CANCELLATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| Town Of Stevensville MT 206 Buck St Stevensville, MT 59870 | Should any of the above described policies be cancelled before the expiration date thereof, notice will be delivered in ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS. |
|  | AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE $\qquad$ <br>  |

# this endorsement changes the policy. please read it carefully. ADDITIONAL INSURED - DESIGNATED PERSON OR ORGANIZATION 

This endorsement modifies insurance provided under the following:
COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY COVERAGE PART

SCHEDULE
Name of Additional Insured Person(s) Or Organization(s):
Effective Date: 06/12/2021
TOWN OF STEVENSVILLE MONTANA
206 BUCK ST
STEVENSVILLE, MT 59870

Information required to complete this Schedule, if not shown above, will be shown in the Declarations.
A. Section II - Who Is An Insured is amended to include as an additional insured the person(s) or organization(s) shown in the Schedule, but only with respect to liability for "bodily injury", "property damage" or "personal and advertising injury" caused, in whole or in part, by your acts or omissions or the acts or omissions of those acting on your behalf:

1. In the performance of your ongoing operations; or
2. In connection with your premises owned by or rented to you.
However:
3. The insurance afforded to such additional insured only applies to the extent permitted by law; and
4. If coverage provided to the additional insured is required by a contract or agreement, the insurance afforded to such additional insured will not be broader than that which you are required by the contract or agreement to provide for such additional insured.
B. With respect to the insurance afforded to these additional insureds, the following is added to Section III - Limits Of Insurance:
If coverage provided to the additional insured is required by a contract or agreement, the most we will pay on behalf of the additional insured is the amount of insurance:
5. Required by the contract or agreement; or
6. Available under the applicable Limits of Insurance shown in the Declarations;
whichever is less.
This endorsement shall not increase the applicable Limits of Insurance shown in the Declarations.

## Confirmation Number: 7814482

Montana
Town of Stevensville
General

## Transaction Details

For
PERMIT


Credit Card Payment Address Information

Order Number
Customer Name keith burgad
Email Address

| Address | 4812 Arcadia Court <br> Missoula, MT 59803 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Phone Number | $(406)$ 546-1030 |
| Credit Card Number | 4 XXX XXXX XXXX 1349 |
| Credit Card Type | Visa |
| Expiration Date | 0224 |
| Operator Name |  |
| Transaction Time | $6 / 1 / 2021$ 1:40:14 PM |
| Authorization Code | 134880 |
| Convenience Fee | 134868 |
| Authorization Code | 1898336372 |
| Transaction ID | 90.00 |
| Agency Total | $\$ 3.95$ |
| Convenience Fee | 93.95 |
| Total Amount |  |

ONE OR BOTH CHARGES WILL APPEAR AS PAYGOV.US ON YOUR CARD STATEMENT.
For questions about this payment, please call (866) 480-8552.
Disputing a charge with your credit card company may result in an additional $\$ 40.00$ charge.

## File Attachments for Item:

d. Discussion/Decision: Appeal of administrative decision regarding tree removal in Town owned right-of-way

## Stevensville Town Council Meeting

Agenda Item Request

To be submitted BEFORE Noon on the Wednesday immediately preceding the Thursday agenda publishing deadline (8-days ahead of the meeting).

| Agenda Item Type: | New Business |
| :--- | :--- |
| Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Second Person Submitting the Agenda Item: |  |
| Submitter Title: | Citizen |
| Submitter Phone: |  |
| Submitter Email: | 06/10/2021 <br> Requested Council Meeting Date for Item: <br> Agenda Topic: <br> Backup Documents Attached? <br> regarding tree removal in Town owned right-of-way <br> If no, why not? <br> Approved/Disapproved? <br> If Approved, Meeting Date for Consideration: <br> Approved <br> Notes:Agenda Communication will be provided in the updated <br> meeting packet on 6/8 |

Agenda Item: Discussion/Decision: Appeal of administrative decision regarding tree removal in Town owned right-of-way

## Other Council Meetings

Exhibits

A. Letter \& Map from Phillip McCann

This agenda item provides Council with the ability to override the administration's decision to deny the removal of 2 mature maple trees in the Town's right-of-way.

## Background:

The Town's Administration previously received a request from Phillip McCann of $102 \mathrm{E} .5^{\text {th }}$ Street to remove two mature trees that are within the Town's right-of-way. Mr. McCann requested the removal to install solar panels on his south facing roof. The trees in question would block the sun from his solar panels if not removed.

The request was reviewed by the appropriate staff and Mayor Dewey. Ultimately, the request was denied because of the healthy nature of the trees and the Town's desire to preserve and maintain a healthy urban forest.

Stevensville Municipal Code Sec. 22-424 - Public Tree Care, states that "Private property owners shall be responsible for watering and care of street trees adjacent to their own property, shall not cause damage to street trees, and shall not prune or remove any street tree without permission from the town."

Mr. McCann is now requesting to appeal the administration's decision.
Stevensville Municipal Code Sec. 22-431 - Review by the town council, states that "Any person may appeal from any ruling or order of the tree board to the town council who shall hear the matter and make final decision."

The Town does not have an active tree board, the ruling of the administration is appealed the Town Council.

The administration recommends denial of the appeal.

Alternative(s): Deny the removal of two mature trees in the Town's right-of-way at $102 \mathrm{E} .5^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## MOTION

I move to: Approve the removal of two mature trees in the Town's right-of-way at $102 \mathrm{E} .5^{\text {th }}$ Street.

From: Phillip L. McCann
120 E. 5th Street
Stevensville, MT 59870
Phone: 406-370-8199

To: Town Council of Stevensville, MT

Purpose: Request a Variance to the Town Code to remove (2) Large Maple trees from the South boundary of my property.

Two Town trees on the south side of my property at 120 E. 5th Street provide a lot of shading to the roof of my house and the roof of my garage. I want to install an off grid solar system for my home. I feel strongly about trying to reduce my carbon footprint and my future 3000 watt solar system will hopefully produce enough electricity to run most of my house.

To provide full southern exposure to my roof I want to remove two trees that currently shade both the roof of my house and the roof of my garage.

As a way of keeping the visual appeal to the street and my property, I propose to replace the two existing maple trees with 3 small trees from exhibit 1 of the Town Code.

Proposed Replacements:

3 Saskatoon Serviceberry Trees
(See attached Sketch)

Thank You,
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$\longrightarrow$ purposed locations of
"New' plautiong of
Saskatoon Service berry Trees


[^0]:    Source: Resolution 378

[^1]:    Source: Water Meter Use Data from the Town and Population Growth Data per section 2.4

[^2]:    Source: Water Meter Use Data from the Town and Population Growth Data per section 2.4

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Assumes current 430,000-gallon uses $5 \%$ and $25 \%$ of storage for operational and equalization storage respectively
    ${ }^{2}$ Firm well capacity assumes largest pump is out of service per MDEQ Circular 1 recommendations

