

New Recording 47 2

We're going to see personnel and yourself on the screen unless it's like a call, and we don't want to go home. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. Excuse me.

I mean, you can say absent for now and we'll adjust to them. And she arrives. Yeah.

Yeah. Okay. I don't want to notice the agenda compliance.

This is finding that the regular meeting that is an agenda were posted in accordance with the code. So before dash two zero four, within 48 hours prior to the meeting at the city about the city hall post office and on the city's website on March, 19, 2026. Make a motion that the list of them has posted recordings.

All in favor. Yep. I'm to call for conflict.

I don't outline and I know code four dash four zero for any conflict with tonight's agenda. Thank you. Moving on to item three, this is mayor and council reports.

Just a couple things to make note of for the community. They're myself. The director will be hosting our town hall for the quarter.

It is on March 30th at five 30 PM here at city hall. Love to have a discussion with residents about the local option tax. That was on the November ballots and just get a little feedback about what people were feeling in regards to that.

Discussion about public safety and how we can provide services to the community. So, just a bit of intention setting will of this year. Just a little review of what you didn't like local option from the last.

So, that is again, March 30th at five 30. And I want to draw attention to a couple surveys that are floating through the development department. One of the comprehensive plan, and then there's a bit of community desire and communication around maybe doing some events on the people world.

So, just there's some surveys there. That's of interest to the community. What teams are interested in kind of the desire for some kind of community around that to happen.

So, two surveys to to take, and then just acknowledgement. We had a lot of community participation in enough of construction waste that happened out. The slaughterhouse Canyon after the large wind incident, we had, and just a general.

Thank you to community members who expressed concern about issue that's happening and went out of their way to help clean up debris. They helped the city team quite a lot to make a dent on a lot of construction trash that blew into the canyon. And a lot of the contractors also

attempted to do their part to mitigate that.

And the community development department will be working with contractors in slaughterhouse to better address things like wind events moving forward so that we don't have as much trash flying into the canyon. So, just thank you to the community members who were on that. Anything else from the council table? Any comments or updates? Is that.

Hello. Hey, I'm on a I'm on a call. Do you need me? And, you know, I mean, here you mentioned we decided that was correct.

Going around. We have code enforcement issues that have been prevalent and repeatedly reported, and we're still having people. This is like the fifth or sixth time we've seen these things on here.

I presented something that was really a complete some move forward for our code enforcement systems. I requested additional information about code enforcement. So I'd like to encourage city to pay some attention to what the residents keep saying, keep asking for, which is enforcement.

I also brought up the topic of block and getting an update on where that is. So, you know, which also is a resident concern. Again, that's helpful.

And then finally, I'm having some trouble getting all the time. I want to address your point on the code enforcement. And again, going back to council timing, you know, there are things that are brought up in comments from the community members and council members.

And just because they don't come up on the next agenda does not mean that it's not something that's actively being worked on. Carter and all departments involved in code enforcement. We've held a work session on it and now a second work session happening next week.

And then a presentation is being brought to council. So thank you for bringing that up. So I address that.

And so I think that things are happening in city hall and you're seeing them come up on the agenda as they come up. And I always appreciate council members communicating residents and council priorities in order to best design agendas. We need the timelines of the work at city hall and the best interest of residents.

So thank you for that. Are there any other council updates at this time? Okay, I will go ahead and move on to our public comment section of the agenda. This is item for public comment for items of concern, not on the agenda.

Just when I don't have to raise your hand, I'll call on you and say your name and address for the record. And please keep comments to the minutes. So I see a hand in city hall.

Evan still not want to let in tonight. We have two rentals sort of across from us on Spruce Street.

It's a trashy.

I've gone to planning. I've gone to law enforcement. And I would, if there isn't a law on the books, I would request that somebody look into it.

There are dead cars. There's now a dead trailer covered with plastic tarps. There are breeding piles of cats that are now in our yard.

It's a mess. It's awful. They had open sewer running that they just opened the drain line.

The people in the storage room actually found that their father found it. And I'm sure Mr. Johnson is aware of that. Now that that will affect the city can do better than this.

So my request is that that be addressed. Thank you. Good morning.

We had our comments in city hall. Yes, ma'am. I was concerned about the pickleball construction.

Namely, what is the estimated long term cost of putting one in? Has there been enough solicitation of surrounding landowners? Landowners who bought the land without a pickleball. And now may have to endure the sound. There's been lots of complaints.

I mean, I'm going to catch them in Haley about pickleball. If you read the miscellaneous in the paper, it's it's a very touchy issue. I would hate for us to spend a lot of money and create another noise.

We have a bunch of noise with overhead airplanes. We already have to do it. So I'm just concerned about the construction of the pickleball ports.

And perhaps the community would be better served with improved bathrooms or picnic tables and more equipment for the kids. I'd like to see that. And then on another topic.

I'm wondering what the plans will be for the maintenance of alleyways, which get filled in during the winter. Most of our electrical lines run down the alleyways. And some of them are impassable.

There's lots of trees around the electrical lines. There's winds that come in during the winter. And a lot of snow is piled up in the alleyways.

It's a place that don't fit from the streets. So it makes it even more impossible to get into those alleyways, public right away. And also, I'm really liking that you're paying attention to the trees and everything.

But I'm wondering what I know Haley has maintenance companies that comes in and works on public right away. Are there any plans for maintaining the public right away? We already have. And there's fire hazards.

There's stuff. I mean, it's like we go through this drought that they're anticipating and it's like a disaster waiting to happen. So I don't see any long-term planning for the alleyways and maintenance of public right away.

So that's the biggest issue for me, especially with fire concerns. Thank you. Thank you for your comment.

Any other public comments inside city hall? No hands raised on our team's call. I'm seeing no other hands raised in city hall at this time. I will go ahead and close public comment.

Thank you to those who commented. We will move on to item five of our agenda. This is our consent agenda.

We have three items in here. Approval of minutes, February 9th, 2026 approval of claims March 10th through March 23rd, 2026 and department head council. Any questions on the consent agenda? Okay.

I was just going to need to accept the consent agenda. If I motion to accept the consent agenda, Yes. Yes.

Yes. Yes. Okay.

Moving on to the presentation portion of our agenda. We are going to start college presentation. Item six, eight.

This is our treasurer report. October to December. 2025 quarter one of the fiscal year.

26. I invite a shell and shoemaker or treasurer up to present this. Hello everyone.

So if you make our treasure. You having your packet, the report, I just want to give you a brief rundown and get a few new things. With it this time around, I actually labeled it as a quarterly report.

So it's the ending of our first quarter, December 31st, 2025. The first thing you see on page two, I believe you have page numbers, correct? Are they on there? Okay. It's a brief summary of our city revenues broken down by all of the departments.

And the two funds, the water and wastewater. That's just a visual. We're going to get to the actual report that this ties to in just a moment.

So page two, any questions about that? Just general revenues there. December is a long time for revenue. We get a lot of tax money that comes in in January.

So the next report will, you'll see a big difference. I did a brief summary on page three, the lot revenue. And I actually compared as the last four years of log revenue.

And so you can see the quarter and how we compare this year can compare to the last three

years. Then I did a summary of our development impact fees. Same thing, except that just goes back two years on that.

So if you turn down to page five, that is the city revenue. Worksheet that shows you by department, what all of those graphs have included. This has all the categories.

I just grabbed a few of the items. So if you want, if you care to look at the revenues for each particular department, you can see them by department along with the total at the end. Do we have any questions on city revenues? Oh, thank you.

Do you have any sense for why? The, like, well, I think that the governments are lower than they have now. Is that just. Well, I can only speculate.

I believe that we need to reach out to some of our law taxpayers. I think that they are getting a little behind in making payments as they should. So we probably need to make some calls to check in on why we're not getting some of that in a timely fashion.

And for the development impact is just based on when building building permits are applied for. So, you know, first quarter is the, is the lowest quarter of the year. Probably.

Yeah. Yeah. No, we would call specific other business owners that are supposed to be reporting to us.

And I think it would come down between Amy and I to get that done. Yeah. Yeah.

Yeah. Yeah. I had a followup to that LRT question.

Shelley, is there a deadline for monthly submission of those LRT? Does it say anything on their submission form? And if so, is there a penalty? Carter, did you have a comment on that? Yeah, I was going to say, sorry. It was not expected to talk. And that's fine.

Um, you can finish. Okay. Okay.

Um, so as far as a lot of penalties and deadlines. So that'd be. Sure.

I also want to comment on the speculation aspect of it. I think that with the winter we've had, I think that hotel, um, occupancy has been down more, um, Valley wide. So I mean, the hotel is the largest law payer, um, of all of our law taxes that we receive.

no, he only receives law taxes from, from hotels and terminals. How do we know if they're behind on the payments? Do we get their gross receipts? They, they send in a little report when they, when they send their check. Sometimes they don't even identify what quarter it's for.

Or what month it's for. They just send it. So anything else? Okay.

So then starting on page two, something right after city revenue on page nine, you're going to see a simple graph. It's the orange. Yeah.

Um, expenses citywide. This is everything. All of the different departments are outlined on the bottom, including the water and wastewater funds.

Um, note in the water, but I did not include the bonds of 3.2 million because I wanted you to actually be looking at operational, um, uh, expenses, um, here. So the, the water fund, uh, bond is not included in this. And then following that is the actual city expenses report by department.

So you can look at each particular department and get the total of year to date, the budget for the year, what's remaining in their budget. And then, um, the percent that is either is being installed already. So does anyone have any questions on any of the city expenses? That's fine.

Why do we pay the mayor? It costs so much. Okay. Uh, moving on from city expenses, age 19.

You have a question. Oh, sorry, Diane. I didn't see what page you referenced.

I am. Okay. Is there not another page number? At the bottom.

47. Oh, really? Let me cross. Um, yes.

It's right. It's the page after. So in your treasure report, it's patient.

Thank you. Thank you, Christine. Oh, it's a big question about, uh, the travel expense.

Am I reading this? 128%. Yes. That is including an upcoming, um, uh, resort.

Resort that the mayor and, uh, our community development director. So that was not, um, planned. Um, so that's going to kick that a little over budget.

Yeah. But, um, to further explain though, there was, um, some expenses coded. I separated trainings and meetings and travel.

And before they used to be combined. Okay. So that we can have, we can track travel versus a meeting cost, a cost to go to a seminar or whatever.

And, um, there was expenses for, uh, a conference that Brian did that got coded all to travel. And some of it should have been to, or put it all to training. Some of it should have been to travel.

So kind of look at those two together. Otherwise. Yeah.

Anything else on an expense or Tom? Um, you know, on the two things were, of course, we're getting close. Well, about 25%, right? This is 25% of the budget. Yes.

Yes. And some of these are, are well above 25%. So that's a little bit of a red flag.

one of them was the, um, in the administrative, which bank charges. He's actually did 200. It's four.

The CEO thinks that's not a significant amount, but it's just kind of curious why bank charges and, um, why we're all a pleasure. Um, with the transition to, um, to sell, there's been, um, there's been a lot of returned, uh, customer payments, um, that have, have occurred, um, with processing our in-house, um, auto pay program. So most of that incurred in the first, well, it mostly all occurred here.

It is leveled out. Now we've been able to, um, get some of those issues resolved with the payments being returns. It happens when accounts get closed, people move, and there's any number of reasons that these payments get returned back.

So, um, we, we just had some bank charges. You're going to see in the next report, I think it's January or February where I get us reimbursed for a lot of the charges. I talked to the bank.

So yeah. Yeah. December just always looks bad in terms of everything, but I did, I did get a lot of that back.

Anything else? Okay. But then on page 19, um, it's the next blue and orange one is a general fund payroll summary. Now keep in mind, this is just general fund does not include water, does not include wastewater.

So the little chart on the bottom shows where we are, our year to date and, um, general one general fund. We're at 26% for our payroll for the year, um, which is pretty much right on track. 25% is what this report is for.

And it shows you all of the categories that, um, are trapped on your budget, on your budget. So each one of these is broken down by department in the previous report, your budget worksheet. Okay.

Any questions about that? Yes, Tammy. This includes the new, this change of carrier for the switch to a different category. Carrier for insurance.

Yes. Yes. New.

Yeah. This is our new. So the next page, page 20, I broke down water and wastewater fund payrolls, which are, um, wastewater.

I mean, water is basically at, uh, 25% right on par and wastewater is at just under 21% for the same. This is the first quarter of the fiscal year. So all that's on track.

Then I get a new report, which I have not done for you before. I created a new one called the payroll expense summary. So if you don't want to look at it on the previous report with everything, this one just breaks down those four categories that we track, um, through payroll.

Um, keep going. Oh, just before that, they were all expensive. Any questions on that? Okay.

Then next page, your cover page shows the departments, which I hope you're getting used to

the department numbers throughout. the last part of this report then is what you would normally have seen from me. So all of that front is new and there, what follows this is your year to date budget comparison by department revenue and expenses all, all together in this report.

So when you scroll down, it's normally about 15 pages for that particular report. So is there's any number of ways you can look at the data here. I'm always open to questions about, um, what's going on.

So, and this will be reposted on the website tomorrow. I'll upload this on the website for anyone who wants to, wants to have it. Any questions? Okay.

Thank you. Appreciate your work on this. You're welcome.

We'll move on to our next presentation. This is I 60 event and right away presentation. Mark is here to present.

Thank you for joining us tonight. Yeah. Okay.

Okay. Yeah. All right.

Mark's in jail. Principle of GGL. Also live at one 20 North fourth street and G G L O. It's a design firm.

It's nice for today's interior designers. Urban design. So why don't we just introduce you a little bit to the underutilized by the way, master plan.

So we're leading a team with great West engineering. Engineering consultants. So we're pretty knowledgeable with current set up and then engagement.

So I think, you know what this is, but just for a refresher, we're working with the urban renewal agency to look at the and rights of way from about chestnut to see her roughly along what you call the alley, which is definitely a street West of mainstream to Howard preserve and in our case. So today it really just a briefing getting the initial reaction to the thoughts and get your feet up for this. We'll actually necessary.

And then we'll be back in probably may with some initial thinking and another briefing just to get your thoughts as we work through the process. So that's on the left, on the right is your zoning district diagram, and I think part of this, there's short term and long term planning, and part of the long term planning is these good end rights and ways which are part of multiple things, like dovetail with comp plan is how we want to continue to activate and make our downtown vibrant, and are there any land use related pieces that we want to look at with this. So we're all pretty familiar with these, I would say you see images on the bottom of what we call the alley, which is some enforcement speaking of, there's a lot of dead RV and vehicle storage, and it's kind of gotten taken over over time I think part of that is the lack of definition.

There's weeds, there's gravel, it's hard to tell where the right of way stops or starts. So there's

some work to be done there. And then there's a couple of key components that I think we've been talking about, one is the Elm Street right of way with restaurants on either side that has an opportunity for enhancements, and then of course Elm Street with Howard Preserve entry.

There are lots of others, and those are probably part of more long term planning that we'll be digging into. This is the general schedule, the red line represents where we are so we've gotten a little bit up to speed, talked to a few folks. We have our priority outreach that are the businesses that are immediately adjacent to these rights of ways, the land for us, the Friends of Howard Preserve, casing the streets, pretty important, and a few others.

So we've dug into those, we've kind of midstreamed on that. And then we're targeting potentially April 14th, I think that's solidified now, for an initial community workshop to really talk about priorities, vision, programming, a few of those broader topics. So we'll come back later in the spring summer with some initial ideas to get to another community workshop where we might do a little bit of an outdoor workshop at one of the street ends and have some fun with it and do a little test series of activations.

So it's a good things to come and then we'll wrap this up by the end of the summer with likely some short term projects funded through Europe and some longer term projects that allow partnerships and the funding sources that might outlast the district. So what we've talked to the land for us, the friends and the city, there's a lot of interest in cleaning up the alley and the interface, the hill or the slope or whatever your favorite name of it is between the preserve and the right of way, the alley. And there are potential partnerships for some of that and that whole interface with the preserve.

Perhaps there is an idea of a south entry to the preserve at Chestnut, that's a little complicated, but we'll look at that through this planning process. The question came up, how do we clean that up and manage the alley and the street ends for snow access, all those things take a little bit more to find and enforceable without slowing down or any competing operations. And really, in talking with Casey, the important thing is to leave those street ends open as you can in the winter.

So what happens between street ends is a lot more flexibility. So I think that works well with some of the prior priorities in some of our initial conversations. So emerging priorities.

These are the beginnings of our conversations and we'll get these through the rest of the process. Historically, that's a functional and tractive interface between downtown and the preserve, so I think that starts as an infrastructure and street project and then it doubles as a placement. There is an initial paving piece that you all are doing at the south end, so that would be a good test case and presumably that would move forward.

Clean up that slope transition I mentioned between the alley and our preserve, that's probably a partnership piece with Land Trust. Enhance the entry down the street, another partnership opportunity. And what I mean by that is we all probably use that.

It's gravel, it's sloped, there's runoff issues, it's got weeds around it, it kind of gets beat up with the snow storage, so making that a little bit more resilient and celebrating that a little bit more. And then there's the short-term and long-term sites that could be addressed in some projects in the workshop. So that's the overall.

If you've got a chance to read this, that's great. If not, a little bit of homework. This just digs in a little further on those priorities I mentioned.

And then, as far as the longer-range planning, some questions I think we'll be asking of you all in the community as far as the longer-range planning related to this. Because part of it is these enhancements, part of it is how do, so what's our historic downtown core? And then how do improvements like this, infrastructure projects and land use work together to create a vibrant downtown for our community? So I think this dovetails well with the out plan and some of the work that's being done there. There's probably some sort of synergy between the two.

And how are we going to make the most of our money? Because we need to spend it wisely. It also might be a test case, one of the street ends, for some future mainstream improvements. I know there's discussion about the lights and there's ongoing issue with those, so we might be able to test a few things at one of the street ends to see if that's applicable to a lot of the community.

And then, this is a graphic that planning worked with some students when I remember. I put this together to assess or look just high level at some of the properties in the core and which ones are more or less likely to develop over time. So we're going to be looking at talking to potential partners on redevelopment scenarios, the ones that are more likely in that near term, and see their thoughts and what we can do to just get a head up and be proactive about what happens in the downtown.

So I can go back to Virginia. This question starts comments. On the last slide there.

So if I understand this chart right, if it's four to five, that means kind of a dark purple, that's more likely to be developed. The symbols didn't have kind of a corresponding legend that told me what was. Yeah.

Yeah, yeah, I think that. Probably, but I am allowed to say that. But yeah, the four to fives are the most likely you believe to Change and The zero ones are very unlikely to change from a land use and redevelopment perspective.

So often the four to fives are vacant parcels. That might have a high value. That's where somebody would be incentivized to Purple lowest And this is just a start.

Obviously, we can focus on the higher likelihood property owners and chattel. Really, the goal is to play this out for you. If we say there's a street and that we want to make some improvements.

We can be gathering and that's something It's a big difference that in the future because car wash and gas station versus housing over a cafe, for instance. So we want to make sure that those So where does the money come from? Doesn't it come from taxpayer money? Currently, right. And in the past, and it's been growing.

So do you include the return on investment because there's a lot of things that go up. Right. And it is absolutely they talk about, you know, revitalizing mainstream, but they also talk about like being unsafe conditions, which basically describes the majority of roads.

So I just wonder where I was determined to be this resident funds on unification rather than the unsafe living conditions. Sorry, I'll interject on that because she was hired by Say on that one, but it's first discretion to choose the projects. With their Improvement plan.

To select this project. Be a question for Say Completely But that These improvements are likely to Trigger the kinds of development in the downtown that can further fund through further Further Like Space And The urban renewal district is a specific district. It's not the whole city.

And so Yeah, so not everybody else. Not everybody in the city. No, not all streets.

Yeah. Not everyone in the city pays into Just people in the urban renewal district, so not Yeah, not well, it's not for It's the majority. I'm not clear.

All right. The point is, you don't collect. Where do you collect money from taxes from the street? You don't like that.

I just want to make sure it's That's property taxes that are diverted to urban But only in a certain and it's a map. There's a map like to where it can be applied. Is not Not everybody in the city pays urban renewal taxes.

You have to be in that zone to pay the urban renewal taxes. I am outside of it and in it and I pay only my business downtown pays urban renewal. You don't pay urban renewal taxes on your own outside of that district.

I want to go back to the question that was asked though. So the question that was asked was about, you know, why the funds are going towards this project and not the other blight within the city. And Harvey did answer the question that this was part of a decision made at Borough.

So I think, you know, for them to move forward with this right of way project. And there is an opportunity to come to Borough and meetings and make suggestions and make your voice known at the borough meetings. If you do not agree with the way in which the borough funds are being spent, that is something to take up with directly because they are the ones who control how the funds are being spent.

Yes, I agree. Okay. Thank you.

Any other questions? Thank you, Mark, for coming. I appreciate the update. It sounds like

there's a community question.

I was just suggesting if you want to connect with Mark. I was wondering if you have any contact with any of those. We have.

We've reached out. We're still concerned with some of this. Okay.

Well, thank you. And I will add anything that you guys need to get the information out there about public outreach. Please utilize the city communications channels for that part of this.

You are welcome to know that you brought it up. Yeah. To piggyback on Mark made a comment about having kind of an installation, potentially at the end of the summer.

Carter, go ahead and take the lead on that. Yeah. The city successfully applied for grants and \$1,000 from Frontier Community Resources to do a sort of pop up events and explore the use of the right of way.

A fun way involving community businesses this summer. Thank you very much. Okay.

I will go ahead and move us on in the agenda. We're going to move on to new business. This is item 78.

This is a water project update and final facility plan approval. We have chatted with us tonight. And Ryan Raider.

Okay, perfect. And then Chris Johnson, our director as well. The entire document was sent to you all digitally for review.

And Amy, I would ask for the those in the community or in the room. If you wouldn't mind pulling up the highlighted facility, send to council members. And Chad, you're welcome to stand at the extension.

Okay. So, once we get that pulled up, Chad, we'll hand it on over to you to take it forward. Okay.

First, I want to say you guys have a really great project. You guys have an old, antiquated transmission line going up Mulder Canyon Road. You guys have a great opportunity for improving it.

You guys have a good funding package and grant money potentially from Simpson's office. And so I just want to reiterate that. Ryan and I work with a lot of communities.

And you guys, they're envious of your funding. So, just as I want to back up and kind of give a little bit of a project update. We have been working towards a facility plan, getting that final approval going.

And so we did provide an updated facility plan to our NEQ. We've also been working on your environmental information document component. It's uniquely tied to the facility plan.

We've been working with IDQ on that, providing requested documents. We've been working on water rights and easements. I've been doing some meetings and discussing on how these are impacting the design.

We're working on your preliminary engineering report as well. We have a path prepared for that. And then also, as we've been doing all those things kind of at the same time, in the order of importance, we've also been working on your construction plans.

And so as we've been moving through this process, we learned more information. And so going back to where the facility plan was when we originally did it, we took the best information that we had. And so we learned a couple of things since we did the original facility plan.

We learned more information. The facility plan is really a 30,000-foot document that ears down and does the best job we can with the information we have to develop concepts and alternatives to an improved system. So you guys have received a copy of the highlighted version of some of the changes that we made.

So backing up, I want to say why those were suggested. So two things we learned since that original facility plan that was effectively approved was, one, we learned that we didn't, well, originally, we didn't have very good flow data. So a flow meter was installed, and we learned that you were actually receiving 3 CFS water from your water, right? It was dialed right into where we were looking at.

So that's one thing we learned. We also learned that the property owner, where we were constructing new springs on, where we were proposing to construct new collector springs on, the property owner was in strict opposition to that. So due to those two items, we thought it was in the best interest of you all to take a step back since we know that we're getting the right amount of work in your springs now.

And we have the property owners as opposing things. So looking at this more from a phase approach would be a much better way to move forward. So we're proposing to construct the transmission line and the collection line from the transmission to the spring as part phase A. And then as part of that project, we'll increase the flow, we'll have additional flow measurement and determine exactly what we are getting from the springs because the 3 CFS that we're getting from a flow measurement is down here at the 10.

And there could be some different flows that we're receiving. So we want to gather more information. And so like I'm talking about, as we start up here at 30,000 feet and get closer and closer with the PR, environmental report, construction plans, and then we actually dig into the ground, we get all more, a whole bunch more information.

So then I can actually provide you a solid system that you guys can use for years to come. So with that in mind, that's the basis for the changes. Anyways.

I think maybe start out with any questions from the council. Okay. Your description of the

project is dramatically different than my understanding of the project.

And yeah, also exactly what we could have expected to be at this point two years ago, everybody knew it was 30,000. That was premature that we didn't have enough information that was premature to ask for a certain amount of money or to posit any of the things that were definitively stated like the rebuilding of the Springs collection. We've known since last July that the flow Greg from Eric had let it slip, but that the water quantity that we had been told was not going to happen.

And now we're seeing that the primary driver, is that correct? The Springs collection system, the rebuilding, the piece that met all of DEQ's contamination and replacing the box and all of that. And there's also the predicate for TD1 and LE1, which is the transmission line of police. That's gone.

That's not gone. You are rebuilding it. We will have, it will be publicly accessible.

It will be on public land and all of that, because that was what we were told. This was an investment in the future that we were going to have it on public land. What's exactly, sorry, what exactly was your question? My question is, where are you getting your information that's so different? The landowner was greatly actually in favor of all of this and was a huge proponent, but unfortunately things were not perhaps handled the way they should have been.

And so we seem to be getting all these different stories about what's actually going on. And you even moved, your document actually moves the project that I just referenced, SS1, which is the springs collection system. It's no longer in this project, but you're saying that it is.

Well, it's no longer, the way I have it written now, there's different ways we can approach this, but the way I have it now is we added a component of one of your alternatives to separate it. Okay. So it's still an alternative, but it's just not included in the ones that you selected.

So that's why we're bringing this here as a point of discussion, because we really were backing up and saying, do we, we don't need to do this. At this time, should we, should we wait before we plow forward and learn more information about how much flow we're actually getting? Okay. So that's, that's the part where the, so is this the plan or not? Which part? Well, you're asking us, I think, to accept the facility plan, but it sounds like it's still not.

No, that's where it needs to be. Yes. But you've taken it, we all, the voters approved alternative one, and you've taken this project out of alternative one.

Correct. And the funding, however, is still loitering in there. So let me back up because I think, so you have, you have adjusted the scope of the project.

It still includes all the compliance elements of the DEQ compliance agreement schedule that we mentored into in terms of litter boxes, port holes, the junction boxes, the addition of the flow meters, the isolation valves. The portion of the projects that has been changed is a

rehabilitation of the springs instead of a relocation of the springs. Rehabilitation and actual construction of the springs.

Those two, those are the two pieces that we're really peeling off and away from it to kind of separate it as a kind of more of a phase B piece. So we'll, as we learn more and construct this first phase, this first piece with the main transmission line and up to the actual perforated pipe. And we can make a further analysis on if we're actually getting the right amount of flow then we'll determine through you all, okay, if you guys want to proceed on constructing it.

So we're really kind of slowing down trying to make wise decisions and spending the money in a wise way. That's really the gist of it. Okay, sure.

I'm still digesting. So what do you, what is your new estimate of what a project this first phase will cost? So that's a great question. I've estimated it.

I've left the numbers the same. And we can probably work that out. The numbers are the same, even though I've taken the pieces out.

And the reason for that is because a lot of times when we're doing these facility plans, we don't have funding in place. So in this case, you guys have funding in place already. And so we just simply left the numbers the same.

And as we move forward in construction and design, we'll be able to hone them on what the actual cost reduction is. So clearly we're removing that piece, but we left the numbers the same just for simplicity's sake and just for funding. But you understand this is tied to a bond, right? And the voters voted for what was in the project and the outcomes that people were told we would get for the project.

So council member, again, this is a high overview facility plan. They are working on the preliminary engineering, which will have the more detailed cost estimates on everything. And that is the actual plan.

The facility plan is much like the wastewater facility plan, where we listed everything that we could possibly do. And then we picked the ones that we can actually afford to do. And we got the funding to do those.

And when we get the actual preliminary engineering and then we move into the final plan, that's when we start dialing in our numbers on the actual costs and how much we're going to be drawing down if any off the loan. But see, that's actually not how it works. It's not how bonds work.

The bond is tied to that technical draft. And yet these are material changes to that document. And the council is not able to speak for the voters for this type of material change.

And you can't simply move a project out and not subtract it from the amount. And we've also

other things that we're going to hold on to all of the money. That's not how it works.

And I understand that everybody's set it up to work that way, but it's actually not how it works. So I did have a conversation with your bond council this afternoon about a bond term or anything like that. And I did not speak for them, but they said the approach that we had was fine.

That we did not need to do anything. So if you're having a lot more questions, you might want to reach out and talk to them. No, no, I'm going to work with the AG.

But I have to tell you that there are very specific laws and the council is not able to vote on this. And the fact that DEQ has even missed a certain ban. So I guess I'm wondering, is this part of like you're updating us and then we're going to hear the legal arguments and how we can reserve the voter approval? Or we can even take that route or we can go back to the technical draft that was approved and we can just move the project forward that way.

You guys don't have to make a decision tonight. Either option is on the table. So we can do that.

We were trying to go down the route to save money on some of your environmental work. It was potentially having to be done because right now, as we've been moving forward on the environmental documentation case, if we were to include the New Springs collection system in there, we would have to get archeological survey on that case in addition to the stuff down south of that. So there's some cost savings and there's also a time savings as well.

So something that we've just recently learned that an archeological survey is required. So that's another reason that we're trying to shift this and streamline the schedule. Thank you.

Okay. Yes. Oh, I'm wondering who's buying council and will they have perhaps give some sort of written statement or something? Chad, I'm going to ask you to, this is a lot of respect to your question.

This isn't an open public question at this time. But I would ask that we could have a follow up with your question at another time. Thank you so much.

I will say Chad, I just want to say that the response that you gave on the, my question about the project isn't exactly in line with what I thought was being discussed when you presented to council tonight. It was under the understanding that the relocation of the springs was the main adjustment from SS1. And that the rehabilitation and all the things that are outlined in here are still the priority in getting in compliance with DEQ.

And I see how you've separated off the two projects. I clearly see how you've made that adjustment, but the main difference I was seeing was the construction of the new spring collection system. And right now, what we were talking about was because of the valve, and the testing of the CFS being a free CFS and the discussion with the land owner, not having a desire to move the springs collection, that we've gone with something that says the springs

themselves are functioning for the quantity of water and all of the compliance elements that are needed, that are still part of the large scope of the project are in place.

So I guess the way that you language it when we were just having that discussion could make it seem like there are substantial changes to the facility plan. But when you were communicating and when we were having our water team discussions, they seemed more minor, which is why it didn't seem as big of an issue. What I'm hearing is being language a little bit in City Hall.

So if we could just dive into maybe exactly what is changing very clearly to see how big of a change we're actually talking about in terms of the project. And if what Council Member Reed is saying in terms of what the voters voted for versus what we have on the table here, because I think there's a bit of a misunderstanding there. So I'll start kind of down to reservoir.

So from your reservoir, going east up Muldoon Canyon Road or thereabouts, we're going to run a new transmission line all the way up to your spring number, or actually lower springs. And then we will run, so there'll be a new pipeline three miles up, basically. And then we'll have some collector pipes from your, it will collect the water from your springs, springs three, two, and one.

We'll be having new piping running to the actual spring collection system. So basically a pipe collecting the flow from springs three, two, and one. And the same for the upper springs.

We'll have new piping up to the springs themselves. So that takes care of the piping piece. So basically all new piping, for the springs themselves, the springs, the pipelines, the perforated pipes, they're actually collecting the water.

We're going to focus, we're not going to, we're not going to replace them or rehab them or construct any new collection systems. So that's where the main difference is right there. But we will address the ACAS items, okay, in those.

So that's high priority. And then there's also some diversion structures, two or three of those that we will either replace or rehab. And we also, we're going to do a flooring building.

Those are all. You know, we've listed that on page 61, the highlighted facility plan. So with that, when we're talking about the funding for the project in the long term, I just want to clarify that the, sorry.

It's the breakdown of the financials and projects just for the under construction. So alternative one was what was selected in the technical facility plan. And this was alternative one in the, this updated final facility plan.

And so the substantial portions of the project, I need the transmission line at roughly 6 million. So two thirds of the project cost. And so the main kind of change we're looking at right now is that SS one, the connection to savings, create existing springs collection system.

I think that the, the question is legitimate is what we see cost reduction in that. And the answer is highly likely potentially. Yeah.

Well, it's, it's highly likely because we're removing the, the actual perforated reconstruction of the perforated. But in the springs and lawyer, would the council and committee members see the financials of what that reduction will look like in the PR construction, but you can see it. We can do some numbers in the PR.

Okay. So that's a preliminary engineer. So then, so let me just get back to it.

I understand. First of all, I think many of these projects, they're totally appropriate. That's not what it's about.

What the voters went to the polls were, they were told that the springs collection system was going to be rebuilt and that public access improvements critical to this. This was part of our standing. That was part of it.

Part of the mayor's letter right before the election itself. These were all pieces of it. And these, and these were foundational.

You don't have TV one originally without, because you would have never triggered the requirement for the transmission line to move. If we hadn't said that we wanted to work on that strength. So the residents were expecting that these friends collection system was going to be rebuilt, that we were going to have better public access.

And this was perpetuity that we weren't going to have these problems going forward. There's difficulty accessing, accessing these things because of the expense or what have you. That was a big part of the sales pitch to the residents about this.

So now we're on to a transmissions line, a \$6 million project that should hopefully help us with possibly leaps and all of that. So there's still a quantity component. Absolutely.

But we were sold on this was going to get us more water. It was going to be a better way to manage it. And we were going to move the transmission line to service it.

And now that is gone. The public access improvements are gone. And those are those constitute material changes.

People did not say we want to spend \$6 million to move the transmission line. So, yeah, those are important points to draw back on. I do want to say, though, that the public access point and even the easement point is not gone.

There are still easement discussions that need to be had and easements that need to be worked out with whatever design is drawn up. So before the springs. Well, what have you said? You're saying what it's not.

I don't I don't agree. I don't agree with your statement that L.A. one completely is wiped out. Well, I just need to see far more detail.

And there's no way right now that the city council could possibly go to accept a facility plan that is tied to the bond that establishes legal authority from the city council over the voters that the voters would not have say if you adopt this facility plan tonight. And there's just far too much that is unknown. There is.

And this to me is totally. I can't even figure out what we're doing at this point. It's still so incomplete.

I think we've shifted from asking questions. Chad. Yes.

You're right. We have shifted from asking questions to deliberating. And I'm uncomfortable with that spot with that space until it gets to ask.

Yes. I just kind of felt like that's where we were going. OK.

So do other council members at this point at this time have questions for that or questions? Chad, I just have one question. Can you go back to your conversation with our bond council? And can you just reiterate your statement? Yeah. So so we had a discussion with your bond council today and just talked about actually we used your concerns and brought those.

They have a copy of those as you brought up some good points. You know, we want to make sure we're doing this the right way. And so they the way that I presented presenting it to me now, they said that there was no issue of the subject that you brought up to me.

So I want to also clarify for the community, just just so the council is very aware when DEQ gave Chad the option of how to move forward, they gave us an option to simply write a letter and also otherwise bringing it to city council. I made the decision to bring it to city council so that we can have a more open public discussion rather than just writing a letter and moving past this and sweeping it. So this is being brought to council to have that open discussion and to have that more transparent discussion where we work as an option to just kind of move quickly over it.

So I'm not I just let you know, I think it's important that we're having this discussion and that we're asking the right questions. And so I appreciate you being prepared to have, you know, this discussion council and also chat for you checking in with bond council and providing the information of how DEQ gave you instruction on how to move forward on this. And so just to clarify for council, this is Chad bringing this final facility plan update or adjustment back to council is at the direction of DEQ and him having council approve it is at the direction of DEQ and he's being advised to use that process.

And he's now also being consulted that from bond council that this is the process to be taken. So he's been guided by the best intentions is all I just wanted to say in terms of in terms of the

way that America has been approaching this. Tammy.

Thank you for responding. Well, I think backing up, which I mentioned this before, you guys are comfortable with amending the facility plan. There is another option to do a very similar process without having to make a motion to do that.

So we can't we can't do that. We've learned that today. So that's, you know, and I think at the crux of this, it's really that you guys, you guys, you guys want to move forward and construct new springs or do you want to drop back from this actual spring collections? That's the moment they were saying being perforated pipes, you know, on the property owners property and and reconstructing the lower springs.

Those are the two main items in that alternative. You want to just forward and do that or do you want to drop back and make a decision on a little bit slower basis when we learn a little bit more information? That's that's really a lot of what's driving. I agree.

But it's not for us to decide because it's not our money. Right. That's my point.

I don't think any of your adjustments are inappropriate. I don't think your findings are inappropriate. I think you're asking a group of people that is not in a position to answer that question that the voters are the ones who said, yes, we want this this and this because this is what you told us we could have.

And so that's why I actually the technical draft. Yeah. I mean, that's why we reached out to Bond Council.

Right. Yeah. And that's wonderful.

But I've also reached out to Bond Council and have them tell me that the math on the bond was accurate. You know, so I think everybody has a different take. And so I think we can put a pause on the legality because I don't think I know.

I understand what you're saying, but I think that we we have counsel that the city has hired that is getting approval of this process. So if the council is not comfortable with this process, I need to hear that from all council members that we need to substantially make a change in the process, how we're going to address this moving forward. And if I hear that from all council, then that was something to consider on how we're going to handle this process moving forward.

What Chad is simply asking is right now we have the original technical technically approved facility plan. The entire process still had to have a final facility plan approval with DEQ. So we did go to the technical facility plan.

Well, it was part of the process. The final facility plan was the next step in the process. There's multiple steps in the process.

So the final facility plan has to be completed and approved by DEQ. At this time Chad is asking council if they would like to move forward with the original technical facility plan that he's referring to or take a step back and realize that the information that's been collected since that was presented to you and now we have found that the current springs with the current perforated pipe or the pipe that's in the ground is supplying the quantity of water that meets our water rate. So rebuilding the new collection system while still potential for the project will be the ultimate cost of the project as if we look at all the different alternatives it would be the ultimate cost of the project or would you like to look at this slightly less expensive project that also meets the desire of the landowner and use the current collection system that's in place still meet all the compliance and move forward with the other elements of the project that were part of the bond.

So the change is to the collection system which if you look at the entire proportion of the money that was asked for for the bond is \$1.16 million of a \$9.6 million project. I'm not trying to minimize what the voters voted for. I just want to put it in perspective that the voters voted for a bond in a \$9.6 million project and we're talking about \$1.16 of it.

I just want to ask for clarification. The new transmission name as you stated from the Hank back is necessary. Right? So and I'm just going to summarize how I hear it.

I hear you reprioritizing at the moment based on current information. We're going to move forward with the installation of the transmission name and in the interim we are going to continue to be collecting the data and working with the things that need to happen. And that gives us enough time instead of doing it the other way around and pushing forward to rebuild the collection system of that Siemens Creek.

We're going to kind of do it the other way around. That's the simplest version of what I'm hearing is happening. And not saying anybody's cutting anything out at this time.

It's like just building up a home and you start digging and you figure out you've unearthed stuff and you've got to stop and you can't move forward exactly as you planned. But there are still some things that we can do that are part of the plan. So we're going to still do those so we don't hold up because they need to be done regardless.

We're not going to hold that up while the people who need to get together to improve that with the impacts of the either replacing or not replacing the perforated collection system is further analyzed and assessed based on the new information that we've been provided. Great. And I don't want to just clarify one piece.

It was a good summary. But we can we really we can go back and use the face of the technical facility plan and still phase this if we go back to that piece and accomplish the same thing and not construct the new perforated pipes. We can go that way or we and not make any agree to this resolution or we can take the resolution.

I run quite flexibly in both of those We can still phase it if that's what you guys want to do. And construct it like describe here. I can still phase it and I'm sorry I lost my point.

I want to clarify for you that LE1 which is SO \$1 million was tied into land acquisitions for SS1. So it's really more than a \$2 million commitment. And the other thing is, is it or any inclusion in this project was directly related to the fact that we were touching the springs collection system and that any that there was an agreement with that landowner that if we touched that the transmission lines had to be changed had to be moved and because of the movement probably also in the gravity fed system there was some of that needed as well.

It was never a standalone element or a preliminary aspect of this. This derived from SS1. Everything in that technical draft suggests that.

So the project structure even states that. But now I'm hearing something different. Can you clarify that that was also a predominant direction? I want to correct you again.

LE1 is still tied to SS1 in this facility plan that you have in front of you as well. Not in the same way. LE1 is still tied to SS1.

It is still tied to the spring collection. Is that correct? Because that is the predominant element. Do we get public access as was a huge predicate of that acquisition piece for the relocated slash new spring? The transmission line has always been the rotation line.

And the easement part has also been a big part of the discussion from day one. We literally have the bond brochure. I have the bond brochure pulled up.

I understand what you are saying but in terms of what was sold to the voters, the bond brochure and the bond language, I don't know if there is a question there to respond to. But at this point, I feel like we are getting to a point where we need to make a decision. I think the presentation of the information and phasing it out is phasing it out as we have been looking at the timeline.

Again, the discussion at hand is this is a facility plan. This is not the project that is being designed. What has been written is a facility plan with some alterations and the original SS1 being moved down to SS5.

So the facility plan still has options. Alternative 1 now speaks to a connection to the collection system. That is what you are being asked to approve tonight.

If the council is not ready to approve that, we need direction for our engineers. At this time, I would ask council to have a discussion about this so we can understand where you are. If there are lingering questions, we can go back and ask questions again.

Council, I'm turning it over to you for deliberation. I believe the council has the legal authority to make a determination on this because there are significant changes. Those changes

mandate the law that it goes back to their statement.

I think voters should be asked what they want to do. appreciate Suzanne's comment. I have some questions and would like to know if it is an option for us to have a bond council present or available at our next meeting so we can hear directly from our bond council what their legal opinion is with regards to some of the issues.

Thank you. Are we going into bad territory by waiting two weeks? Two years. I'm sorry.

It's been two years. Who else would like to speak? Tom? You used the term plow ahead. We don't want to plow ahead.

That gives me a pause. If we can make adjustments to this that would save money and are not considered material, the material is the defining legal criteria for evaluating this. We can do things that are acceptable as long as they're not material.

That's why I think Diane's suggestion is a good one. We can have that conversation a little bit. I think that's important to have.

Find out what parameters we have moving forward. Based on what we learned, we can reduce the cost of this project, if my understanding is correct, or delay the cost. Talk about phase 1, phase 2, but I'm not seeing a number up there.

If you go with alternative 2, there's no number, meaning that's dropped. It's delayed. It's not necessary, essentially, is my understanding, and therefore it would be dropped from the project.

Is that accurate? Or am I not understanding that correctly? But if something, based on what we studied, is unnecessary now, then certainly the council should consider that because that is potentially a savings, and it would be supportive of such a change. you. Jenny? About projects, and I agree with what Tom said.

A partner sits here and thinks if the company we have hired to oversee this project, if, and I'm just sharing my personal thought, if he sits there and he tells me he contacted the council, because now I'm paying him to represent me and the city of Bellevue, if I can tell him he didn't talk to the council, I would be remiss and you would be fired. That's my personal thought on that. So with that, the fact that if any projects, things like this come up, always, always, you make modification.

And whether or not the site rebuilt based solely on the CFS or not feels like that's one of the things in question, right? So where are we going to be rebuilding based on what we thought we weren't getting enough quantity. If we are, does that mean we don't need to rebuild them? It's not a question I feel comfortable answering at this point based on the information I've heard and I've been told. but the new collection system, the lines, they need to be installed.

We've known that for a bunch of years. That's not a secret either. So I don't have a problem with reprioritizing because no one is saying it's not going away at this point.

But if in the end something could be removed and we could save our taxpayers money and it's prudent to be the right thing to do, then that's how we're supposed to act. We're supposed to act in the best interest within the law, absolutely. Our representatives say we're doing a good job.

We're doing a good job. We're doing a good job. We're doing a good job.

We're doing a good job. We're good job. good job.

We're doing a good job. time constraints we're dealing with. And don't respond to this thing tonight and this is I'm going to, unless there's another round of discussion here, I would like to open it back to ask, open it back up to ask a couple of questions, clarification based on your comments during deliberation, um, or if there's something else, Diane, do you want me to say? It looks like you're coming in on it.

I am, uh, and that has to do with, um, this letter from Suzanne, and I guess that would be one of my questions for our block council, would be about the realities that she has raised here, like us moving ahead, or not moving ahead, or adopting this resolution. I'm thinking out loud at this point. In this case, wouldn't our own council just be responsible for making sure we get paid at the end of the day? At the moment, it's still valid, but do they really have that restriction to say, that's what the city can do over the voters? Right? I mean, it seems like, I don't know how Suzanne's been, we all agreed to pay for a project, or have a project completed.

It'd be easier to proceed forward with the proposed project, and we come to these things like, oh, maybe we don't need to revisit this. Then we notify people, instead of trying to change this whole plan. Because those things are crazy.

And also, there's still discovery that needs to be made to be confident that we need them or we don't need them. Until you guys put a boat in the ground, you have solid answers on some of these things. We're not, we haven't.

Sorry. That's okay. But I'm making that, I'm making notes.

So at this time, it seems like I want to direct some questions back to Chad if Council is in agreement with that. So, go ahead and ask your question to Chad. Like on the Siemens Creek, the existing Springs collection, will we know if that needs to be replaced until you guys are actually in the ground digging, working on the transmission lines? It kind of has to be phased.

It will be phased. Once we get the new plumbing, then we'll be able to really determine if the flow measurement of 3CFS in the tank is really an accurate measurement of what we're receiving out at the top. So that's difficult to perceive, but that's what we're looking for.

We want to make sure you're getting it up there, not down here with the potential of actually collecting the more water. That's one of our main concerns. And then, question for you.

Is there a time consequence in terms of not making a decision on this tonight in terms of, that was Tom's question, time consequence for the project? Yeah, so this will further delay the approval of moving forward and approval of the environmental information document and the facility plan, which will further delay a significant amount of approval of the PDR. It just kind of trickles down. A follow-up question based on what you said.

If we start with the original facility plan and you design your PDR around that and the construction plan, and at the point when you got to the springs and you put these flow meters in and you determined, hey, we actually don't need to reconstruct these, would we then be able to come back and make an adjustment to the plan to save the voters money? Why the adjustment in the facility plan first versus doing it as you're kind of communicating to the council now where you need more information? Can you clarify that? So this kind of really kind of was borne out a lot of discussion today. We already had this one here moving forward. I guess the differences really are, it comes down to the cultural survey that will need to be done.

So there's more than likely going to be an archaeological survey done. So will it include this new collector springs or not? Okay. So that's really the difference between whether you approve, make this resolution, put the facility plan as we have amended, as highlighted, or if you take the route of using the technical draft approach, we can use that one, but we would face a construction as like a phase one.

And once it's built, then we have to get flow data. So we can't get flow data until it's constructed. And then once we get some flow data on what the flow is actually is up the springs, then we can have an update and say, okay, yeah, we're only getting two CFS now because we have a solid pipeline going from the top to the bottom.

We're not getting a bunch of infiltration into our pipe on the collector lines that we never really even had. So, so that's the big, that's the big differences. I hope that's helpful.

Okay. So I was just, I thought the memo was stated that farm council or water council or some sort of advice that pursuing this plan was not feasible. And for the springs, I thought that was the predicate for changing, but now you're saying we could ignore that.

We could ignore the landowner. Just pretend that we're doing. Is that what I understood? Because the memo said that the memo that came with the solution, the fact that I said, I said that during the discussions, Chris Bromley, our water attorney was worried about moving the collection system or rehabilitating it.

Because if we go any deeper or if we move it outside the quarter, quarter, quarter, the 10 acres from our points of diversion, we could jeopardize our priority data. But that's something that. That's something we absolutely can't do.

We lose our priority gain. We lose it all. We can't move.

We can't. I've been around out there in those springs. I didn't believe that.

But that's the plow ahead. We would be more. Well, I guess it's a bad thing.

But yeah, sorry. No, I mean, I'm for the best plan possible. I'm simply suggesting that you can't.

I can't. You mentioned the installing the transmission line all the way to the tank where you could evaluate how much water is coming through the springs. Why can't you evaluate how much water is coming through the springs at the end of the first line of pipe? All right.

You're going to have a load of springs. And the first line of pipe should tell you what the pre-CFS or not. You shouldn't have to develop a whole transmission line to do that.

I like what you think. Yeah. There's some alternative.

We could do that. I'm not saying. I mean, you set a direction on the first pipe.

And therefore, you can't. You know, it's like that sets the direction and you're kind of established. You can't really do that or change plans.

But it seems like as far as flow. Yeah. Right.

You would know that. I mean, it's going to take this kind of a structure. Yeah.

Okay. Okay. Okay.

Okay. Okay. Okay.

Okay. Okay. Okay.

Okay. Okay. Okay.

Okay. Okay. Okay.

From our folks. From that direction. When we find out that it's not VCFS.

We're gonna have to move with that. If we had. Construct a new, I think the transmission might as well.

And for the most part. When we get back where we would construct the springs up and down. We had to drop back a little bit.

And there's also, you know, perhaps, with other alternatives, we could be collecting well right at the springs, and right now we could do that. We could, there's also that. We could get, you know, in gear and moving, and it would take a little bit of excavation, and some installation of some, you know, some bag beaters probably, and some manipulation of the pipe under a

whole pipe flow.

I'm thinking of a box there, but, yeah. Is that included, is the cost to do that already included in all of this, or would that, is that separate? So, I mean, we would, we would, some would be, some would be separate, I think. I'm Gavin from Council.

Go ahead, Chris. I do want to say that we've had an outside engineering firm come do measurements and come do assessments on the weirs so we can get an idea of where our current measurements up at the spring are at. Since that project, since we started this project, we put a new flow meter at the tank and abandoned the old flow meter, and we're getting solid readings off of it.

It's a meter that has been, what do you call it, calibrated, and it's been installed now for about a year. I believe the flows are pretty good. We have had this conversation a few times about digging up part of the last part of the transmission line and putting temporary meters on them so we can see if we are losing water somewhere, gaining water where we don't know.

And this project started in 1880. It has had revisions every 20 to 40 years since then. It happened in 1920.

It happened in 1947. It's happened in 85. And here we are again.

So we know that collection system is good. It is a good source of water. We are getting good readings.

And if we can just get the data and save the city money, I don't see why look at a project that has been under, it's been engineered by this council for over 10 years. This is our third work engineering firm that's helped the city with this project. We've finally gotten this far with it.

And I think it would be a detriment to our community and to our water right to look at saving us some money and for minor fixes, minor changes to the overall project. So what I'm hearing from council at this time, I don't, I'm not getting general concessions from council that anyone's, everyone is comfortable living for it without on council leaning in front of deal, not on, not the fact that Chad has spoken to on council that you need to speak to mom council as the city council about it. And from my perspective and with respect to my, my comments, it's, it's, I don't not trust you.

I, it just gives me pause and I'm, I'm very torn. I will say this is a huge responsibility representing the city and making decisions like this. And I appreciate what our city attorney says about losing our water, right? Because that can't be, we're losing our position in our water, right? I guess for lack of a better.

So, so then I would ask the council to put a motion on the table to continue this to the next city council meeting, which annually confirm is April 13th. And at that time I can work with Merrick or our works director and bond council to bring back a clear, clear facility plan situation for you

all to make a decision on at the next meeting. And so is that our option then this evening to table it or do you continue it to our next meeting or pass it as is written as it is as written resolution in your pockets.

If there is consensus to pass it as written, and if there is not then a motion to continue to the next Council meeting. Are there modifications to the resolution as written that council would like to discuss? Is there a builder option beside that? I guess it was the sort of post I'm saying after everything that has transpired in the last, let's say 24 to 48 hours, I mean, outside the fact that it didn't have to be brought this way, not trying to hide anything, just saying it could have just said, Hey, we need to rearrange the schedule. You know, we need to have this information.

So people do general doing the job all the time. Right. I'm just saying that didn't happen.

Is there another option besides just passing a resolution that wasn't necessarily in the first place? I'm just trying to say, we could have just said, Hey, why can't you, can you rearrange the schedule? Can you get this information? I don't need to pass a resolution to say I don't need to pass it. You can't tell me that. Please don't keep that in front of me, please.

Oh, so. I didn't just see. Okay.

For tonight. Yeah. The option at hand is to have a resolution in front of you that you could make minor modifications to on the fly as we have done, you know, without resolutions or I would, I would ask that you move it to the continuing to the next.

So for tonight, I would say those are, unless there's another option, because I'm supposed to be asking for this evening. I'm going to continue it to the next meeting. I'll call that.

Okay. Would you be safe in Washington? Continue it to April 13th. Yes.

Yes. Yes. No.

Yes. Thank you. So we will reconnect chat and bring this back again on April 13th.

Thank you for your time tonight. And thank you for making the drive up there. We appreciate you being here.

Okay. I am going to ask to take just a few minutes recess to the restaurant. And then we will jump on an eight, which is our roadwork session.

Don't race me. Let me go. Great.

Okay. Okay. I already did.

Yeah, no, they, she probably has to go out. It does not have this. What's this? It's.

I'm going to be. I'm going to. It's.

It's. It's. It's.

Okay. It is at this time. It's seven 24.

Yeah. I will go ahead and call the meeting back to order. And we're moving on to item eight.

This is our. Work session. Broke.

Broke. Landscaping and trees. And we have part of all the planner for the city of Bellevue is here to present tonight.

I'd love to turn it over to you. Perfect. Planner.

I have a presentation for y'all. A reminder. Last time.

We talked about. Bro was. Or.

General encroachments and especially parking, loading. Personal property sorts of the rights of way. A lot of those issues that people see.

In this particular, It's the city of Bellevue. And some of the. In words.

That. And so our residents said that we would like to manage through. Which is.

Part of what we are working on. Here at city hall as a cross department. Across the department.

And so we will have more to bring before council on that front. There may be some code changes that are needed to enable code enforcements, to enable ticketing, et cetera, that the Council has expressed interest in, especially in the past. And so as promised, this road work session is about trees and landscaping, but especially all the other kinds of encroachments into our rights of way that under our current code are not allowed.

Under our current code, if you go to the city and you say, I would like to plant a tree in the portion of the right-of-way in front of my house, according to our code, I have to tell you no, because it's not listed as a permanent encroachment. So this is something that would be lovely to fix. And then we'll also go into all the considerations for our utilities, et cetera, to make sure we can do that safely.

So we're right here in Trees and Landscape Management. Just as a reminder, we started off this effort with the initial town hall. Then in October, Brian Harker came before you, and the general consensus of the Council was to break this up into multiple work sessions in order to kind of make it more approachable and digestible, and so here we are.

So just some initial definitions. If you have questions, let me know, and we can skip them. So first, trees and landscaping.

Under our current code, if you see 922, does not allow trees, shrubs, or other plantings as

encroachments. It has a list of permanent encroachments, but they are very, very limited. And then under street tree requirements, we have a ton of different street tree requirements in our code, many of them contradictory.

There are multiple places in subdivision code that either say you need street trees or don't need street trees. It's up to PNC's discretion. Under design review, it's set as required for a number of zones.

However, it's not allowed as an encroachment. So these are things that we need to iron out with code changes to make sure that it's consistent across our code. And then our parks code provides for the Parks Committee to preserve and protect right-of-way trees.

However, our Parks Committee code is also extremely muddled because it was kind of chopped up and parts of it don't make sense anymore, don't flow. The Parks Committee has called different things and has conflicting responsibilities. So that's also a thing to figure out.

And then in 2006, the Development Treaty Committee adopted tree planting guidelines, which are likely outdated, the scans are old, and it does not seem like, just from my research, that it has been applied since 2006. And then just as far as root vegetation, our 1997 street standards require root vegetation in the row after disturbance for a project, but I don't see evidence that beyond the street standards, this is necessarily applied, but that's also just due to my research and innate of them. Existing conditions, I thought this part of the building right-of-way was illustrative.

You can see on one side of the street, there's a ton of trees and landscaping, and on the other side, there are none. And I just want to emphasize that under our current code, we can't regulate either one. We can't regulate people planting too many trees because it's not a permanent encroachment, and really, we'd have to tell them to tear them all out.

And if there's absolutely no trees in a right-of-way, if somebody wants to add one and they're putting in a driveway and they want to add the street tree as well, you can't legally permit that. So some considerations, shadows from trees, but especially our evergreens, shade snow, lead to ice buildups in the right-of-way, but they're also very, very good for heating in the summer. That's something to consider.

Safety, we already talked about. Oh, sorry, that's a vision triangle. Visual narrowing from trees can improve driving behavior and improve perceptions of neighborhood safety.

And there are multiple studies that show that, that when there are tree-lined streets, people drive slower and drive safer, and there's more of a sense that you're in a safe place. Vision triangle, we talked about that last time. Utilities, improperly planted trees can interfere with underground and aerial utilities.

Generally, the rule is do not plant a tree that goes taller than 25 feet under power lines. Do not plant a tree where the roots can interfere with our underground utilities within five to 10 feet of

underground utilities. One nice thing about Bellevue is that our underground utilities are located relatively deep.

And then future planning, large trees can complicate future sidewalks, road expansions, pathways, and water sewer projects. You can see here that it's going to be more expensive to build a sidewalk on the north side of the street because you're going to have to chop down a ton of trees, pull out the trucks. Irrigation and water use.

In-ground irrigation in the right-of-way can expend substantial water, and it is much of what has damaged our current road infrastructure. When there's in-ground irrigation in our right-of-way, the water gets under and damages our roads. Downtown and commercial streets should be considered differently than our residential areas with tighter tree planting restrictions and engineering standards, because for those you are putting in tree gates, you're building boxes to hold the soil underground, so those need stricter engineering standards.

And just as far as vehicles and storage and many of the issues that we see in our right-of-way, right-of-way that is used for trees and vegetation deters illegal parking, living, and storage. So it can be considered as part of the solution. I think a lot about passive infrastructure and how when we have infrastructure that deters illegal behavior, we don't have to put as much work into code enforcement and actively going out to change behavior because the design of our town incentivizes behavior, which is what it's doing already.

And then just as far as the specs, I don't think I need to tell you on this, but trees look good. Code examples, I did some of the other Bellevue's. Certain street trees are required on specific streets in Bellevue, Washington.

So say one corridor may have a standardized tree that's used, and then the next corridor over will have a different tree. So it causes general biodiversity, but it also looks uniform when you're passing down the street. It looks really nice.

Bellevue, Iowa, which is weirdly similar to Bellevue, Idaho, requires permits to plant street trees. They're relatively simple and cheap. A utility locate must occur before planting.

So you'll go out to find where you want to put a tree. The public works team will come out and look at that spot and say, yeah, we've located the utility. It's far enough away.

You're good to go. There's your permit. And trees must have specific spacing standards.

In Seattle, Washington, they have a max height for non-tree landscaping. They encourage drought-tolerant native plants. They have other standards.

Oh, applications for, if you want to have a tree as an encroachment, et cetera, have no fee. So that incentivizes people to go get a permit for a tree because they're not paying a hundred bucks like if you were paying for an encroachment permit for a driveway. In Vancouver, British Columbia, going international is some of the examples.

Now, as you'll see later, edible and food plants are allowed, chemical pesticides are prohibited, and in-ground irrigation is prohibited, which is something we'll recommend later for us. So some of my recommendations as far as trees and landscaping, add trees back to the title and mission of the Bellevue Parks Committee because we don't currently have anymore a body that really is looking at trees and focusing on them. And I believe Bellevue Parks and Trees Committee Reborn, which the Bellevue Parks Committee appears generally supportive of, could help advance recommendations such as recommendation two, which is to adopt new street tree guidelines.

And they can also provide oversight for if we hire a trimming company for our industry. I recommend either the 2013 Wood River Valley Tree Guide or Haley's Recommended Street Tree List because both seem fairly applicable here. And especially the Wood River Valley Tree Guide I think is very good.

And selections from those are in your packets. Tap the parks and maybe also Trees Committee with recommending updated street tree guidelines and consider budgeting for a city-wide tree inventory, which we actually just bought a \$10,000 grant for from the Keystone Concept and Wayne County. So we'll be able to do a tree inventory and then further management of our community forest by a licensed farmer's work team.

Third is to simply allow trees and vegetation as permitted encroachment, require utility located prior to tree planting, require trees to be at least eight feet from the road surface. I worked with Casey on this one and do not allow trees within five to 10 feet of underground utilities. Do not allow trees with a mature height of 25 feet to or more under power lines.

And that's something that our hopefully new street tree guidelines document could assist us with. Require street trees as part of new development projects and major additions. Require street trees at least 30 to 40 feet in every zone.

Currently, this is the case, except for our general residential zone, which is most of the land in Bellevue and where people live and would benefit from a consistent tree canopy. And then require, oh, change the definition of major addition to be those that add a residential unit, increase the structure size by 20% or more, or increase parking by more than 20% that would be focused on commercial developments. And these standards basically are standard for major addition right now, which is only found in our design review code.

It says that it's \$50,000 or more. And I think that having the standard not be a one size fits all for all properties, parcels, et cetera, would be beneficial. Consider requiring new development to provide a certain number of trees on private property or certain canopy coverage standards.

Currently, I think what you'll see in some of the new subdivisions in Bellevue is that a property, Marks and Dell jokes about this all the time, they'll put in like maybe one evergreen and a maple, and that's it for the whole property and the whole rest is grass. So having more trees would reduce the water usage on those properties, provide more habitats and more consistent

forest and would be beneficial to the colony as much overall. So this would affect our zoning code because it would be on private property and it would be for new development suddenly.

And then consider different ways of doing that and then prohibit in-ground permanent irrigation within the right of way, service drip irrigation by lines would be totally encouraged. Do not allow new encroachments of grass lawn in our rights of way. Those encourage a lot of water usage, which damages the streets, damages our utilities and uses a lot of water that we can't afford to use.

Prohibit usage of pesticides and chemical fertilizers in the right of way and reaffirm the right pre-vegetation must occur in any area where desired plants were removed for encroachment and construction work. These are in our 1997 street standards, but those are very hard to find and reference and putting it in code would be very beneficial. Okay, then this is an easier one, ornamental features.

Currently, if you want to put a sculpture in part of the right of way in front of your house, that's not technically a permanent encroachment. If you want to have garden docks, if you want to put one of those arch things that vines grow on, any of those sorts of things our code does not allow. Some of our rights of way contain sculptures, benches, little free libraries, artifacts.

I can think of ones that have wagons and I think they're fantastic. They add to the character of our community. They add to walkability.

They add interest generally and I think they should be encouraged, but our current code is not allowed. And if we want to be consistent about our encroachments, really, we shouldn't let somebody do that. We shouldn't let them put ornamental features in front of their house.

And I want us to be able to, considerations are aspects. And British Columbia, I mean, Vancouver is good at that. Wrong example, but it's in your package.

And then my recommendations are just to allow those features in the right of way as permanent encroachments. This will need a very good definition in code. This is what it hinges on, because we want to allow the things that we want in the right of way.

We're not allowing the things we don't want. So we don't want somebody to say that their junk vehicle is an ornamental decorative feature. We don't want somebody to say that a wrecking ball that they put out there is a decorative feature or other things that are typical or expensive to move or things that serve as storage.

But we want all those other things. So we need a good definition. Garden boxes should not be above a certain height or too large.

That was a behest of Casey. And allow the administrative to reject ornamental features that encounter the right of way, impede snow removal or utilities or block visibility. And then pedestrian approaches.

This is something I added for us to look at, because walking around town, you notice that people have snow walkways to their front door, but most of them stop at the right of way, because technically our code does not allow that. It doesn't encourage that. You can't technically extend that all the way to the road surface.

And my main consideration I put here is accessibility. If you're getting dropped off by friends in your house and you're in a wheelchair, it's gonna be much easier to get to your front door if the pedestrian approach goes all the way to your front door. It's also better for delivery personnel, those of age and with disabilities, like I said, and first responders.

So Seaside, California gives encroachment permits for these and it seems to work right here. And my recommendation is to allow them. The major stipulation is that, just say something's a pedestrian approach, but then it's car parking 100% of the time, or that the road surface is pavers, because our snow plows will just rip on that.

And then swales and drainage. In our street standards from 1997, which is kind of reincorporating ones from 1985, and our street standards in 2021, there are swales shown as standard and swales are kind of the dips on the side of the road that collect water and allow for percolation of water into the ground, which can control flooding. And it's part of our street standards.

However, our code does not strictly allow them as permanent encroachments. So if somebody is building a road from scratch, they'll put in swales, but if you want to put in one in front of your house and you apply for an encroachment, it's questionable as to if you can. So a handful of these exist around town, in our right-of-way.

They have not been built to previous standards. They do provide a degree of water retention. Most, however, are built with grass or rock.

I think the problem with having them made of grass is that it's grass in the right-of-way. It still needs to be watered. It still encourages water consumption and also further damages our utilities and roads.

If it's all rock, you're walking next to basically a heat sink in the summer, and it encourages sucking up heat. So breaking up swales with plantings, with grass, et cetera, can bring a visual monotony if it's only rocks, as well as provide shade, et cetera. And then some of the considerations are impermeable surfaces and flooding, safety, because swales can be a hazard to road users if they're not designed correctly.

And so we need some standards around, for example, when there's a swale that's going around the corner of a road, how do we differentiate that so you're not in danger when you're turning, so you don't turn right into the swale? We want you to be able to see it at night and during the day when it's snowing and don't want it to be too steep, but also if it's too shallow, it's not acting correctly, it's a swale. So those are some of my standards. I'll have some

recommendations on safety.

And then accessibility, swales can block pedestrian access to properties, so there's some different features that can help to overcome that. Beautification, I think that swales can be a visual detriment if they're monotonous and cause undue heat in the summer. So we should try to make sure that swales are filled with landscaping, including trees, and it can actually encourage trees to be healthier and happier because there's more water getting into the swales and watering the trees, and it's encouraging water to percolate into the tree's roots.

And then swales also, on the other hand, are very good at discouraging parking and discouraging your personal property storage because it's a dip and you don't wanna park it. It was very hard to find a code example of explicit encroachments for swales. So Townsville, Australia, which is an AI-sounding name, the street trees in the swale have to be free to be from curb, sorry, stair.

Anyways, my recommendations are that swales be explicitly permitted as encroachments. They should be required to contain trees and vegetation. I am, well, I'm receptive to recommendations as to how much vegetation you think should be required, whether it should be large rocks required.

I think they were really nice, but I don't know why it would need to be required. And then swales in business and industrial zones should be considered on a case-by-case basis and with a lot more scrutiny because sidewalks, other curbs, other improvements are typically required in those zones. And then consider requiring swales as required improvements for new residential developments.

It could be required in a portion of the right-of-way. It could be required for all non-encroached portions of the right-of-way, however we decide to approach. So I will just move to explain how this all fits together.

Basically the first work session that we had, we solely talked about approaches and we talked about some of the things that we would like to mitigate and manage more in our right-of-way. And now we have talked about things that we would like to encourage and see more of which are not currently allowed in our right-of-way. These enclosures are included in your packet.

I tried to limit it to only the most relevant information. And the next steps, give me a feedback on those recommendations, what you think, what you like, what you don't like. So with that, I'll send questions.

Thank you, Carter. Any questions from the council at this time? Or we could have an audience question. I said, I let her know that we could ask, she could ask a question.

Please. No. Go ahead.

Go ahead. Well, I'm not going to count it. I just, as a practical application for saying, replacing

all the grass, the same water, what do you suggest goes in this place? A bunch of asphalt and weeds and then you're saying take away.

I mean, it's all fine and dandy to say you can't spray and kill weeds, but are you going to have a crew out there picking the weeds? I mean, how are you going to, there's a lot of suggestions that don't have practical implementation to take care of and to maintain. For example, planting more trees means you have to get an arborist out there to cut away the dead wood. And especially with certain varieties of trees like cottonwoods and coblars and aspens are constantly dropping leaves.

Isn't this huge cleanup? Who's going to clean that up? It seems like grass is actually a low cost maintenance. And particularly if you plant something like that's heat tolerant, keep it cut and then you just don't water it and it comes back the next year. But you still, if you have rocky, barren soil that is blowing around and blowing away, I mean, what are you going to adjust? I'm just throwing this out as, and who buys drip irrigation? Who pays for that? As far as the drip irrigation, sorry, I lost track of.

Well, you said trees would be supplied with the drip irrigation. Who pays for that? The city, the land owner? If they want to plant something on the city right away? I'm not getting that. Well, currently the way it would work is you go plant a tree in the right of way and either you go supply water to it or it dies because the city isn't.

I think the intention would be to have a street tree list that once you maintain those trees and provide water to them for the first few years of their life, which would be required to be provided by drip irrigation. After that, they become established. Now, ideally we would have a street tree list that those species will tolerate being established and then not being provided with regular water with them.

Okay, Jackie, do you have multiple more questions? Yeah, I have some more just to, are you going to consider trees that grow really tall like the elms? And I wish you would hone in better on trees because trees like poplars, that especially hybrids grow enormous. They have a short lifespan. They're in severely messy as are the Siberian elms.

And they can fall over onto the next door neighbor's house. They can fall across the street and still take out somebody's property, car or otherwise. It's just planting trees instead of grass.

And I don't know, I don't think it's a win-win. But anyway, I just wish you slow down on the tree thing and maybe focus on, I mean, grass provides a heat, a carbon sink, and it alleviates heat. So I'm just wondering if you're ripping out all the grass and mandating it, what are you going to put instead? And I would say, let's stay for that comment.

Let's sit with that in terms of grass. And if there are more, And also maintenance. Who's going to pay for all the maintenance on this stuff? Thank you very much.

Council, any comments at this time? Or if you need time to sit with it, you can also email Carter

comments on his presentation. Tammy? I'm just asking because I've been in my house for 30 years, the same house. And when I moved in, there was a swell.

And there were swells all the way coming down Main Street. And a lot of the other streets that was like in the old, it was a part of the old aesthetic of the old way. And they don't know in many cities, they've done away with them.

So how are they resurfacing? And is that, how do they come back as a consideration? Even though I'm just wondering, as I know the guy in like Coastal Street, he's got a big old circle of swell. It is kind of cool. I don't know who put this in, but he didn't do it.

And part of why that swell ended up there on Pine Street in like four, I think, is that it is according to our current street standards. Our current 1997 street standards say that's the kind of swell you put in. Doesn't allow for grass, like tall grasses.

Doesn't allow for rocks, doesn't allow for trees. So it's just a hater for piles. Yeah.

And so part of this is changing our code and looking at how we can update our street standards to actually reflect what we want to see in the right way. Because from a planner's perspective, something that an engineer might recommend might be different from what, from a design perspective, you might want to see. And so we need to balance those.

You have a comment on this time? No, but we do have the option to reach out to Carter. Absolutely. Yeah.

I think there's a lot of information here to digest and respond to. And I didn't expect you all to be able to solve all these recommendations tonight. Yeah, no.

This one's a, yeah, this is a good one. And so I would just say, think about a minute on it, Jackie. Just have one more question.

Yeah. Were you suggesting that regulation, just to make sure I heard right, regulate trees on private property? Regulates the number of trees that are planted in new developments. In new developments.

Yeah. So say like historical developments, like my house is like, I don't know, built in the 70s. Let's say- Are you gonna regulate the trees on there if I want to plant them? No.

On private property, but in the right of way at this time, trees. So let's say you were putting in a new subdivision, you'd have to put in new trees as a part of that subdivision. In the right of way or in the private property? Both.

I didn't understand. Huh? Both. Both.

So you're suggesting that you would regulate tree planting on private property? For new developments, yes. That doesn't seem right. All right.

Let's table that. Okay, thank you. Anything else? Mayor, I would just like to move this forward.

I think you suggested that we reach out to Carter with comments about enforcement or anything else on this. We do have another agenda item to get to and- Well, Matt just reminded us of the work session and feedback is the whole purpose of this. None of this is ready to bring forward.

A lot of this really good information that I've heard, great job. Okay, yeah. Andrews? Yes.

So something that I wasn't noticed in years in Boise. Okay. And a big thing for them is property owners cannot touch trees in the right of way.

They belong to the city and the city has to maintain them. So it's any tree that's in the right of way is technically our property. Yeah.

And I think that has to occur so that we don't incur anything for those on the property. And I think that's part of why we need to transition the parks committee back to be looking at trees again because it's a complete blind spot that the last few years, nothing in the city, no one in the city could look at it. It's been such a long time.

Yes, let's say over 20 years. But yeah. No, and again, I think that's the point of maintenance is a very pertinent part of this discussion.

So I appreciate all the comments on that. After we have a tree inventory, we'll have a much better idea of what that might look like. Yes.

Yes. And then you, planting guide, it's not a game with more drought tolerant species right now than always. Yeah.

Okay. And I guess I just wanted to make a note to that point that even though it's in the right of way, most of Jason property owners, at least even historically and for many years, it wasn't the right of way. They never considered it the right of way.

They maintained it and planted out to it. New developments have remote delineated, right? They have a higher rate of delineation versus the old town people. Yeah.

Thank you. Right out to that road. Yeah.

So it wasn't like anybody's, the city's trying to not maintain. It's just like, are we able to establish them in a name fit or a fit? Thank you. Well, thank you Carter for putting this all together.

It's good. That is good. It is coming back to the council.

Yeah. Yes. This is all coming back to the council.

Yeah. We will have direct code languages when informed by the recommendations of staff and council. Thank you very much.

Okay. The last item on our agenda is item nine of the executive session. And when we go into executive session, everyone besides the council and the lawyer clears the room.

So thank you all for attending the meeting tonight. You forgot me? I don't know what that means. So I would ask for a motion to speak.

I don't think that's it. And what I'm looking for in fact is a question. I have a question.

Can you give one more tick? One. You're like a, a more bigger sentence. Yeah.

I was just trying to say, I've been doing it a year, and you haven't done it yet. You're doing it. Onto the next item.

Yes. Onto number one. Yes.

Number two. Yes. Onto number three.

Yes. Onto three minutes. Yes.