

CITY HALL
EVANSDALE, IOWA, JULY 30, 2019
CITY COUNCIL
DOUG FAAS, MAYOR, PRESIDING

The City Council of the City of Evansdale, Iowa met in special session, according to law, the rules of said Council and prior notice given each member thereof, in the Council Chambers of City Hall of Evansdale, Iowa at 8:30 a.m. on the above date. Council members present in order of roll call: Seible, Bender, Walker, and Dewater. Absent: Loftus. Quorum present.

Bender/Seible to approve July 30, 2019 agenda. Ayes-Four. Motion carried.

Dewater/Walker to approve request from Animal Control Officer, Chris Schares, to remove vicious animal from the city. Cindy P., 2418 W 3rd, Cedar Falls, stated that she attended on behalf of Molly as she is not a vicious dog and should be allowed to remain at her home. Councilor Dewater stated that this was a vicious attack to another animal. Ryan Ramirez, 930 Central Ave., explained the circumstances that led up to the issue with his dog Molly. Dolly Walton, 925 Central Ave., stated that she was aware that her dog was at large and that she felt horrible for it being out but had no idea that she would be torn apart by the dog across the street. She feared that the dog may attack again. Mayor Faas stated that this was the second time the animal was brought to council for vicious tendencies and had been given a second chance. Councilor Walker questioned the type of leash that held the dog. Faas responded that the dog was tethered in the yard. Faas also stated that the resident violated not only the city ordinance but also the restrictions that were set the last time the violation came to council and that they were warned in March 2019 that their dog was in violation of city ordinance. Councilor Seible stated that the dog at large shouldn't have been in the yard and doesn't want to see an animal taken away from its owners. Dewater questioned if had bitten a child. Mayor Faas responded no, it was an adult. Steve Bender, 1760 Timberline Dr., stated that the dog was protecting its property and the city council shouldn't recommend its removal as the other dog came onto their property. Councilor Bender stated that she disagreed with the city's ordinance. Tammy Causevic, 1770 Timberline Dr., stated that the dog was contained on its own property and shouldn't be asked to be removed. Mayor Faas questioned if it would be a different if it was a child that had been attacked. Jerry Makedonski, 215 Feldt, stated that he had been an owner of a pit bull mix and was given a citation when the animal barked viciously at the edge of the property line and if anyone comes on the property it has a right to protect its family. The Mayor stated he felt the Councils decision was a mistake. Ayes-One. Nays-Three. (Seible, Bender, and Walker). Motion denied.

Alex Potter with McClure Engineering to present Preliminary Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) options: Mr. Potter discussed the new NPDES permit that was received in September 1, 2017 included a compliance schedule for E. coli and Iowa Nutrient Reduction strategy requirements. The permit was amended on April 1, 2019 and again on the 1st of June 2019. The final compliance deadline had been extended to December 1, 2022. He discussed current wastewater treatment plant conditions and needs and what would have to be completed by the deadline. He explained what the facility plan consisted of and what the council would have to review to proceed.

Mr. Potter explained the WWTP alternative to council as follows: Option BPCA: Renovate existing WWTP to include headworks building, UV disinfection, and effluent pumping/flood protection. Pros: lowest cost, utilize existing infrastructure. Cons: Reuse aging infrastructure, additional improvements required for Nutrient Reduction Strategy (NRS), flood risk. Estimated cost \$7.4 million. Option LDA-2: Aerobic Granular Sludge (AGS) Treatment System at existing WWTP to include all BPCA improvements and replacing aeration basins with new treatment system designed for nutrient removal requirements. Pros: Extensively renovated WWTP at current site, small footprint, meets NRS goals, and no final clarifiers. Cons: New technology, repurposes aging infrastructure, flood risk. Estimated cost \$10.9 million. Option LDA-4: Aerobic Granular Sludge (AGS) Treatment System at new location. Completely new WWTP designed for nutrient removal requirements and protected by flood dike. Pros: new infrastructure, no final clarifiers, no flood risk, meets NRS goals. Cons: New technology, difficult location. Estimated cost \$13.8 million.

Chris Even, Waste Water Foreman, stated that we have three options that the council is looking at and needed a general direction provided by council on the direction to move forward. It actually comes down to two questions should we include nutrient reduction now or wait up to ten years for it to be mandated by the IDNR and should we continue to operate in the floodway or move it out of the floodway. The city has to submit a plan to the IDNR by the 1st of September regarding the nutrient reduction plan but it may be more cost effective to address it now. Another one of the demands on the city is to provide offsite control of the waste water plan during a flood event. Tammy Causevic, 1770 Timberline Dr., stated that several people in the community had a lot of questions and concerns about the plans that have been brought to the council for approval. She also stated that they had received over 134 signatures stating that they were in favor of the minimal updates to be completed for the waste water treatment plant. She also suggested that we complete the minimum requirements and start placing a minimum of \$25.00 in a fund to complete the updates that will be mandated in the future. She stated her doubts about the costs of the updates or a new plant build and wasn't in favor of plans that have been submitted. Charles Beam, 542 Evans Rd., stated his concern about the proposed flooding issues and he wasn't in favor of the proposed updates. Jerry Makedonski, 215 Feldt, stated that he would be an advocate for the city as his experience is in the field of industrial maintenance, questioned why the city had waited to proceed when we are so close to the deadline. Nichole Huse, 470 River Forest Rd., questioned why it wasn't budgeted earlier and funds set aside. Gary Hansen, 141 Joy, questioned if we would be protected by a meteor in the event that it would land on the waste water plant. Justin Herald, 721 Burr Oak, wasn't in favor of the total projected plans and expense to residents and felt connecting with Waterloo was a viable option. Liz Bumgardner, 1745 Michigan Dr., wasn't in favor of the large increase the residents would have to pay for the upgrades presented. Kathy Behrends, 317 Trail Ave., stated that the residents should have a vote, wasn't in favor of the large increases. Mark Atkins, 909 3rd Ave., questioned the expense of the upgrades and wasn't in favor of a new WWTP as the citizens can't afford the increase. Ken Nichols, 610 East End Ave., wasn't in favor of the proposed plans and wanted the public to know that an election is coming up. Jurly Nichols, 1120 Evans, wanted a PA system installed so everyone would here the comments. Denny Wilson, 1023 Central Ave., questioned the manhole cover in the middle of the Cedar River and stated that he was in favor of connecting with Waterloo. Councilor Seible questioned the expense the city was contemplating entering into and wasn't in favor of proceeding without more consideration and wanted the citizens to be able to have a vote on the ballot. Councilor Dewater stated that he had verified by a third party that we need a minimum of \$7 mil in updates to our current WWTP if we chose to stay there and the costs were not unreasonable and impending nutrient requirements could drive the cost to \$11-14 mil and according to citizen Tom Little the city has been delaying the necessary upgrades to long; so he was in favor of the new plant placed out of the floodway and not in favor of connecting with the city of Waterloo. Councilor Bender questioned the cost per month to the residents as the rumor is the rates would go up an additional \$54 per month and thought maybe the residents had been misinformed on the increases. Mayor Faas responded that it would be up to \$54 from the current \$23 rate per month. Mayor Faas also stated that we will be required to raise the road to the waste water plant in order to operate, stated in Chapter 14.2.6 drafted by the Iowa DNR flood protection June of 2018, and it is physically impossible at our current location to raise the road to this standard.

Derek Anderson, Mc Clure Engineering, Vice President Water Management Group, stated that he commended the council, citizens, and staff for gathering and questioning the information presented at tonight's meeting. He had written down several questions from the citizens and would address as many as possible: first question was could the city bank \$25 per quarter or approximately \$8 per month and fund the improvements going forward. The \$7.4 mil project had an increase of approximately \$14 per month if we were to finance a \$2.5 mil dollar project the cost per month would be at \$6. He also stated that he reviewed construction costs from 1985 to the present if the city were to hold off on the recommended upgrades it would cost the city a minimum of 3.1% affecting the pieces of the project that you want to withhold. The nutrient strategy requirements plan is required for this project and is due by the 1st of September 2019. He stated that the city of Adele was mandated similarly to the city of Evansdale initially but before the DNR would give their final approval for their design plan they

were required to add the nutrient reduction upgrades. So, there is a good possibility that Evansdale would be required to do the same. He also stated that the plan costs that have been provided to the city is a total cost including engineering and administrative costs. He also addressed an approximate cost to combine waste water systems with the city of Waterloo that would not include any capital costs that Waterloo may charge to be right around \$14 mil. Mayor Faas stated that there had been several meetings to combine all cities in a regional plant and there had been no consensus to move forward with that option at this time. Walker questioned what the quote of \$2.5 mil updates would include. Mr. Anderson responded that it would only include the e. Coli upgrades but doesn't include the back-up generator or the Scada System that ensures the plant can be operated offsite, and replacement of the headworks that will have to be upgraded.

The city is at a crossroads and will have to decide how they will plan for the future of their waste water treatment plant. Mr. Anderson stated that he would present questions to the IDNR official Jim Oppelt and stated we would wait to move forward until some of the questions were answered.

There being no further discussion, Seible/Dewater to adjourn the meeting at 8:58 p.m. Ayes-Five. Motion carried.

ATTEST:

Doug Faas, Mayor

DeAnne Kobliska, City Clerk