

CITY HALL
EVANSDALE, IOWA, SEPTEMBER 10, 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 6:00 p.m. on the above date. Council members present in order of roll call: Dewater, Seible, Bender, Walker, and Loftus. Quorum present.

Loftus/Seible to approve September 10, 2019 agenda. Ayes-Five. Motion carried.

Walker/Loftus to approve Resolution 6347 approving the sale of City Property (as amended). Mayor Faas stated that there was a scrivener's error and an amendment to the buyer's legal name. Roll call vote: Ayes-Five.

Mayor Faas thanked public works department, police department, and volunteer fire fighters for all their efforts with cleaning the debris off the streets and their efforts to keep the city safe after the storm last evening.

Council will consider approval of Waste Water Treatment Plant Design. Mayor Faas stated that there were still questions that haven't been answered from our previous WWTP discussions that would be addressed first and then have McClure Engineering and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) representatives available for questions by the council.

Discussion Questions: Can our City regionalize with the City of Waterloo WWTP: It is feasible from a technical standpoint, but there are many other issues to resolve to determine ultimate feasibility. Cost: estimated to be approximately \$14.5 million; timing: 5 to 10 years for regionalization; organizational structure, ownership and management issues, operational and maintenance questions, legal issues, political feasibility, and does not address the issue of a new lift station still in the floodway. Referendum—public vote on wastewater plant: the Iowa Supreme Court in 1995 held that general law cities are prohibited from adopting local initiative and referendum measures. State of Iowa code (364) grants municipal legislation to city councils, and a city provision allowing electorate-initiated ordinances would improperly contradict Iowa code. Why hasn't the city created a capital improvement fund to offset some of the proposed rate increases: a \$15 dollar per month increase in the sewer fees was proposed in the summer/fall of 2016, but after lengthy discussions the council decided on a \$5 per month increase (\$15 per quarter) instead, hearing and discussing much of the same arguments as today (residents can't afford it, wait until we are mandated to make improvements, etc.) the \$5 per month increase has generated approximately \$324,555 in additional revenue in the 2.75 years it has been in effect. During that same time frame, over \$198,000 was spent to repair the arbutus lift station alone. Other unanticipated aging infrastructure repairs, and routine maintenance and repair projects system-wide have reduced our current sewer reserve to \$281,000 from a balance of \$366,000 in the fall of 2016. As a city, we are going backwards in our capital improvement reserves. For a point of comparison, the City of Elk Run Heights has been collecting a capital improvements fee

in the amount of \$50 per quarter for the last five years in anticipation of that city building a new WWTP. To date they have accumulated approximately \$500,000 in the fund, which is only approximately 8.3% of their anticipated cost. If the City of Evansdale had been collecting the same \$50 per quarter for capital improvement funds for the last 5 years, the fund balance would be approximately \$1.66 million subtracting the above noted repair expenditures. This is approximately 12.7% of anticipated cost. Waste of money to purchase combo truck and televising unit: from 2012 to 2017 (before we purchased both the combo truck and televising unit) the city was spending an average of \$6,661 per year on outside contractors for these services. These actual costs would have been much higher if we had been doing routine lift station and other preventative maintenance as was being reported. In all of 2018 and year to date 2019 we have spent \$355.30 on outside contractor services and parts, approximately an 87.5% reduction in yearly costs.

Alex Potter with McClure Engineering spoke regarding the questions that were presented to the IDNR and the feedback that was received as follows: If Evansdale were to construct a UV disinfection system, would they be required to install a standby power system? IDNR responded yes, new and upgraded facilities must meet this requirement. Will the City be required to protect structures from physical damage from the 100-year flood per 14.2.4.a. of the IWDS? IDNR responded yes. Will the City be required to protect structures from physical damage from the 100-year flood plus 1'-0" as outlined in rule 567-72.5(1)(b)(455B) of the Iowa Administrative Code? IDNR responded yes, this is a requirement for new or modified structures per the IDNR Floodplain Section, which is more stringent than the current IWDS. Also, the protection level is 500-year plus 1'-0" for any fuel storage facility that may accompany an electrical generator. Will the City be required to provide wheeled access to the WWTP during a 10-year flood event as outlined in IWDS 14.2.4.a.? IDNR responded yes. Will the City be required to provide wheeled access during the 25-year flood event as outlined in 14.2.6.b. of the DRAFT design standards? IDNR responded no. The 25-year requirement is a proposed modification to our design standards. The City would not be required to comply at this time. Will the City be required to provide wheeled access during the 100-year flood event as outlined in rule 567-72.5(3)(b)(455B) of the Iowa Administrative Code? Yes, however the City may apply for a variance to this requirement if equivalent effectiveness is provided. Remote operation was discussed at our meeting in January of 2018 using SCADA controls in high water events. It was decided during that meeting this would be an acceptable variance. Without a Q100 access route, we will also need information on the flood warning, fueling needs (if required), duration, and response time with respect to the wastewater plant operation throughout an event. Will the City be required to provide a means of remote operation (i.e. SCADA system) if the WWTP cannot be safely accessed during a major flood event? IDNR responded yes, if a variance to the access road requirement is requested, SCADA would be considered equivalent. Would Evansdale be permitted to propose a delayed implementation schedule for nutrient removal? IDNR responded, yes. The nutrient reduction feasibility study requires the permittee to submit an analysis of feasible and reasonable options for reducing nutrients and provide a schedule to implement those options. The scheduled timeline must take affordability and other priorities into account. Delayed schedules have been approved with appropriate justification. If the City were to propose a substantial plant upgrade, expansion or replacement, then anti-deg may require nutrient removal capabilities be included at that time. What is the IDNR's position on approving future wastewater

treatment projects when the risk of catastrophic flooding is unavoidable? IDNR responded, as stated above, if the IDNR Wastewater and Floodplain Section Design Standards are met, these projects can be constructed. Is there an initiative or position in the foreseeable future where Iowa IDNR would require communities like Evansdale, Elk Run Heights, and Raymond to regionalize treatment with the City of Waterloo? IDNR responded, No. While the NPDES permit's compliance schedule only requires disinfection, the Iowa IDNR may require a plan of action in the future due to the Wastewater Treatment Plant's physical age. An evaluation of the current plant's reliability is recommended. Mr. Potter stated that all options that have been discussed for the WWTP are still viable options.

Mayor Faas explained the results of the AECOM analysis of the no-rise alternatives. Chris Even, Waste Water Foreman stated that the IDNR has reviewed our no-rise alternative, but they have to be approved by FEMA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Councilor Seible questioned if the USACE had to approve the plans. Mr. Potter responded that once the design was prepared it would be sent to the IDNR, FEMA, and to USACE. Seible stated that he had several pictures showing that the WWTP did not go under water in the 2008 flood event and questioned if there was an alternate access to the north of the plant that would be explored and wondered if we were still considering all the options originally chosen to explore. Mr. Potter responded that they haven't explored an alternate access to the plant, but all the options council had chosen are still viable options. Seible also questioned why the City isn't pursuing regionalization with the City of Waterloo and if it was a viable option. Mr. Potter stated that the capital cost to merge with the City of Waterloo would be upwards of \$14.5 million as stated in the regionalization plan prepared by AECOM. Seible also questioned what the operating cost increases would be to operate a new WWTP. Mr. Potter responded upwards of \$60,000 per year. Councilor Bender questioned if it would be clarified what the basic cost would be for the City to comply with the IDNR mandates at our current location. Mr. Potter responded that the 1st option, upgrading the current WWTP was in the amount of \$7.4 million and included the following improvements; e Coli disinfection, site work, improvement to the access road, standby power, and SCADA system costs that were approximately \$3.3 million; other items included in that option was to extend a new force main to the plant from the East End lift station, headworks upgrade, replacing blowers in the blower building and repairing a leaking roof in the amount of \$3.3 million; additionally an additional storage garage and much needed improvements to the lab amounting to \$880,000. Seible questioned if it was a viable option to merge with Waterloo. Bret Myers, IDNR, stated that if the City was seriously looking at combining with the City of Waterloo it should be documented on paper and that Waterloo has operational issues that may prevent the City from combining with them at this time. Mayor Faas stated that regionalization wouldn't be an option for approximately 10 years; if we were to combine with the City of Waterloo any sooner, we would become a customer of the City of Waterloo. Seible stated that he would like to have the options reviewed to ensure they are viable options and that if the IDNR knows we are working toward a plan would they allow lenience to their time frame. Derek Anderson, McClure Engineering, stated that we would need concept plans in place in order for the IDNR, USACE, and FEMA to approve the elevation of the plan the City chose. Mayor Faas questioned the time line for preparation of the plans for each option chosen. Anderson responded that it would be a few months but regardless if you went down that path we would have to present and clarify to the IDNR what the City's plan is to move forward. Walker questioned how the IDNR would

respond to our request. Anderson responded that all the elements would have to be in place and present the IDNR with a revised schedule. Anderson also questioned if the City wanted to spend and invest millions of dollars at the existing site that ultimately would have to be updated with nutrient reduction costing close to \$11 million. Councilor Dewater questioned if in a flood event high water was the only issue. Anderson responded that there are levels of a flood event that effect the hydraulic profile that needs to be achieved to pump water from the plant and when the water backs up in the plant the hydraulics' have to be able to operate during those flood levels. Walker questioned what option would be in the best interest of the city and would that option be approved by the IDNR. Anderson responded that as a part of the process a plan is chosen, the design is prepared, and the IDNR would evaluate the plan at that time. He also stated that if the council wanted both plans to be considered the costs for engineering would increase and the city would face not being in compliance. Mr. Myers, IDNR, stated that the compliance schedule is set and if the city chose to push it down the road they would be out of compliance and that the permit is federal, and the EPA would then become involved. After a lengthy deliberation Dewater/Walker to approve moving forward with the option to build a new WWTP on the dry side of the levee. Roll call vote: Ayes: Three. Nays: Two (Seible and Bender).

There being no further discussion, Seible/Bender to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 p.m. Ayes-Five. Motion carried.

ATTEST:

Doug Faas, Mayor

DeAnne Kobliska, City Clerk