

City of Colville

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 17, 2012

8:30 a.m. – City Hall

MINUTES

Chairman Jim Lapinski called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Planning Director Jim Lapinski, Building Official/Inspector Bob Cleaver, Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos, and Councilmember Dorothy Bergin. MEMBERS ABSENT: Street/Park Superintendent Terry LeCaire and Councilmember Lou Janke. OTHERS PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee, Paul Wade, Ron Rehn, Carol Fairbrother, and John Prietto.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of June 26, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Eric Durpos moved and Bob Cleaver seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Voice vote showed all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS: There was no Old Business to be presented.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Request by Paul Wade to discuss annexation alternatives for some properties on Garden Homes Drive

A request by Paul Wade to discuss annexation alternatives for some properties on Garden Homes Drive had been distributed to each TRC member prior to the meeting (copy on file). The subject properties are located within the City's urban growth area and are currently served by city water through the Garden Homes Water Association.

Paul Wade provided background information regarding the Garden Homes Water Association and efforts to resolve issues with the City. He stated at a meeting last week with Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos, the Association reviewed alternatives, including a 1.5% low interest loan for the estimated \$600,000 water line project. The Association voted to proceed with the loan at a cost of approximately \$13,000 per household or an additional \$70-\$75 per month on the water bill for 20 years.

At this time, Mr. Wade explained that he represents a group of up to 6 properties on Garden Homes Drive between the dialysis center and Miner Street who are exploring annexation alternatives. They are seeking information regarding the replacement of the water main fronting these residences and the associated costs, as well as understanding all other City requirements that would be imposed upon annexation. They are also interested in what additional services they would receive if they annexed. Based on preliminary figures, Mr. Wade stated if these property owners annexed and installed a new water line at a cost of about \$40,000-\$50,000 divided between 6-7 property owners, they feel their share would be better than the \$13,000 per household for the above referenced loan. He requested an opportunity to meet with Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos in the future to further discuss potential costs.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 17, 2012

Page 2

Recognizing that these property owners would bear the cost of the line, Mr. Wade stated they are trying to figure out what makes the most sense and make an informed decision. He noted they have not yet talked to Verle Gotham, who is on the Board of the Garden Homes Water Association.

Carol Fairbrother explained that an additional factor in exploring annexation alternatives is because some of the property owners are latecomers to the Garden Homes Water Association. They realize that no funds have been paid over the past 30 years for maintenance or replacement of the water line, which has resulted in a huge burden for the property owners.

Planning Director Jim Lapinski commented that the subject properties are located in the City's urban growth area (UGA) and connectivity can be achieved. He stated the potential annexation area is a logical extension into the UGA and can be served by city services. He did not foresee any issues with zoning as the properties are currently residential. Mr. Lapinski felt that any resolutions being pursued amongst the Association would be a separate matter. He pointed out that Street/Park Superintendent Terry LeCaire has not submitted any comments relative to potential street or storm water issues.

Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos expressed the feeling that annexation is a viable option for the property owners. Whether the water issue is resolved as part of the Association or separately, he felt it would save the property owners \$10 per month on their water bill over that 20 year period. He stated that the water line would have to be replaced as a condition of annexation. Mr. Durpos identified cost issues associated with the design, which requires stamped engineered plans, and construction of the line as well as new connection fees. He indicated a willingness to discuss some of those costs at a future meeting.

Bob Cleaver referred to the Garden Homes Water Agreement with the City of Colville noting that Section I, Condition #1 states "That there will be a limit of forty-five individual hookups to the system established by the Association until such time as any part of the area serviced by the Association should be annexed to the City and subject to the conditions of annexation as described elsewhere herein. Should annexation of any part of the service area occur, the original forty-five individual hookups shall be reduced by the number of hookups within the annexation service area." Mr. Durpos advised that the agreement was resolved and expired three years ago. The issue of connection fees has been a point of discussion. He advised that the City Council has not made a decision about whether additional connections will be allowed once the new main is installed or until annexation occurs.

Bob Cleaver questioned at what point is sewer addressed and who bears the cost?

Eric Durpos advised that whoever needs the sewer would bear the cost of extending the line. They won't be required to install sewer until one of their septic systems fail; but if they are within "X" amount of footage then they would have to extend it at their cost. He pointed out a latecomer agreement would be an option for future connections to the line.

Mr. Wade advised that the property owner at 161 Garden Home Dr., on the corner of Garden Homes & Miner St., has a septic system that is at maximum capacity. They are located approximately 600 feet from the City sewer. They are interested in the potential costs associated with sewer service and Mr. Wade requested a rough estimate from Mr. Durpos.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 17, 2012

Page 3

Ron Rehn advised that Columbia Associates purchased adjacent property for potential future expansion of the dialysis center. He indicated at some point they want to annex that property anyway, regardless of what happens with the water issue.

Assistant Planner Melinda Lee pointed out some of these properties appear to have the potential of being subdivided after they are annexed and the residential zoning designation would allow that to happen. She questioned at what point in time would sewer service be required. Eric Durpos stated that anything new would require sewer.

Councilmember Dorothy Bergin asked about the approximate age of the systems in this subject area. Mr. Wade responded that the systems range from the 1930's to the 1990's.

Mr. Durpos indicated that time is somewhat of the essence. With assistance from the City, a loan option from Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) was presented to the Association and they voted to proceed. Eric stated that papers with DWSRF were signed and within the next couple of weeks he has to have a project scope and a detailed layout of the construction project.

Dorothy Bergin questioned whether it is possible for these 6 interested properties to get their own loan or does it have to be the whole association. Eric responded that this was a small system consolidation loan – it has to be the whole association. He stated as long as the improvements are made the City would take it over. The property owners are paying the whole bill.

Carol Fairbrother asked if Mr. Durpos would be willing to provide the group with the specifications that would be required to take to a contractor. Paul added if they go forward with their proposal - is there any way that they could pay a part of the engineering fee. He explained part of his rationale is that engineering costs were part of the \$600,000 estimate for the original project. He felt these are the kinds of details that could be worked out.

Bob Cleaver suggested at some point it might be prudent to find out if the City Council would entertain the annexation prior to paying for engineering, etc., because ultimately it is a Council decision. Jim Lapinski indicated that a Notice of Intent could be filed with the City Council. Jim noted the Council would consider whether it is in the best interests of the general public.

Regarding the potential need to connect to sewer, Mr. Wade questioned whether there is a cost equation that could be considered in the annexation process, such as if it costs \$70,000 to extend sewer and yet they could put in a new septic system for \$30,000 – would that be considered as an acceptable alternative to the City? Mr. Durpos felt there is some flexibility within the rule which requires sewer to be connected if it is within a certain number of feet and the connection is feasible. If the property were already annexed into the City with a septic system Mr. Durpos felt it would be the same way – there would be an option.

Ms. Fairbrother asked how much savings they would be looking at if they put sewer in at the same time since the trench will be there and the pavement dug up – is it a significant factor to consider? Eric stated he would have to pencil it out adding that he is pretty leery about giving estimates. Mr. Wade recognized that the figures would be for information purposes and would not be definite.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

July 17, 2012

Page 4

In conclusion, Mr. Wade stated he would meet with Mr. Durpos regarding the requested cost information. He anticipated that the property owners would then meet as a group in the next 30-60 days and decide what their next step will be.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no other public comments.

REPORTS: There were no reports.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, Eric Durpos moved and Bob Cleaver seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 a.m.