Session 21-01, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Acting Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:31 p.m. on February 10, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

**PRESENT:** JULIE ENGBRETSEN, JACOB ARGUETA, JAN KEISER, LARRY SLONE, CHARLES BARNWELL, CAROLINE VENUTI AND DONNA ADERHOLD

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

The agenda was approved by consensus of the Task Force.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

**VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS**

**REPORTS**

**SYNOPSIS APPROVAL**

**PENDING BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. Introductions

Each member of the Task Force provided a brief introductory statement of their reason and interest for participating in the Task Force.

B. Memorandum from Deputy City Clerk re: Election of Officers

Acting Chair Aderhold introduced the item and requested input from Deputy City Clerk Krause on the election process and duties of the Chair and Vice Chair.

Acting Chair Aderhold opened the floor to nominations for Chair.

Member Slone nominated Donna Aderhold seconded by Member Venuti.

There were no other nominations for Chair and Member Aderhold accepted the nomination for Chair and there was no opposition from the Task Force. She opened the floor for nominations of Vice Chair.

Member Venuti nominated Julie Engebretsen as Vice Chair seconded by Member Barnwell.

Chair Aderhold asked if there were any additional nominations hearing none she inquired if Member Engebretsen accepted the role of Vice Chair.
Member Engebretsen accepted the office of Vice Chair and there was no opposition from the Task Force.

C. Memorandum from Deputy City Clerk re: Revising Scope of Work Timelines and Establishing a Meeting Schedule

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title.

SLONE/ENGBRETSEN - MOVED TO ESTABLISH A REVISED SCOPE OF WORK TIMELINE AND A MEETING SCHEDULE TO THE FLOOR FOR DISCUSSION.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Discussion was facilitated by Chair Aderhold on the following:
- Scope of work timelines could be adjusted by 4-6 weeks from those listed in the resolution
- Having worksessions and regular meetings in quick succession but allowing for the public notice of these meetings
- Mondays and Tuesdays are not good
- Wednesday afternoons, twice a month plus additional worksession once each month to make progress
- Preference was noted for during the workday on the second and fourth Wednesday with a worksession on the third Wednesday of the month.
- It was noted that due to advertising requirements a worksession could be scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2021 at 2:30 p.m.
- Topic of the worksession could be review of the inundation report and listing the risks
- Then a regular meeting on Wednesday, February 24, 2021 at 2:30 p.m.

The Task Force agreed by consensus on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month at 2:30 p.m. and having a worksession on the third Wednesday at the same time.

It was agreed that the Task Force will review reporting dates at the next regular meeting.

D. Open Meetings Act & Legal Issues for Advisory Bodies – Review

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED TO REVIEW THE OPEN MEETING ACT AND LEGAL ISSUES FOR ADVISORY BODIES.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested input from Deputy City Clerk Krause.

Deputy City Clerk Krause asked if everyone was able to review the document and if there were any questions.

Member Slone stated he had a comment if there were no questions.

Discussion ensued by members of the Task Force on what would be allowed under the Open Meetings Act, requesting clarification from other members on information provided at meetings, two members working on a specific task or research and bringing a report back to share with the whole group, disseminating questions and requests through the Clerk.

E. Next Steps – for the Next Meeting:
   - Review inundation report and be prepared to identify and evaluate risks and how they can be catalogued

Chair Aderhold introduced the item and noted that Member Barnwell volunteered to provide a more in-depth review of the report.

Member Barnwell responded that he did sort of volunteer himself along with Member Argueta on providing a more in-depth review report to the group but he would be more interested in having DGGS making a presentation to this group and be able to answer some questions.

Member Engebretsen volunteered to contact DGGS to see if they will be able to present at the worksession or the meeting on February 24th.

Chair Aderhold inquired if it would be too early to have a discussion regarding identifying the risks that may potentially be experienced.

Member Slone thought that it may be too soon and should focus on the veracity of the report.

Member Engebretsen advocated that they should use the worksession and the next regular meeting to identifying risks would be a good exercise in cataloguing those risks. She will provide a memo on that for the worksession.

Member Keiser commented that she would be willing to provide a guided tour to those members who are interested in seeing the public works campus. Member Argueta and Barnwell would appreciate a comprehensive tour both citing their limited exposure to the public works facility.

There was a brief discussion facilitated by the Clerk that if the whole group wanted to tour then she could advertise it as a worksession which would allow multiple members to attend. Concern was expressed on the ability to be socially distant during the tour.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
A. Resolution 20-125, Creating a Public Works Campus Task Force and Establishing the Scope of Work and Parameters Under Which the Task Force will Conduct its Work.
B. Public Works Facility - 2021-2026 CIP Project Sheet
C. Updated Tsunami Inundation Maps for Homer & Seldovia, Alaska
D. Updated Inundation Maps Showing Cook Inlet & Kachemak Bay
E. Appointments to the Task Force - Member Information

Chair Aderhold noted the items provided as informational items and those items provided in the supplemental packet. She then noted the tasks that will be provided by members of the task force for the next worksession or meeting: Memo from Member Engebretsen and report from Members Barnwell and Argueta.

Chair Aderhold noted something from a teambuilding workshop on forming, storming, norming and performing. Today they were forming. We will see how well we get through the other steps.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause stated that she looks forward to the next meetings and that it will be exciting.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Keiser thanked everyone for their time and their talent but had another meeting to get to, great meeting.

Member Engebretsen commented it was a great meeting.

Member Slone echoed the good meeting sentiment.

Member Argueta appreciated meeting everyone and looks forward to working on this project.

Member Barnwell commented that they were off to a great start.

Member Venuti stated she was looking forward to the storming, thought that this will be a fun project everyone has great enthusiasm and she was really excited about working with everyone.

Chair Aderhold expressed her thanks.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 24, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. and a Worksession is scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ______________________________
Session 21-02, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:31 p.m. on February 24, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

**PRESENT:** JULIE ENGBRETSEN, JACOB ARGUETA, JAN KEISER, LARRY SLONE, CHARLES BARNWELL, CAROLINE VENUTI AND DONNA ADERHOLD

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

KEISER/VENUTI MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

**VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS**

A. Presentation by Barrett Salisbury with the State of Alaska Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys and Elena Suleimani with the Alaska Earthquake Center

Barrett Salisbury with the Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys and Elena Suleimani with the Alaska Earthquake Center provided a PowerPoint presentation covering information and discussion on the following topics:

- Tectonic Plate contact and Homer/Kenai Peninsula is sitting right on top of these plates which are moving a few inches each year.
- How this movement affects the area and the disturbance to the sea floor is cause for tectonic tsunamis
- 2011 Earthquake in Japan and how it changed the existing and known data on inundation, experiences in that earthquake, evacuation structures not suited for the worst case scenario, various wave directions in series not just one direction as planned for or expected.
- Probability and strength of earthquakes, size does not mean a bigger one will not follow.
- Homer Inundation Scenarios
- The inundation maps should not be used for regulatory or building code purposes. There are too many uncertainties in the modeling of these maps to make them regulatory. There is science and they are peer reviewed, so the information can be helpful for emergency response.
- The smallest wave can cause devastating damage and even loss of life as proven in video of Tsunami hitting Santa Cruz, CA 10 hours later from across the pacific
- Seismic hazard assessment is the best estimate at the probability that an earthquake of a certain magnitude, with a certain amount of associated shaking is going to happen in a particular period of time

Ms. Suleimani and Mr. Salisbury facilitated questions on the following topics:

- If the rupture patch shifted to the west towards Kodiak and the west side of the inlet how would that affect Homer.
- Risk to Homer would come from underwater landslides
- clarification on the maximum inundation in relation to the map provided
- more of a rising tide that never ends and the second wave would have debris from a first wave so no one would survive in six feet
- information on what could be expected if a tsunami happened at low tide noting that their modeling is project for worst case scenario at highest high tide.
- in 1964 the highest wave in Valdez came 11 hours after the earthquake. Since it was low tide the Valdez and Seward waterfront collapse because the water was not there the sediment collapsed. Then 10 hours later there was a high tide and the tsunami came so preparation to expect a minimum of 12 hours from the initial quake is required.
- Homer was not at the head of a narrowed bay which would create 30-40 foot wave and due to Homer’s placement it would suffer more of a flooding or tidal like surge, slowly rising but it will still have whirlpools, fast currents and debris.

Additional discussions and explanations were facilitated on the following:

- Technology available – Seafloor seismometers, GPS, earthquake early warning system that is integrated with the Tsunami Early Warning System
- Examples of technology that is available if placed on the sea floor
- Subsurface ground of Homer, based on their expertise, sediment coal seams, slight flat, less clay in Homer, geotechnical properties data from 60 70s on the possible coal
- Verification steps before all clear is issued to communities
- Homer has a complicated glacial history
- The inundation report should be used for sensible decision making for emergency response such as:
  - Making decisions on placement of shelters
  - Planning bug out bags,
  - locations of equipment and supplies
  - practicing drills
- Public information for people especially visitors
- First responders
- Intelligent development so that low lying areas within the inundation zone should be turned in recreational areas and parks for example
- Creating plans in order to remove people from the spit in an orderly manner as well as getting people moved who may live within the inundation areas.
- Creating a brochure to be able to distribute to the population, businesses, hotels, etc.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for February 10, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Continued Review and Discussion on Inundation Report - Resolution Task Goal #1 & #2

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and provided a brief overview of the process and exercise that was performed by the Task Force during the worksession last week. She requested input from the Task Force members, noting that Member Slone had a few questions that were listed but he could read them himself.

A brief discussion ensued on the points made in the presentation at this meeting that were supporting the discussions and exercises they performed at the worksession on February 18th. Two particular comments regarding the following were made:
- The inundation report was to be used to assist in emergency response and planning
- Consideration should be made on not developing further in areas that are at greatest risk

Chair Aderhold noted that member Engebretsen was unable to prepare the memorandum with the spreadsheet of the risks that the Task Force listed and spoke about at the worksession due to her work schedule and we will have that at the March 3, 2021 regular meeting. She then asked if there were any questions from the members before they get back to some details.
Member Barnwell commented that he has created some maps and suggested summarizing what was presented today and commented that maybe they could collaborate on that information.

Chair Aderhold informed Member Barnwell that under advisement from the Clerk they must work on items individually or with the whole group. So if he wanted to provide the maps and summary of the presentation for the next meeting that would be great.

Member Barnwell noted that and will forward his work product to the Clerk when completed.

Additional discussion and comment was entertained on the following topics:

- Life expectancy of Public Works infrastructure to provide additional support for relocation
- Importance of the Sewer Treatment Facility and impacts to the ecological systems while important the overall costs involved in replacement of such as facility would be extraordinarily steep and not has easy since the City’s system is gravity based
- Relocating of materials stockpiles such as calcium chloride and equipment to another location could be accomplished without the construction of another Public Works Facility
- Determining at what level elevation is Public Works at to determine the actual impact to the facility

It was agreed to conduct and review the risks at the next meeting when they have the information from Member Engebretsen and they will have the maps from Member Barnwell to review as well.

B. Memorandum from Deputy City Clerk re: Revising Scope of Work Timelines and Setting Appropriate Meeting Dates - Approval of Draft Memorandum to City Council regarding Task Force Reports

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Clerk Krause to provide some input on revising the timelines.

Deputy City Clerk Krause stated that in review of the process being undertaken and the meeting schedule the Task Force approved she drafted the memorandum to City Council showing proposed meeting dates and correlating reporting dates. She also noted that due to not having a designated staff person she did not mind acting as their staff and clerk as she has performed in that role for other groups but the problem came when the Task Force wants to meet three weeks in a row. Ms. Krause stated that it is difficult to provide structure and guidance not to mention materials as well as the minutes when meetings are scheduled back to back. She recommended having the worksession for the month of March but then reducing the meetings to twice monthly noting that if needed a worksession could be scheduled. This will guarantee that members of the Task Force can complete assigned deliverables and Clerk can facilitate gathering needed or requested information and compete the minutes timely for any memoranda or reports.

Chair Aderhold clarified the meeting schedule the Clerk proposed and that a motion to approve the timeline was requested.

Member Keiser offered to act as a staff member and write memorandums, perform research, etc.
Deputy City Clerk Krause explained that as a member of the Task Force Member Keiser would also be voting on items she drafted. It is not necessary or required by OMA to have a staff person but it assists in keeping a clean perspective for the public and since the City Attorney advised that two or more members of the Task Force cannot work on an item as that may be perceived as a committee as well as members in a small body could be perceived to expend undue influence on a recommendation or issue. It is nice to be able to have a staff but the Clerk can fill that role as well.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO ADOPT THE AMENDED TIMELINES AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF.

A brief discussion evolved on the inability and restrictions imposed by the OMA on small groups, extension of the timeline, submitting a budget request to council for this project using the final report, having the Task Force work on that issue to have a report by May, scheduling a worksession before the halfway point, say at the end of March to show where the Task force is and then Member Keiser can make a presentation regarding her proposed budget request. It was noted that then Council would be aware of the upcoming budget request in August. It was advocated for establishing the schedule so Council, the media and members of the public that are following this process can follow it too.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE JUNE 14TH REPORT DATE TO MAY 10, 2021 CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

Discussion ensued on that time allowing Member Keiser to put together a budget request and moving it forward by one month which would then move final report date up a month too. Questions were asked regarding the report and who would author this report. Clarification was provided as follows: Identifying and quantifying risk, if there is risk strategies to mitigate that risk with comparable costs, it may not be a identified cost estimate for a building on a site but a relative order of magnitude costs and strategy and then the third report would be strategy which may be to look for real estate to relocate Public Works. Further clarification was provided on the dates suggested by the Clerk for the second report from June 14th to May 10th. The other dates could remain the same.

VOTE. (Amendment). NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was a brief clarification that the only date that was amended what the June report date.

VOTE.(Main). NON-OBJECT, UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold noted that there was a draft memorandum to Council and requested changes or comments.

Member Keiser appreciated the summarization provided by the Clerk.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE JUNE 14TH DATE ON THE SECOND REPORT TO MAY 10TH
There was no further discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold noted that the Task Force will meeting on March 10th and Member Engebretsen is to provide a memo on the risks listed at the February 18th Worksession and Member Barnwell will provide some maps on the inundation points so we will be able to continue our risk assessment discussion and strategies.

Member Slone inquired about the Task Force addressing the issue of creation of a brochure and Chair Aderhold noted that it was something outside the purview of this task force but that the city staff can at least initiate and see what the process might be and whether there needs to be Council action.

Member Engebretsen volunteered to address that issue, noting that the City Manager is in attendance at this meeting today, she will email him. She further commented that it was a great idea to have the brochure and will report back to the Task Force.

Chair Aderhold confirmed with Member Keiser that the Task Force was proceeding in the right direction. She then recommended that each member review the Hazard Mitigation Plan that was included in the Supplemental Packet for the first meeting, for the methodology that was used on risks.

Member Engebretsen reported that since that plan was developed before the new report they are hoping that the State will be able to assist them in updating or writing a new plan this spring, indicating that what they have is basically a boiler plate. So if you have comments about that plan outside of the task force feel free to let her know as they will be having a more extensive process on that document in the near future.

Member Keiser commented that she only skimmed through the plan herself but there were some interesting sections on probability and seismicity and believed this answered some of Member Slone’s questions but she will go back over that section again carefully.

Chair Aderhold reported that in that plan there were methods established to review and not reinventing the wheel if it was not necessary to save them time.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

Ken Castner, city resident and Mayor, requested that the Task Force look into the insurance coverage that is existing or available. He continued by explaining we have personnel protection, we have
property to protect and if you make your plans too cumbersome and then cannot comply with the plan that could eliminate your insurance recovery. So he would appreciate the inclusion of insurance coverage for this sort of an event and believed it would be meaningful.

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

City Manager Dumouchel commented that it was a very interesting meeting, super fascinating and he learned a lot being a new person to Homer so it was very useful to him. He believed that the work that the task force is putting forward so far is great and he wanted to pop in for a few minutes and ended up staying for the whole thing. He looks forward to what comes out of the group and he will catch up with Julie regarding the few items they were talking about.

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented that it was a very informative meeting echoing earlier comments made on the presentation but opined that it was a little scary and believed dealing with hurricanes over earthquakes, since she grew up in Florida, was more preferable to her.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Barnwell commented that he thought he knew so much but he had to admit that he learned quite a lot tonight. The passion of the presenters and how interested they are in their work really shows.

Member Slone commented on the video they watched showing how a small wave could do that much was absolutely incredible and believed that the general public should be exposed to examples like that, you could not even stand even in a foot of water because of the debris and the significant flow it knocks you off your feet.

Member Venuti commented that it was hard to watch those videos has it brought back so many memories as a young person in Kodiak, she remembers friends who passed away having drowned, she did not want to think too much about it, but she loves Homer and believes that they are on the right path to get an awareness. She like what Ms. Suleimani said about education and awareness. They are going to get Public Works moved and really appreciate Jan being at the helm as she believed she was the right person for the job.

Member Engebretsen commented that she worked for the city when the last report came out and then the earthquake in Japan happened and then they came out with this new study like 10 to 15 years after the first one and with the availability of video and modern pictures to see the destruction in Japan which is the most prepared country in the world is something that she carried with her when she thinks about this type of planning and the vulnerabilities in multiple ways that Homer has, so she is glad that they are thinking that public works is a critical facility and some parts cannot move but parts of it can so while they want to talk about hospitals, schools, police stations and emergency shelters as places you want out of hazards way public works is very much in that same vein of facility. It was a good conversation and glad that others found it as enlightening as she did.

Member Keiser commented that she will have her emergency go bag packed and keep it under her desk.
Chair Aderhold commented that she appreciated all the work everyone did and that they are putting into this task force, she opined that she is still getting her legs under her as chair and hopefully they continue to bear with her. It was great to spend the time listening to the authors of the report and appreciated that they spent so much time with the Task Force and for each members time tonight.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 10, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. and a Worksession is scheduled for Wednesday, March 17, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

____________________________________
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-03, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:31 p.m. on March 10, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: JULIE ENGBRETSEN, JACOB ARGUETA, JAN KEISER, LARRY SLONE, CHARLES BARNWELL, CAROLINE VENUTI AND DONNA ADERHOLD

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for February 24, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Memorandum from Member Engebretsen re: Risk Catalogue and Evaluation
Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Engebretsen to present her memorandum.

Member Engebretsen reported that Member Barnwell had provided some maps and Member Slone had presented some questions that were distributed by the Clerk and she would like to address those items before launching into the exercise of cataloguing the risks.

Member Barnwell reviewed the maps which indicated the following:
- various contours at 6 foot which provide the key elevation interval that were discussed during the presentation at the last meeting.
- the Public Works Campus in relationship to the maximum inundation at 36 feet, according to DGGS worst case scenario
- Scenarios depicted in the Inundation Report relative to the contour lines vary due to the different factors used in the computer modeling for the scenarios
- He supported the science used to depicted the scenarios, which were vetted by various organizations to include FEMA
- Using the information in the report it is recommended that you go above the maximum inundation by 20-30% which is 7-10 feet.
- Using the GIS information provided, relative to the LIDAR data and the potential sites will prove our due diligence and it will just require the completion of the report and Council final decision.
- Frame of reference is the Mean Highest High Water is from DGGS
- GIS data can be looked at directly
- The full inundation of the Public Works Campus is 24 feet and the southern boundary would be reached at 18 feet
- Accuracy of LIDAR is 3 cm vertical and 2cm horizontal which is very high resolution data and is tightly monitored and controlled. The LIDAR data is calibrated against the flight data, the information was vetted since 2019 and was not released until 2020.
- The information was a great base for engineering and planning.
- There is a big difference in comparing evacuation planning versus building placement

Member Slone posed the following questions and or comments:
- Possible to receive additional info about earthquake event probabilities, perhaps in the form of a graph or matrix. This would be helpful on determining the potential risks to Public Works from a worst-case scenario that we discussed at the worksession, risks that Julie is refining for our next meeting.
- The information would list the generally accepted numbers for energy released for each magnitude between, 7.0 to a 9.2 earthquake. It would also list the frequency of occurrence. Example: Barrett Salisbury stated in the presentation that a M7.0 earthquake was 30 times less powerful but ten times more likely than a M8.0.
- once the actual elevation of Public Works is determined above MHHW (Mean Highest High Water) then we can work on determining what Tsunami level (Magnitude 7.0 or 8.0, for example, the other factors – depth of earthquake, slip-joint – remaining the same) constitutes a break-even point, above which Public Works would be vulnerable, but below which no threat would be posed.
There are three factors, earthquake Magnitude is the dominant factor to us because it appears to be the one element most commonly used in discussions about Tsunami risk.

A brief discussion ensued on the following topics:
- Mean Highest High Water line that would reach but not flood the Public Works Facility is 18 feet while any water over 24 feet would flood the facility
- Current LIDAR data takes into account the Mean High Water line and it is the best data to in terms of topography
- LIDAR data accuracy
- Report and data was fully vetted by FEMA, USGS
- Recommendation from DGGS buffer is 20-30% beyond the maximum inundation line which amounts to 7-10 feet
- Reviewing evacuation routes is a different planning need

Member Engebretsen provided information regarding evacuation routes and community brochure and future work on that topic.

Member Slone stated that he is looking for additional information to figure reasonable probabilities and believes that it would provide a basis to enable their review.

Data presentation last meeting that every step, in other words like from seven to eight magnitude increases. The energy by 3232 32 times. But it's also only one 10th is likely.

Member Slone presented concerns regarding probability and believes that the Task Force requires additional information regarding probability before they can catalog the risks and recommend how to mitigate them as well.

Member Engebretsen suggested that Member Keiser contact Ms. Suleimani or Mr. Salisbury on the technical questions regarding probability and translate that technical information so the lay person can understand it.

There was brief dialogue on information provided in the All Hazard Mitigation document on page 31 regarding seismicity, earthquakes and probability of risk and getting further clarification on that information so that they can fully discern the various scenarios and probability of the Public Works Facility being inundated. A point made during discussion was that the likelihood may be low but if it does happen it will be catastrophic and believe that has relevancy and import to the determination.

Further discussion on the following items ensued:
- Translating this information so that it can be understood by the general public
- Possibility of minor event causing major damage
- Updating evacuation routes and emergency plans to reflect new information
- Homer first Tsunami and storm ready community
- The information in the report was intended for use in planning development and emergency response
- The damage cause by the earthquake in Japan in 2011
- Information is relevant to community planning and that is what this action is actually performing with the Public Works Building and if the City is going to use this red line or blue for designating evacuation routes and safe zones then the City needs to fund for the future
- There is limited ability to forecast earthquakes and any resulting tsunamis, the science is good but not exacting, there is not enough data available
- This action will assist the Community understand the importance of the issues such as human life, materials, equipment and overall impacts

Member Engebretsen facilitated an exercise in reviewing and rating the level of impact to the community with regard to the following:

Materials –
Calculus Chloride Storage – Quantity – unknown - Value of Materials – Approximately $10,000
Fuel Island – Quantity would be nice since that would need to be mitigated - Value of Fuel

Member Keiser will provide those numbers for the next meeting.

Member Slone stated that he had a conversation with Member Keiser and noted that while the material is consumed and when it comes to replacement it could be stored at another location, but that then brings the question of security that would be needed at a new location. This may take a few years. He then noted that they could check the requirements from the EPA for the Fuel Depot but maybe they could place a berm around the Public Works facility.

Chair Aderhold recommended that they include what the risk actually is such as the damage that calcium chloride does to the environment.

Member Engebretsen stated that is where she needs input and information from the scientists on the Task Force. She then reviewed the Workers Section noting that Administrative Staff, Mechanics, etc. would lose their place to work some may be able to work from home but others would require another location. This would require immediate relocation which would be difficult. The difficult part is determining the threat to life that is credible.

Member Slone noted that it is difficult to determine and the time that there is before the facility would be flooded would allow an able bodied person to get to safety, but knowing who is onsite at all times and being able to deal with a possible medical event and need for assistance to remove that person or persons.

Member Keiser agreed that in the best situation the loss of life may be a minimal risk but described the possible scenario of the greater potential to life with the current practice of everyone heading into the facility to remove all rolling equipment, the police coming in to fuel their vehicles, traffic conflicts, and just the general confusion.

Further comments on the topic of workers and fueling were offered as followed:
- Relocating fuel depot to the old police station
- Alternate fuel source or storage
- Traffic control during evacuation of rolling stock interacting with evacuating persons
- Lack of materials, tools to effect recovery from an incident
Current equipment evacuation process does not impact too much on residential or visitor evacuation from the Spit.

Depending on the severity of the earthquake would affect the probability of tsunami and thus require the evacuation of Public Works.

What would Public Works Employees be able to do if they did not have to perform the evacuation of Public Works assist other departments such as Police with notifications, Port and Harbor in relocating their equipment.

There is no current plan other than remove and relocate the equipment.

Some mechanical services could be hired out, but most are specialized services and tools (equipment) so there would be difficulty in maintaining equipment.

Replacement of lost equipment, tools, etc. for administrative personnel as well as mechanics, parks, etc.

Flood Insurance costs mentioned in the All Hazard Mitigation plan is for residential and Flood insurance does not cover tsunami waters.

It is not reasonable or feasible to contract out heavy equipment repair or maintenance or to create a vital tools/equipment list since there are multiple permutations of the possible list.

Movement of the Sewer Treatment Plant is not feasible due to the cost involved, possible mitigation of any environmental harm from the inundation, impact of tsunami wave to the structure may be minimal or repairable.

Loss of historical files related to projects and subdivisions (drawings), mitigation efforts can be accomplished by making the drawings electronic or placing these documents in a storage facility.

Radio and Communications systems loss would be detrimental to the control of PRV systems which is part of the water system and the lift stations; loss of communication system capacity affects emergency response for the city.

Bulk Water Use in winter or summer

Comments and discussions on equipment covered the following:

Current mitigation plans does not cover all rolling stock especially the equipment that is on a trailer, in for repair or disabled up to 20-25%, hard to maneuver such as the asphalt machine; dependent on the weather materials and supplies are mostly protected there may be some piping or culverts.

All parks related equipment would not be moved including signage.

Loss of sand or gravel would impact repairs and maintenance of city roads and water service.

Motor Pool – other department rolling stock in maintained and repaired by PW.

Security and Vandalism issues if equipment and supplies are relocated to another location, currently the existing location is not in general view and there are personnel in the Public Works facility 24 hours a day.

Relocate all rolling equipment to Hazel Avenue but for long term storage mitigation equipment could be relocated to the HERC or Library parking lot.

Member Slone questioned the existing continuing operations plan for Public Works in the event of a tsunami.

Public Works Director Keiser responded that currently Public Works does not have one that would be effective and are working on it now which is what triggered the request for this Task Force to be created.
Additional discussion ensued with points made on the extent of Emergency Operations Planning by Departments and touching on that within the catalogue but for the most part that is beyond the scope of this task force.

Chair Aderhold inquired about adding the technology and administrative office computer equipment.

Member Engebretsen noted that due to COVID the technology part would be simple to mitigate but the loss of phones and office space is what would be hard to mitigate.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. Next Steps

Member Engebretsen will refine and update the chart for the next meeting.

Member Keiser will be contacting Elena Suleimani regarding probability

Member Argueta will look into the toxicity to the environment for the fuel and calcium chloride and other additional chemicals that are located at Public Works.

A brief discussion ensued on the ability to have information for the worksession available and if they can cancel the worksession since the packet would need to be ready on Friday. It was noted that there was a typographical error on the date in the packet.

**VENUTI/KEISER - MOVED TO CANCEL THE WORKSESSION ON MARCH 17, 2021 AND HAVE ALL RESEARCH AVAILABLE FOR THE MARCH 24, 2021 REGULAR MEETING.**

There was a brief discussion.

**VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested any additional items that they should address for the next meeting.

Deputy City Clerk asked about the insurance coverage information.

Chair Aderhold recommended that if any member thought of an item for the agenda to let the Clerk know and she will get it on the agenda.

**INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS**

**COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE**

**COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF**
Deputy City Clerk Krause commented on the retention of historical records retention and the intent of the City Clerk’s Office implementing a City Wide Records Management System.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Ms. Venuti commented on learning some interesting facts regarding earthquake and tsunami that they are happening everywhere. It was interesting meeting. Have a good weekend.

Ms. Engebretsen thanked everyone for their time and attention.

Ms. Keiser commented on a remark made at the recent Council meeting by Councilmember Smith about having the meetings in the evenings since the meetings are conducted in the afternoon it does not allow for public participation.

Chair Aderhold requested Deputy City Clerk to contact Councilmember Smith regarding his concerns.

Mr. Barnwell commented on the questions from the Planning Commission regarding the work they are doing and believes there should be some more public involvement.

Chair Aderhold commented that once they have progressed a bit further that they can schedule some public engagement associated with the project for solicitation of public input.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 24, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-04, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:32 p.m. on March 24, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGEBRETSEN, ARGUETA, SLONE, VENUTI AND ADERHOLD

ABSENT: MEMBERS KEISER AND BARNWELL (EXCUSED)

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

VENUTI/SLOANE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for March 10, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

SLOANE/VENUTI - MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTIEON. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Probability on Tsunami

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading the title and asked if there was any questions regarding the information.
Ms. Engebretsen expressed that she still had questions regarding the risks and probability and did not believe that she would be able to explain it to a member of the public if she was questioned on it at some point. She explained that having a talking points that were very elementary and that can be used on the website to communicate this complicated information to the general public was preferred. Ms. Engebretsen further explained that if this group could synthesize and put it into everyday language so if the Council asks what the analysis of the risks are they can respond in two or three sentences.

A discussion ensued on what it would take to get to those talking points with references to the map that was done by Member Barnwell and the information in Member Keiser’s memorandum did not quite match up. Further discussion on the following:

- When comparing the maps to memorandum the Public Works facility will only get about 2.8 feet of water.
- All information and discussion is public and will be on the website available to the public.
- Goal is to explain to Council and the Public why they are recommending action and who they got to those recommendations.
- Exactly what the Council is expecting from the Task Force and rating the risks with the resulting remedies.
- This is a low probability event but potentially catastrophic or high consequence.
- Even a low probability the Council will have to have some idea so that funding can be reserved to mitigate those issues.
- Creation of a matrix to determine risk probability using the data that is currently available, there would be no accuracy, but how low would the probability be.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED THAT THE TASK FORCE CREATE A TSUNAMI INUNDATION PROBABILITY MODEL.

Discussion that there is data available on the likelihood of an event by scale which could be used to create the model ensued with Member Slone providing an example of equations he used to figure the likelihood of a tsunami based on those figures in the data provided by DGGS.

Further discussion points were made in review of the information:

- The information does not support relocating the facility on a whole, only certain aspects of it.
- Should be addressing the Public Works needs moving forward similar to the police and fire station projects.
- Alaska does not use this methodology for probability because there is not enough historical data to base the probability of events on and they do not have a simple response for the public.
- Every tsunami warning Public Works personnel take action to mitigate any possible damage to the equipment. These warnings are issued by the State and the city is part of the system and cannot be changed. It provides good practice on behalf of the city and the community.

There was no further discussion

VOTE. NO. VENUTI, ARGUETA, ENGEBRETSEN, ADERHOLD.
PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS TASK FORCE
REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 24, 2021

VOTE. YES. SLONE.

Motion failed.

**PENDING BUSINESS**

A. Memorandum from Member Engebretsen re: Risk Catalogue and Evaluation

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Engebretsen to present her memorandum.

Member Engebretsen reviewed, from the previous meeting, the information that was requested.

Member Argueta reported on the information he found regarding impact to the environment from fuels and calcium chloride. He noted that while there would be immediate acute toxicity following the event of a tsunami, because of the underlying dilution to those chemicals from the tsunami there would be no long term damage. He stated that the information he received on additional items such as hydraulic fluid, motor oil, etc., were that the quantities were very limited and it would not be a significant source of impact to the environment.

Member Engebretsen reported that she contacted Homer Police Department and they do not currently appoint an officer to direct traffic, however there is enough of a lag in traffic that allows Public Works personnel to move the equipment. She then reported that there are two bulk water suppliers in the area that get their water from other locations that would be able to supply residents.

Member Engebretsen stated that it would be helpful to have an executive summary for the report putting the highest risks and most likely along with mitigation strategies. That will leave these concerns to be addressed by City Council and the public. The Chart will assist in showing the Council and Public what the Task Force looked at overall.

Further discussion points made were on the following:
- Highest priorities include relocating materials such as sand and gravel
- Using the current information in relation to the requirements as outlined by the resolution, including a priority level
- Review of the table and placement of priority of those items based on discussion

Member Engebretsen stated that the next part of the discussion in the development the table would be does the current Public Works meet our needs and will it continue to meet our needs for the next 30 years.

At the next meeting Member Keiser should lead a discussion on what the current needs are of Public Works and what the future needs would be.

Member Engebretsen volunteered to provide the draft for the next meeting and Chair Aderhold volunteered to be copy editor for the document.
Member Slone did not agree with adding in the long term needs for the Public Works Campus is high jacking the intent of the resolution and doesn’t fulfill the request of the Council.

Member Engebretsen acknowledged Member Slone’s concerns and opined that they could have that conversation with Council when they present the table and ask those questions of Council noting that this was a difficult exercise and what direction would they like the Task Force to take.

Member Slone concurred with that approach since there was no way to define the risks in general terms of probability.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of title and noted what next steps were going to be brought forward for the next meeting as follows:
- Member Engebretsen will be drafting the Probable Risks Table and Report
- Identifying Strategies for Mitigation of Risks has been partially worked on
- Short & Long Term Costs for Mitigation Strategies

Deputy City Clerk Krause reported that the steps listed are those that were listed in the resolution, she explained that the risks shown, identified strategies, and some of the mitigation strategies as listed responded to the requested information, and with two meetings in April that should be enough time to get that information to finish the table.

Additional points made were the following:
- Finish the report to Council including the information found on tsunami risks
- Should the Task Force refocus energy on looking at the facility long term and adequacy of will the facility work for the city in the long term
- Public Works Budget requests for FY22/23
- Council unlikely to make a decision this big this quick
- Costs are needed to mitigate the strategies whether it is from tsunami or old age

Deputy City Clerk Krause reported that she did hear from Councilmember Smith on his concerns regarding the public attendance at the meetings were focused on the following:
- the average person is working during the day and they're unable to attend
- due to the complexity and depth of discussions, it would be hard to follow by reading of the minutes
- A webpage would not be adequate information for the general public

Chair Aderhold requested to add on the agenda for the next meeting public input and meeting schedule.

**INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS**

**COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE**
COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented that it was an interesting meeting.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Argueta commented on the decision making process and statistical model on the possible worst case scenarios and expressed appreciation for everyone’s input.

Member Engebretsen echoed Mr. Argueta’s comments and appreciated the good conversations.

Member Venuti expressed appreciation for Ms. Krause’s follow through and doing an excellent job taking notes and adding her comments. She then thanked Member Engebretsen for doing most of the heavy lifting and reminded the Task Force that on March 27th it has been 57 years since the 1964 earthquake which totally wiped out all infrastructure in seven cities noting that those cities she believed came back stronger and better for every community because they had good city leaders, she expressed her belief that Homer had good leadership and that this committee is a good example. She continued by acknowledging the members individuality, intelligence and ability to work well together. Member Venuti expressed her appreciation for everyone’s work and thanked Member Slone for reminding them about the tasks outlined in the resolution.

Chair Aderhold expressed her thanks for everyone’s work and stated her hope that one day soon everyone will be once again able to meet in Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 24, 2021 at 2:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

______________________________
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved:__________________________
Session 21-05, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:30 p.m. on April 14, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, ARGUETA, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, AND BARNWELL

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

VENUTI/BARNWELL - MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

Chair Aderhold stated that the agenda required amending to move the Informational Item B to New Business item C so the Task Force can discuss and take action. She requested a motion.

VENUTI/ARGUETA MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO MOVE INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS ITEM B TO NEW BUSINESS ITEM C.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold inquired if there was any further discussion on the motion as amended.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for March 24, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 2021.

There was no discussion.
VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Probable Risks Table & Report
   - Draft Memorandum to City Council
   - Risks Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Engebretsen to speak to the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen reviewed the work that the Task Force did at the previous meeting and she was unable to finish the table but will be able to at the worksession. She then addressed her draft memorandum to City Council and wanted consensus on the recommendations 1 and 2. She reviewed conclusions providing a brief synopsis for Member Barnwell and requested his opinion on them since he was not at those meetings.

Member Barnwell disagreed with Member Slone points on probability that he raised. He stated the following:

- The DGGS report and analysis is authoritative and that the report shows calculations for the probabilities with the different scenarios shown in that report and those are reflected on the maps.
- He should have spoken up in earlier meetings that the information reflected in the report and maps are an assessment of probability in themselves
- The lines on the maps are the result of computer modeling which takes in all the factors – earthquake magnitude, elevations - that are listed in the report.
- DGGS has presented the scenarios with the worst case scenario going right through the Public Works Campus.

Mr. Barnwell related a conversation with Dr. Salisbury three weeks prior regarding the percentage of probability on the worst case scenario happening, Dr. Salisbury responded that he could not, but asked the question in return, if the City really wanted to take that risk. This science is not as exacting. Member Barnwell expressed that to his professional experience the risk is serious.

Discussion ensued on the applicability of Conclusion 1 as presented in the draft memorandum. Points were made on the following:

- The building is old and is no longer really suitable, not ADA compliant
- If an event happens it will be catastrophic, probability may be low but there is no way to predict an event.
- Materials and supplies need alternative storage locations in reason since they would be required if an event happened.
- Personnel could be assisting in other ways in an event if they were not required to focus on relocating equipment.
- The table clearly identifies that Public Works is a valuable and critical part of the city’s infrastructure.
- Plans should be directed at relocating the facility since data does not support investing in the current location.
- Even a smaller event similar to the one that was presented in video from Santa Cruz can cause devastation.
- Focus should be on the consequences not on probability.

A brief discussion ensued on the drafting of the memorandum to City Council from Task Force. The following edits were made to page 9-10 of the packet:
- Lines 27-28 on page 9 of the packet was not quite correct and should be deleted.
- Lines 28-30 is good, but the verbiage of line 29-30 there is a question on who defines what is dependable.
- Add the statement, The State of Alaska Geological Survey which is the authoritative expert has determined a number of scenarios that would cause catastrophic damage to the lower elevations of the coastal part of Homer.
- Add Geological Survey cannot provide a specific probability but the scenarios are based on computer modeling.
- When a warning is received there is no information

Member Keiser joined the meeting at 3:10 p.m. and Chair Aderhold brought her up to speed on the discussion on the table.

Member Keiser provided her understanding of the information and how that would affect the Public Works Campus and resulting damages.

Member Barnwell provided the correct impact that would be experienced by the Public Works Campus in a worst case scenario which could happen tomorrow or 100 years from now. He further explained that even if an event happened and Public Works was not affected as bad as other areas they would be needed to mitigate other areas of the city that it would happen such as the Homer Spit.

Chair Aderhold reminded the Task Force that the maximum inundation is 50 feet which means that Public Works could be 20 feet under water.

Member Engebretsen stated that is the message that needs to be presented to the public along with clarification that even if the water level is only a couple of feet it would erode the areas around the building which would be detrimental to the foundation of the building.

Further comments from the Task Force were made on the following:
- level of water, debris contents in the water and time period with regards to the amount of damage received by the facility
- the unknown science of Cook Inlet, Gulf of Alaska or Shelikof Strait
Member Engebretsen reviewed the requirements of the Resolution 20-125 and noted the items that she would address for the worksession. She initiated a brief discussion on the table to fill in the following:
- RV Holding Tanks capacity
- The existing coverage that the City maintains versus the actual cost of replacement in the vicinity of $12-14 million dollars
- Disruptions to sewer treatment operations and mitigation options would be cleaning and repair of damages to the building, such as replacement of wiring.

Member Engebretsen stated that she would short and long term cost estimates as well as the revised Council memorandum.

Member Keiser noted that the information for the Public Works Facility from the CIP would be really helpful on costs.

Deputy City Clerk Krause will forward that information to Member Engebretsen and include in the packet for the worksession.

Chair Aderhold noted the email submitted by Member Slone supporting the determination of general risk assessment of low, medium and high and that there would be a low risk but high consequence and recommended that the Task Force formally adopt a statement reflecting those determinations or one similar.

Member Barnwell requested clarification of the raw date mentioned and what type of low probability model Member Slone referenced in his email. Member Slone requested a few minutes to review his email.

Chair Aderhold called for a brief break at 3:32 p.m. She called the meeting back to order at 3:36 p.m.

Member Slone stated that his reference was raw data, not raw date. He then reviewed the actions and discussion from the last meeting which at the time the Task Force seemed to concur with that statement regarding the low risk, high consequence analysis. He then figured that they would need to adopt it formally by motion but now it seems that they do not agree with that and reversing the decision.

Chair Aderhold reviewed the discussion on the requirements of the Resolution that tasked them to come up with a probability which is not possible and that they can make that statement at the beginning and they can approve the memorandum before submitting it to Council.

Further discussion points were made on the following:
- The Task Force is not the experts, that is the State of Alaska Geological Survey who is putting the authoritative analysis out there that states the risks Homer is or will face
- There are six different scenarios presented
- Any of them could happen at any time now or in the future
- Do not have to reinvent the probability model, it has already been done
- Decision is needed to determine if the Public Works infrastructure should be exposed to the risks that are outlined in the report.
Deputy City Clerk Krause noted a point of order that the Resolution 20-125 did not require the Task Force to determine probability of a tsunami but the probable risks that would be incurred if one happened. She further noted that page 19 in the packet showed the goals that were requested by City Council.

Member Keiser stated that she agreed with Ms. Krause and then explained why she wanted the Task Force to be formed.

b. Identifying Strategies for the Mitigation of Risks
   - Identify strategies for each risk identified in the table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item and opened the floor to discussion.

Member Keiser requested clarification on line 30-32 in the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen explained that they discussed that sentence and it will be removed.

Discussion was facilitated by Member Engebretsen on portions of the table and the following amendments and comments were made:
   - Adding information regarding worst case scenario to loss of life in the workers section

A difference of opinion was expressed on the event that would trigger the worst case scenario that would affect the Public Works Campus and the time that would be available to evacuate the facility ensued with Member Slone requesting the time to review the record to bring back to the next meeting his findings and advocated that if the Task Force is to make a decision based on the science then they should defer to the scientists.

Chair Aderhold noted that they were only working on the details and not making any decisions at this meeting. She further commented on the value to the overall discussion and inquired if there were any further comments on that particular topic, adding that if there is no known information, then they must use the information provided in the worst case scenario, noting that if a tsunami caused by an underwater landslide in Kachemak Bay would be a very fast moving event and difficult to respond to quickly.

Member Engebretsen responding to Chair Aderhold that she believed they had all the information needed to complete the table and then recounted the next worksession to review and amend the draft which can then be approved at the April 28th. They will then have a final document ready for the May 10th Council meeting on Goal #1.

c.  Short & Long Term Costs for Mitigation Strategies
   - Identify short and long term costs involved for each of the mitigation strategies identified for each of the risks shown in the table.

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and open the floor to discussion.
A brief discussion was facilitated by Members Keiser and Engebretsen on the following:
- Is it necessary to move the whole facility or just the majority
- Prior space planning and dimensional issues
  - Requirements for newer equipment used by other departments
- Bring information for review during the worksession

NEW BUSINESS

a. Current and Future Needs for the Public Works Department
- Identify and categorize the current and future needs in relation to the facility that the department would require.

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and opened the discussion by commenting on the overlap within the topics since they just touched on this topic but requested any additional future needs that Member Keiser could possibly list.

Member Keiser responded with the following needs for Public Works:
- Additional covered storage for equipment
- Larger mechanical shop
- Office and storage space for Parks Department
- Storage for supplies
- Size of the existing Public Works is roughly 2.5-2.75 acres but this does not include the Animal Shelter or the Water Sewer Treatment Plant, snow storage, etc.
- Conceptual plan is 4.6 acres however some things such as the gravel or sand pile could be maintained at the existing site
- New facility would need to allow for more parking

b. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold reviewed the potential items for the worksession agenda as follows:
- Memorandum to Council and Table

c. Public Works Campus Task Force Approved Meeting Schedule

Chair Aderhold introduced the item noting that this was moved from the Informational materials to address the following concerns expressed regarding the accessibility of the meetings to the public as follows:
- Average person is working during the time the meetings are scheduled.
- Due to the complexity and depth of the discussions it would be hard to follow just by reading the minutes.
- A webpage would not be adequate information for the general public.

Chair Aderhold opened the floor to discussion.

A discussion ensued on the following topics:
VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE MEETING TIME TO START AT 4:30 P.M.

There was a brief discussion on the new time being applicable to the worksessions.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Venuti will inform Councilmember Smith on the change in their meeting time.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

a. Resolution 20-125 Creating the Public Works Campus Task Force and Assigning Scope of Work

b. Inundation Maps

A brief discussion was held on including the Tsunami Report in the worksession packet or if the document could be provided on the meeting page on the City website since it was so large. It was determined that the document could be available on the website as all the members had their paper copies from the previous meeting.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause expressed her appreciation for the change in the meeting time to make it easier for the public to attend the meetings and advised the Task Force of the vacancies on the other advisory bodies.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Venuti commented on the weather warming up and noticed that Member Argueta did not have his bike hanging up on the wall behind him so she was hoping he was able to get out a ride and then noted that Council just approved a Resolution in support of Fairbanks to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. She expressed her concerns for all cyclists safety. Ms. Venuti appreciated everyone’s
serving on this Task Force knowing that they serve on multiple committees and its really nice getting to know everyone.

Chair Aderhold thanked everyone and expressed that they had some very good, productive discussions today.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 28, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. A worksession is scheduled on Wednesday, April 21, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

__________________________________________

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved:___________________________________
Session 21-06, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:35 p.m. on April 14, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBREITSEN, ARGUETA, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, AND BARNWELL

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

A worksession was conducted on April 21, 2021 and the Task Force worked on drafting the Memorandum to City Council.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

VENUTI/BARNWELL - MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

   A. Regular Meeting Minutes for April 14, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2021.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS
A. Probable Risks Table & Report
   - Draft Memorandum to City Council
   - Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and requested a motion to adopt the memorandum.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO ADOPT THE MEMORANDUM.

The Task Force members reviewed the draft memorandum and made the following minor corrections:
   - Line 3 added the word “Campus” before Task Force
   - Line 31 footnote should be in Line 24
   - Line 32 last word “is” should be “are”
   - Line 55, delete “wasn’t” and add “were not” after personnel
   - Line 71, capitalize the words Task Force
   - Include the inundation map as an attachment so Council will be able to review what they are talking about
   - Remove the site locations, A-D since the Task Force has not talked about locations
   - Shorten the scenario titles to Scenario 1 - 9
   - The order the attachments to the memorandum, the map or maps can be first or second attachment

Chair Aderhold briefed Member Keiser and Member Slone who arrived at the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Member Barnwell recommended that they use map two which zooms in on the public works facility noting that the map one focuses on whole town.

Discussion ensued on the map that Member Barnwell created from the Tsunami Report information and the scenarios that would actually affect the Public Works facility. Argument was presented that the map reflects all the scenarios and it was agreed that since their focus was on the existing public works campus the maps should reflect only those scenarios that would impact the facility.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO INCLUDE THE INUNDATION MAP DEPICTING TWO SCENARIOS TO THE MEMORANDUM.

VENUTI/KEISER MOVED TO INCLUDE THE INUNDATION MAP CREATED BY MEMBER BARNWELL AND THAT THE MAP REFLECT THE TWO SCENARIOS THAT AFFECT THE FACILITY AND FURTHER AMEND THE MAP TO REMOVE THE PROPOSED SITE LOCATIONS A-D.

A brief discussion on the motions on the floor ensued providing clarifications that two scenarios only shown on the inundation map.

VOTE. (Secondary Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
Further discussion clarifying the map attachment to the memorandum would contain.

VOTE. (Primary Amendment.) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Further discussion ensued on changes to the memorandum regarding the following:
- Line 55, when speaking about opportunity costs, is this currently part of the designated function or would it be included in the emergency response plan
  - This would be included in the emergency response plan and would be on an as needed basis, example was provided that Public Works personnel could assist the police department in getting the word out in another section of town or assist Port & Harbor in evacuating from the Spit in lieu of relocating their equipment.

Chair Aderhold confirmed there was no further discussion and called for a vote to adopt the memorandum to Council as amended.

VOTE. (Main as amended) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Short & Long Term Mitigation Costs
   - Memorandum from Member Engebretsen
   - Prioritized Mitigation Strategies and Relative Costs Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and noted the items in the memorandum from Member Engebretsen and opened discussion.

Member Barnwell requested some additional input on the conundrum presented.

Member Engebretsen explained that there is a question on how much detail does City Council want from the Task Force. The resolution requested a dollar amount should be listed for the risks but then there are opportunity costs where we can be using our dollars smarter and wiser if we are using our people smarter. So that lends to the question of how much detail and which direction you want to go.

Member Venuti stated that City Council reviews a budget and I believe understands the salary and how it spreads over multiple departments. She did not believe that they had to put a cost to personnel labor.

Member Engebretsen expressed some of the struggle on how much detail on costs for each mitigation strategy and the best way to present that information.

Member Keiser noted that it was this very discussion with her staff on what kinds of supplies should they stockpile and where to put them, what machines should they think about putting someplace else.
They discussed the possibilities and there were some minor things that could be done but the long and short of it is the buildings are in the wrong place, and all our stuff is on the wrong place. So they did not really pursue specific mitigations but it would be a good exercise to go through as a demonstration to show that they reviewed all possibilities.

Ms. Keiser provided the example of the Fuel Depot and that there is some funding put aside for it but if they look to relocate that there is an added cost of upwards $300,000 to $400,000. Then proceeded to state that if you review the mitigation strategies in increments you will end up with a large dollar amount whether it is done all at once or step by step. However, step by step you may be all over the town and therefore adding costs. She still supported going through that exercise of demonstrating that.

Further discussion on the estimation of costs would be conducted similar to other projects that Public Works does but the bigger question is, where are you going to put it?

Member Venuti stated that you do not want City Council to expend the time to go through each amount, from a council perspective the information needed is what is the most important to move, possible sites and what is the cost. She advocated that they present a bigger picture and suggested sites.

Chair Aderhold noted that Member Argueta needed to leave the meeting and wanted to allow him some input before leaving the Task Force.

Member Argueta stated that this has been his introduction to the workings of local government and a very valuable process and experience. As far as the work on the Task Force he stated that it was clear that the Public Works facility needed to be moved, not only to mitigate the tsunami hazard but just to be able to function and serve the city as the population grows, and it is a critical component to the infrastructure of the city as pointed out by Ms. Keiser.

Member Argueta departed the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Discussion continued on the best path forward for pinning down specific costs with the following topics raised or points made:

- Using two scenarios, low risk or initial response and long term response or scenario
  - Generalized costs
  - Complex interactions lend to the impossible task of listing all costs involved
- Urgent issue is the equipment and repairs to that equipment
  - This makes up 75% of the Public Works facility
    - Mechanic Shop requires the specialized big ticket costs
    - The remaining building is nominal cost in comparison
  - Sand and Gravel stockpiles could remain on existing site plus other low commodity items
- There are limited choices in regards to the facility move all of it or none of it
- Make the recommendation and Council can start working on this funding while bonding may not be the best direction
  - This project is on the CIP and could be updated with the information from the Task Force
- Instead of completing a cost table, they make the recommendation to relocate the whole facility and consideration on the next step of where are they going to put it
They need to tell the story, there will need to be a narrative to explain the process on how the Task Force reached their recommendations
  - Including the timeline for the project to commence, sooner rather than later
  - Costs related to the mechanics shop and equipment shed is majority of project
  - Replacement of the Fuel Island due to the corrosion should be completed before the facility and how should that be accomplished

Public Works Five Year Capital Improvement Plan includes modest $50,000 to develop a strategic plan and conceptual layout

Acquire property before it gets too expensive or is no longer available, the opportunities are shrinking, number of large parcels available is shrinking and we should take the funding available for the fuel island and buy property.
  - There are options available such as establishing a fleet account for fuel purchases, installing fuel tanks on pickup trucks to fuel other equipment

Three major cost areas for this proposal which would be more acceptable to the public and City Council

Should start incrementally by buying property then move the facilities when the opportunity arises and funding is available

Support expressed for moving to a single location and sooner rather than later starting with a strategic plan
  - Summarizing the options and what is going to be moved
    - Relocate the entire facility $12 million cost not palatable to the city
    - Limp Along Plan – do what we need to do to keep operating
    - Long Term Incremental Plan – Move things as funding and opportunity presents

Member Slone proposed to review the three options then focus on the long term incremental plan especially purchasing a property.

Commissioner Barnwell expressed his support for moving the facility as a whole, purchasing property as soon as possible as well as creating a strategic plan for the project. He believed that it needed to be analyzed sooner rather than later on a location and a strategic plan would layout the timeline.

Member Slone questioned offering a motion on what they were just discussing, limp along plan, incremental or lock stock and barrel focusing on the necessity of acquisition of land and including it in the report to Council.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED THAT THE THREE SCENARIOS LIMP ALONG PLAN, LONG TERM INCREMENTAL PLAN AND THE LOCK STOCK AND BARREL MOVEMENT PROPOSALS BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL WITH EMPHASIS ON PURCHASING SUITABLE LAND AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

A recommendation to bring suggestions for property to purchase was made but it was determined that should be done in separate motion.
Further discussion ensued on including these recommendations in addition to the chart that the three options would be used as a narrative, and the cost chart and other learned information would be attached as backup.

It was noted that Public Works Director Keiser would be required to provide the information regarding the 85% of the campus being the crucial part and the remainder comes along for the ride.

Member Barnwell requested the motion to read.

Deputy City Clerk Krause read the motion as she had it for the record.

Member Slone provided clarification on long term incremental development, noting that better verbiage could be applied as appropriate. He added that this was also be included in the report to City Council.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO HAVE MEMBERS PROVIDE PROPERTY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT MEETING TO DISCUSS LOCATION AND COST.

Discussion ensued on additional information that is needed to be able to shop for land. It would be best to perform a review before they go looking at land such as the following criteria:
- Size, how many acres
- What kind of configuration would work
- Does it have to be a big square, rectangular, could it be tear drop shape
- What type of topography is acceptable

Member Venuti stated she wished to pull her motion from consideration.

Member Slone supported that request and pulled his second.

Further discussion included the following points:
- Establishing criteria such as location to city hall and or other city facilities
- Rank the parcels of land based on the criteria established

Deputy City Clerk Krause responding to Chair Aderhold that the correct action would be to vote down the motion.

VOTE. NO. SLONE, BARNWELL, VENUTI, ADERHOLD, ENGEBRETSEN, KEISER

Motion failed.

Chair Aderhold invited Member Slone to speak.
SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED THAT MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN AND KEISER PRESENT A REPORT AT THE NEXT MEETING OUTLINING THE CRITERIA NECESSARY REQUIRED FOR A SUITABLE PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS TO BE SUPPLEMENTED THEREAFTER BY A GIS REPORT.

Member Engebretsen and Member Keiser agreed to meet at 10am on Thursday, May 6, 2021.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Slone inquired if there was additional professional services that Ms. Keiser may need to speak with such as an Architect or Engineer.

Member Keiser responded that would be helpful to refine some of the layouts that has been provided by the former Public Works Director and it would also assist in determining what type of property they would be looking at, she then noted that they do have some funding that would pay for professional services such as this.

Member Engebretsen stated that additional information would be very helpful.

Member Slone asked if a motion of support would be beneficial.

Member Keiser responded that it would be helpful to have the endorsement.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED TO ENDORSE THAT PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR KEISER SEEK PROFESSIONAL SERVICES OF AN ARCHITECT TO THE LIMIT THAT AVAILABLE FUNDING ALLOWS TO DETERMINE THE VARIABLES FOR A NEW PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS.

There was no additional discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was a brief discussion on the upcoming actions and deliverables for the next meeting as follows:
- Bringing back the draft of a document listing the three options proposed by member Slone as All in One, Incremental and Limp Along
- Site Selection Criteria and Discussion with an Architect

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

a. Inundation Maps
b. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
c. Approved Task Force Meeting Schedule – Revised April 15, 2021

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE
COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause stated that she will be on vacation in June and complimented the Task Force on getting a lot done tonight.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Barnwell offered his offices to Member Slone and stated it was a great meeting.

Member Keiser requested clarification on the next meeting date.

Chair Aderhold echoed the sentiments of a great meeting and announced the next meeting date.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 12, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

______________________________
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-07, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:30 p.m. on May 12, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, AND BARNWELL

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

Chair Aderhold inquired if there was any discussion on the motion as presented.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO ADD “COUNCIL REPORT” UNDER REPORTS.

There was a brief clarification on the request.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was no further discussion on the main motion as amended.

VOTE. (Main) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for April 28, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 2021.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS
A. Council Report on Memorandum Report for Goal #1 from the Task Force

Member Venuti provided a summary of the report she provided to Council. She noted that there were concerns expressed regarding the two votes in favor of any recommendations from the Task Force; expenditure of funds and going beyond the scope of the assigned work.

Chair Aderhold provided additional information on the concerns expressed by members of the Council regarding the funding of a consultation with an architect; and the direction of the recommendation to relocate the public works facility. She reminded them that the makeup of the Task Force was outlined by a resolution approved in January by the City Council, the relocation and construction of a new public works facility was already in the CIP and the funding was already appropriated and came from public works budget.

A discussion ensued on the inclusion of information in the report on requesting Council to broaden the scope of work of the Task Force to include other reasons to relocate the public works facility and clarification that the report to Council only included the findings for Goal #1 as outlined in Resolution 20-125. It was further clarified that the Task Force should include a bit more background information in reports to Council on the steps performed.

PENDING BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS
A. Memorandum from Task Force Member Engebretsen re: Site Selection & Draft Site Plan

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Member Engebretsen to review her memorandum.

Member Engebretsen provided information on the process she took to review and eliminate various parcels of land that are available or would be suitable for relocation of the Public Works Campus in the city. She then reported on the properties that were visited with Public Works Director Keiser
- the Waddell property located east of the Police Station is great large enough and basically flat, but is barely above the inundation line
- a parcel north of Grubstake on Lake Street just above the HEA equipment yard would be tight fit, suitable location and accessible
- a parcel off of Greatland which would be great location but is really sloping, there is also a creek through the property and would not be suitable
- the parcel in Town Center off of Main Street & Pioneer Avenue would have heavy equipment egressing onto Pioneer Avenue or Main Street which would not be great, steep slope

Member Keiser reported that she focused on the property on Lake Street and reported finding some previous work that was conducted by the prior Public Works Director. She reported that the review of the other available properties were not conducive or suited to the uses that Public Works needs and in
her opinion would have a higher and better use for the community. She then reported that she engaged the services of a local architect to configure how exactly the components of existing Public Works Services would fit or placed on the parcels of land. She believed that the Lake Street parcels would also fit into the current uses that are surrounding it. The Bad news was that they would require considerable development work and they would require three parcels if not the use of the four parcels which are not all currently being offered for sale. The largest parcel is being offered currently.

Member Keiser and Member Engebretsen responded to questions and commented on topics regarding the following:
- compiling a database on real estate costs, analysis of the different sites that were reviewed
  - there are strong competing interests to spending funds on a new public works facility
    - over a new community recreation facility
  - a new updated Fire Department Campus
- providing options to City Council will not override the decisions to expend the amount of funding required to construct a new public works facility
- City Council has changed over time and keeping this on the CIP along with the report to back it up is valuable
- The available funding is a concern but should only be one concern of the Task Force
  - The Task Force may be outpacing the expectations of City Council
  - Focus on it is necessary to relocate the Public Works Campus
  - We can present a good start for Council such as the Lake Street parcel, access, commercial zoning, etc.
- If the Task Force wants to continue the discussion then they should submit a request to Council to broaden the scope of work
- Recommendation could include that City Council purchase the parcel on Lake Street
  - The City would benefit having that parcel in its portfolio whether it is for a new Public Works Facility of Fire Department
- Prior land sales and current or future development and the shrinking opportunities
- The steps and work Council took to reach consensus with the development of the new Police Station and that this may need the same work and steps to bring to fruition.
- Needing to relate the story to effect understanding by City Council

Member Slone stated that he could not support further discussion unless City Council is willing to broaden the scope of the Task Force to address the issue of obsolescence and the issues of running out of room which will affect the ability of the public works department to function.

SLONE/ENGBREITSEN MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS TASK FORCE REQUEST CITY COUNCIL TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF WORK AS OUTLINED IN RESOLUTION 20-125 TO INCORPORATE OTHER ISSUES OF CONCERN REGARDING THE FUTURE OF THE PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS INCLUDING THE OBSOLESCEANCE AND INADEQUACY OF SPACE.

Discussion ensued on the following topics:
- Primary Goal to address the possible risk to the Campus and losing the ability to be effective
- Perception on focusing on relocation of the facility
- If they ask for the authority to discuss the expanded scope there should be no offense
- There is no question on the risk but on the probabilities there is no way to really quantify those
Previous decisions made on city facilities is because they addressed all aspects of staying in the current location, renovate or build new

Recommended looking a little broader but not necessarily spending too much time and using that information to update and facilitate further information for the project on the CIP

Require City Council permission since the Resolution succinctly defined the scope of work

Explaining that they are looking into the future and this threat was discovered during the discussion on the risk of a tsunami and is considered a risk just as much as a tsunami

Using different verbiage other than expand or increase

Deputy City Clerk Krause recommended verbiage of “develop the scope of works to include” and stated that a memorandum can be added to the agenda under new business for approval where a resolution might be perceived as a bit strong since that would be used to amend the previous resolution approved.

Further discussion ensued on the preference of a memorandum over a resolution to request the amendment to the scope of work, and reviewing the resolution under the goals the Task Force can consider this as a part of their recommendations as described under Goal #3 and that the location is just part of the assessment, such as considering the elevations acceptable, zoning, etc. and orders of magnitude.

VOTE. YES. ENGBRETSEN.
VOTE. NO. SLONE, BARNWELL, VENUTI, ADERHOLD, KEISER

Motion failed.

Chair Aderhold referred to the memorandum in the packet and requested further comment from Member Keiser.

Member Keiser noted that in review of the parcels available on Lake Street it was determined that they could use the existing Public Works facility for storage and personnel, such as maintenance and parks personnel could use the existing Public Works Offices, relocating from the HERC 2 facility as well as storage of low value equipment and materials such as the sand pile which would then free up the space required on the proposed new parcel for higher value equipment and supplies.

Member Engebretsen requested direction on how this information should be reflected in the final report to Council. She then opined that they have this memorandum and information and who will draft the final report and incorporating the information they have into that final report.

Chair Aderhold noted that Angie Newby reached out to the City Manager to remind him that she is contracted by the City and would be happy to attend a meeting as a visitor with regards to the services of a relator. She explained to the City Manager that they were not at a point to require the services of a realtor at this time. She further noted that they would need to determine the criteria that the city requires for a potential site to offer a new public works facility.

Member Keiser commented that she felt Member Engebretsen had the knowledge and expertise needed to vet proposed parcels.
A brief discussion ensued on Member Engebretsen speaking with Ms. Newby to see if there may be some valid points that they might be missing or that a property may be available that they are not aware of; further clarification that Ms. Newby would be representing the city in any land purchase that they city may conduct. Concerns were expressed by the Task Force on presumptions and possible misunderstandings.

B. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold stated that this is where they discuss the items for the next meeting to be on the agenda and those deliverables. She then requested input from the Task Force, listing some ideas such as Goal #2 and Goal #3 and what the final report would look like.

Discussion ensued on developing the final report and how that should be formatted and the content of that report. Included were the following items:
- Two Part report
  o First part contains the analysis and what was analyzed included could be the risk and mitigation table
  o Second will contain the recommendations and rationale
- Inclusion of the strategies and cost estimates
  o Moving the campus is the preferred choice
  o Additional Strategies are shown on the risk & mitigation table
- Recommendations
  o Site Selections

Member Keiser was volunteered to write the report by Member Engebretsen.

Deputy City Clerk Krause volunteered to assist Member Keiser with drafting the report.

Chair Aderhold stated that she would like to use the memorandums, tables, and minutes to create a framework of the story they need to tell. She then noted that the process is what brought them to their final recommendations. She then questioned whether they should submit a report for goal two and three.

Member Engebretsen advised that they should be mindful of their time and staff ability as Council did not hire a Consultant to put this together so they need to be respectful of their time.

Discussion ensued on the following points:
- Goal three listed developing a system for evaluating strategies to identify mitigation
  o Listing individual strategies to mitigate the issues such as storage of supplies at other location
  o Validating a system of evaluating a strategy to develop conclusion
    ▪ Efficiency of ability to continue service
- Limp Along Plan, Long Range Incremental Plan, Lock Stock & Barrel Plan
- Important to show that they did not go straight to relocation
- Important to show that Public Works is an essential service to reinstate city services including those located on the Spit
- Not to have the report too overwhelming
- Identify criteria for evaluating the strategies then drafting the final report
  - Continuity of essential services
  - Cost effectiveness defined

Chair Aderhold requested that the memorandums from Member Engebretsen, the resolution and then the report to City Council in the next packet.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

a. Inundation Maps
b. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
c. Approved Task Force Meeting Schedule – Revised April 15, 2021

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented it was a good meeting.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Venuti commented that it was very thought provoking and that it was the first time that Council had questions on their report but is confident that Council will make the right decision. She further believed that it would be 6-8 years not 15 years or more.

Member Barnwell commented that he liked the 6-8 years and agreed it was a good meeting.

Member Slone apologized for wasting time at the last meeting as he did not realize that Charles had agreed with him in the beginning and he continued on for another ten minutes.

Member Keiser commented in including a line item in her upcoming budget for developing a plan that will hopefully move them forward.

Chair Aderhold expressed her appreciation for a good meeting and called for adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 26, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-08, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:44 p.m. on May 26, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD

ABSENT: MEMBER BARNWELL (EXCUSED)

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

The meeting was delayed to connectivity and device issues.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

ENGBRETSEN/KEISER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for May 12, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

VENUTI/ENGBRETSEN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 12, 2021.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS
NEW BUSINESS

A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Criteria for Evaluating Strategies

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Keiser to review the memorandum.

Member Keiser provided the following information:

- The Task Force was directed to develop strategies and then develop criteria to evaluate those strategies.

The Task Force developed the following three strategies:

- Strategy #1 – The Limp Along Plan
  - The City continues as it has always done and takes no action regarding the Public Works Campus.

- Strategy #2 – Lock, Stock & Barrel
  - Make the decision to relocate the Public Works Facility as a priority

- Strategy #3 – Long Term Incremental
  - Recognize that there is an issue and phase the project
    - Site Acquisition
    - Design
    - Funding
    - Construction in Phases

Member Keiser then stated that she developed the Criteria as follows to be applied to the strategies:

- Criteria #1 – Cost/Benefit Ratio
  - This can be finite or more intuitive
  - Computing the expected costs
  - Quantifying the expected benefits
    - These may support the higher costs

- Criteria #2 – Supports Public Works Mission
  - Preserves the ability to perform essential functions
    - Assist in Emergency situations
    - Construction Management and Design
    - Repair and Replace city infrastructure

- Criteria #3 – Funding Strategies
  - Grants, In-house or Loans

- Criteria #4 – Strategy can be Phased
  - This would allow the strategy to be more feasible and financially viable
    - Limp Along
    - Lock Stock & Barrel
So taking the three strategies developed at the last meeting and using the criteria that was develop to review and rank them with High, Medium and low point values as follows:

- Low – 1 point
- Medium – 2 points
- High – 3 points

So the higher the number, the more favorable the strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Strategy #1</th>
<th>Strategy #2</th>
<th>Strategy #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limp Along Plan</td>
<td>Lock, Stock &amp; Barrel</td>
<td>Long Term Incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports PW Mission</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Availability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be Phased</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is of Essence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Aderhold opened the floor to questions or comments from the Task Force.

Discussion was facilitated on the following:
- Noted that there was an error in the point value shown on Strategy #3 under Funding Availability should reflect 2
- The strategies all were scored the same for time is of essence
- From a public perspective with a three point spread difference
  - Out of 15 points available the 3 point spread there is not much difference between the strategies
  - Giving the value of 6 per point would then place the value for Strategy #1 at 66 which if we increased the overall value to 100 the perception could be changed
  - Allowing more points would express the spread and difference in the strategies
- Strategy #3 should be rated high under supports Public Works Mission, instead of medium
- Refining Time is of Essence on the strategies should be refined
- Public Receptivity should be included as a criteria and recommendation made on the following:
  - Limp along Plan 3 points – no additional costs to the public
  - Lock, Stock and Barrel 1 points
  - Long Term Incremental could be rated a 2 points - $250K land purchase to start
- Public Perception on large expenditures on construction projects is not favorable with the Police Station as an example of the time and effort needed to get that project approved
- Need to define the Ranking Scale
  - Defining the Cost Benefit Analysis, it stands that the cost of doing nothing is rated high but we need to depict how the benefit is outweighing the cost. Need to define how you get to each of the ranks
  - Providing a narrative that describes how the scores were developed.
- The current Public Works CIP has included $50K for creating an implementation plan which would develop and create a plan and phasing
- The recommendation will be based on the information provided by the experts, include the facts with the story
- Narrative can be supplied for the ranking and adding a public perception criteria would be a good thing and will be added to the table.
- Capacity of Public Works, consideration to include the costs for doing nothing
  - Including a separate memorandum that covers the inefficiencies that are existing currently, the operations and staff that are placed in other facilities that are not appropriate or suitable to reflect that doing nothing is not a viable response
    - Maintenance and repair of equipment increases in some newer equipment so appropriate facilities are required to conduct that business no matter
  - Defining the benefits to keeping Public Works Departments together and not supporting separation of services.
  - Include facilities being occupied by Public Works Departments/Personnel

B. Next Steps
   1. Draft Report Outline and Content

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and facilitated discussion on the framework for the report and what they should include in the report. The following topics were to be included:
- risk, risk analysis, site selection, site evaluation, criteria, strategy evaluation, recommendations, next steps
- introduction that provides why the task force created and what were they directed or tasked with
- Memorandum of two pages or less with a summary of recommendations to Council and the report will be about 20 pages with the details
- Using the same narrative voice throughout the document
- The memorandum dated April 30, 2021 was submitted to Council and some of the language would be included in the report but it would be attached as an exhibit to the report.
- Executive Summary, Overview, body of the report that speaks to the phases and attached the report would be the memorandums and tables for more details.

Deputy City Clerk Krause inquired if the Task Force would consider canceling the next regular meeting to allow them to work on the draft report. She additionally noted that she would be on vacation for two weeks and that Member Engebretsen as stated that she has a prior commitment and will be unable to attend that meeting as well.

VENUTI/SHONE MOVED TO CANCEL THE JUNE 9, 2021 REGULAR MEETING.

Discussion included points on canceling the meeting would allow a more complete draft of the document to be presented to the Task Force for review; staff commitments and additional absences of members.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Keiser volunteered to draft up the Next steps section for the report to have at the next meeting as well.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
A. Resolution 20-125, Creating the Public Works Campus Task Force and establishing the Scope of Work and Parameters under which the Task Force will Conduct its Work.
B. Memorandum dated May 12, 2021 from Member Engebretsen re: Site Selection Review
C. Memorandum dated April 20, 2021 to City Council re: Risk Catalog and Evaluation
D. Memorandum dated April 22, 2021 from Member Engebretsen re: Short & Long Term Mitigation Costs
E. 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Project Sheet - New Public Works Facility

Chair Aderhold reviewed each of the items and asked if there were any questions or comments.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented that she will endeavor to do her best.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE
Member Venuti commented on the Memorial Day holiday coming up and the importance of the holiday to many folks and wished Deputy City Clerk Krause a safe trip.

Chair Aderhold hoped everyone enjoys the almost month off from the Task Force meetings and have a great Holiday weekend.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 23, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

______________________________
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved:________________________
Session 21-09, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:44 p.m. on May 26, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD

ABSENT: MEMBER BARNWELL (EXCUSED)

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to amend the agenda to add discussion of the report to Council under pending business for discussion and review.

ENGBRETSEN/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO ADD THE DRAFT REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL UNDER PENDING BUSINESS.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was no further discussion on the motion as amended.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for May 26, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes of May 26, 2021.

SLONE/VENUTI- SO MOVED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

Mike Parrish, Senior Mechanic, Public Works Department, spoke to the Task Force on the inadequacies of the Mechanic’s Shop for Public Works. He provided a brief history with the City of Homer and briefly outlined the required needs for the maintenance and repairs for most of the City owned equipment.

Mr. Parrish facilitated questions on the following topics:
- Upcoming or pending purchases of equipment that will be too large for the shop
- Safety issues and lack of work space necessary to conduct the repairs
- Capability of the existing shop area to be expanded is not viable due to the existing layout being constrained by the vehicle access required to reach the animal shelter and Water Treatment

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Criteria for Evaluating Strategies
   a. Criteria Scoresheet

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Public Works Director Keiser to speak to her memorandum.

Ms. Keiser reported that she reviewed the Task Force comments from the last meeting and using those comments as a guideline added criteria to address public perception, redefined criteria related to timeliness, provided clarification on the criteria. She further noted that she reevaluated the ranking scale to apply a higher number to allow more distinction between the different categories.

Discussion on the following ensued:
- Under the Cost Benefit Analysis how is the cost actually weighted versus the benefit
  o Using the Risks and Mitigation spreadsheet as a guideline for understanding the benefits of a particular mitigation strategy
  o A traditional cost benefit analysis was not done using scientific means but more of an intuitive approach using the risk hazard analysis that the Task Force compiled
  o The data is not available to perform an actual cost benefit ratio analysis
  o It could be delineated as a probable costs would be worth the probable benefits
- Under Timeliness how is a high score taking action important
  o Similar to the Cost Benefit, seeking ambiguity since there is a risk
  o Not enough available data to compute said risk
  o Some constraints but there are windows of opportunity that could be taken advantage of
  o Importance is reflective on the worth of the benefit
    ▪ Example of purchasing land now since it may not be available if time elapses
- Additional narrative is required
Including a separate paragraph to address the facility has been outgrown and that the city does not do a regular analysis on needs and if the current facilities will meet the needs going into the future.

Additional paragraph to include the information that addresses the inefficient and aging infrastructure while reviewing the tsunami risk.

Criteria two redefined and applied to the strategies.

Chart needs to be revised for clarification and ease of understanding by the public and Council.

Timing because importance when a decision is made by Council on the probability.

Preference of having Council weigh in on the obsolescence over tsunami inclusion in their report.

Requested in the Scope of Work mitigation strategies were to have a cost applied to them.

- Doing noting still has a cost applicable.
- Lock, Stock & Barrel costs are provided in CIP page and costs could be provided for the other two strategies.

Ranking Scale includes the Community as a beneficiary.

- Strategy may benefit the department but not the Community.
- Efficiency in serving the public and department safety.

Scale numerator.

- Using only three numbers.
- Applying a range of numbers.
  - This might allow for more nuance.
- Remove numbers altogether since it may be construed as arbitrary.
  - Low, medium and high.
  - Range of numbers and words.
  - Explaining the range of numbers if asked by the public and using words how to determine the total score.

- Scoring.

  - Mitigation solely based on Tsunami risk versus obsolescence.
  - Timing is effected when you cannot determine when a tsunami event may occur versus obsolescence.
  - Revised the language in criteria two.
    - Recommend creating another criteria to address obsolescence versus tsunami risk to be transparent.
    - Criteria 2A and Criteria 2B.

Engebretsen/Venuti moved to amend the Criteria for Evaluation Strategies Table to include Part A and Part B with Part A referring to Tsunami Risk and Part B referring to Obsolescence.

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
Chair Aderhold wanted to emphasize that a narrative would be included in the report on how the scoring was determined for each of the strategies presented. She noted that they have had or included in the discussion but it needs to be reflected in the report for the benefit of others.

Member Slone commented that it would also present justification for Part A and Part B and provided as an example the Limp along Plan.

**B. Draft Report to City Council for Review and Discussion**

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and requested Deputy City Clerk Krause to provide some input on the document.

Deputy City Clerk Krause reported that she reviewed the minutes from the meetings, the information from the resolution and memorandum submitted to Council. She included the information that was reviewed by the Task Force. She strongly noted that this was a draft and will include information in the memorandums from tonight.

Ms. Krause addressed the photo that was used in on the report reflected Seward after the 1964 earthquake. She then recounted watching a show recently which depicted a tsunami hitting Santa Monica and made her realize that there was more to a tsunami impacting the city as a whole other than the Public Works Facility. She noted something that was not discussed was the water leaving causing additional destruction to the Public Works Facility.

Chair Aderhold stated that if the photo is used to have a title and give credit to the photographer.

Member Slone commented that the lines 84 through 87, he believed this was the most crucial paragraph in the document. Assuming Council approves there is a risk, which would then bring them to their recommendations. He recommended expanding a bit more in that section to bring those two points together.

Chair Aderhold agreed that the sentence should be included in the cover memo with the recommendations.

Ms. Keiser acknowledged that she was supposed to draft up the next steps but then asked how comments on the document should be presented to Ms. Krause.

Ms. Krause recommended the following in regards to submitting corrections and additions to the draft report:

- Mark up the document with changes or additions and return to her
- Submit changes via email noting the line numbers on each change
- Deadline for submitting changes is no later than the 8th so it can be included in the packet
- She has a process in mind on how each of the members recommendations will be shown/presented in the report
- If a section of the report should be included in the cover memo that should also be submitted as well for the next meeting so a draft of the memorandum can be included for the next meeting.
Member Slone stated that it would be appropriate to include a general statement to introduce the other argument of obsolescence into the memo then include more in the report to Council.

Member Keiser will include Member Slone’s points in the revision to her memo.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. Memo from Public Works Director Re: Functional Inefficiencies of Existing PW Campus

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Keiser to review the memorandum.

Member Keiser provided a recap of the information provided by Mr. Parrish and summary of the information included in the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen requested an explanation of what a Vactor truck actually was then asked for clarification on the personnel who worked in the water and sewer department would stay at the existing facility.

Member Keiser explained that they would keep a supply of essential supplies since most of their rolling stock is vehicles which could be moved relatively easy. They do not have an intensive investment in tools that the mechanics have. Same issue with Parks Department as their supplies are not as critical. There are beneficial uses for the existing facility.

Member Engebretsen noted that that information would be relevant to include in the report to Council.

Member Keiser provided additional detail information in regards to tools and supplies for those departments that would be working out of the existing facility in other safe locations. She then addressed the funding for the Fuel Depot that has been allocated and that it is not included in the cost estimate for a new Public Works Facility. She will verify that for the next meeting.

Member Keiser stated that during inspection of the fuel tanks it was determined that there was corrosion and it would not pass inspection when the next inspection is due. She then address the question that the new fuel depot is not expected to cost more than $300,000 and it will be above ground.
Chair Aderhold commented on pointing out that there are two buildings that are in use at the HERC facility and that the section regarding the fuel tanks should be re-worded to address the corrosion with regards to cathodic protection and the tanks.

There was a brief discussion on inclusion of DEC and clarification of the inspection report on the fuel tank condition.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
  A. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
  B. PWCTF Meeting Schedule
  C. Draft Risks, Evaluation, & Mitigation Spreadsheet
  D. 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Project Sheet - New Public Works Facility

Chair Aderhold reviewed the informational items.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented on it being a good meeting and looking forward receiving the comments and recommendations for the draft report.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Keiser thanked everyone and noted she had her work cut out for her for the next meeting.

Member Slone thanked Deputy City Clerk Krause and Member Keiser for all their ongoing efforts to help resolve these issues.

Member Venuti expressed her appreciation for all the information brought to them by Deputy City Clerk Krause and Member Keiser.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 14, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-10, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:31 p.m. on July 14, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, BARNWELL

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to amend the agenda to move New Business Item A to Pending Business Item B and renumbering Pending Business item B to Item C.

SLONE/VENUTI – MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA AS REQUESTED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was no further discussion.

The amended agenda was approved by Consensus of the Task Force.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for June 23, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes of June 23, 2021.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTIION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS
A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Costs Related to Incremental Approach

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Public Works Director Keiser to speak to her memorandum.

Ms. Keiser provided a summary of her memorandum and facilitated discussion on the following items:

- Site selection and recommendation
  - Could use a smaller site to relocate the equipment, materials and mechanic shop
  - Offices could be located in separate location, the Maintenance facility in Soldotna was provided as an example.

- Cost estimates
  - Does not include fencing or security camera systems, costs for cameras run approximately $20,000
  - Not an exact figure just representative for the land cost, current site of interest is $575,000

- Utilizing the existing facility for the Parks and Building Maintenance departments would lower the costs for a new facility and move those departments from the HERC facility
  - While there would be the potential to lose equipment the impact would not be detrimental to the functions of the city and recovery in the case of a tsunami event
  - Replacement costs would be substantially less for materials and equipment
  - This point should be included in the report to Council

- New Fueling Depot could be placed on new site within the appropriate budget of $200,000
  - Old Police Department location is not a suitable location as there is not enough room even for temporary placement

- Project can be phased, utmost importance is on the purchase of land since there are extremely limited locations available currently
  - Current facility which includes the Sewer Treatment Plant and Lagoon is about 5 acres
  - 2 acres would be sufficient to start with option to purchase additional surrounding land preferred
  - Design and Development would include the entire project so that they could build as they go

- Including content as a topic and this memorandum as an exhibit to the report
  - Insert at line 268 within the report prefacing with the following statement, “of the three mitigation strategies, the Long Term Incremental Plan has the highest beneficial score. See page # laying out the plan’s cost estimated at $12 million.”

B. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Inefficiencies of the Existing Public Works Campus

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title, inviting Public Works Director Keiser to present her report.

Public Works Director Keiser reviewed the additional information included in the memorandum in response to the comments received from the Task Force at the last meeting. She noted the additional information included that would support how detrimental, to the City and residents, the loss of the facility in the event of a catastrophic incident would be, plus consideration of the necessity for
replacement of the facility due to growth and age. Ms. Keiser provided anecdotal information related to the recent inspection of the fuel tank and conditions.

Chair Aderhold facilitated discussion on the following points:
- Information provided on the condition of existing fuel depot should be included in a section
  **Additional Considerations: Obsolescence after line 269 in the report**
  o Refer to Mitigation Strategies in parentheses
  o Should be included in the report after they have reported on the assigned tasks
  o Distinguish between the two items tsunami and obsolescence
- The amount of work that Public Works was able to accomplish even during COVID
- Including information from the Planning Department in relation to the increase in building
  o This would lead to residents wanting additional services such as water & sewer and paved roads
- Total existing footprint including parking lot for the Administrative building and shop is 36,000 square feet and the gravel pit area to the south is roughly 35,000 square feet.

Mr. Barnwell will provide a GIS square footage for the next meeting of the existing facility.

c. Draft Memorandum and Report to City Council on Tsunami Risk for the Public Works Campus

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited the Clerk to provide input.

Deputy City Clerk Krause reviewed the process that she employed to add each of the Task Force member’s comments to the document. She noted that Members Slone and Keiser recommendations were submitted late and were provided in the supplemental packet. They will be incorporated in the document and the completed draft can then be presented at the next meeting with any additional recommendations from this meeting.

Chair Aderhold facilitated discussion on the draft memorandum and report. The following points, recommendations and comments were made:
- Too much verbiage, more like a lecture
  o Should contain seven bullets
  o These bullet points should be in place of the introduction and background section
- Clarification of which document and section to be addressed
- Timeline on submission to City Council
  o August 9, 2021 Council meeting for presentation
  o Written information should be exhaustive as it will be referred to many times in the future
  o Highlight the most important points in the PowerPoint Presentation to Council
- Memo should focus on the specific topics assigned to the Task Force
  o Bullet points on materials reviewed, mitigations, risks
- Memo should be used as the Executive Summary of the Report
  o Remove the details from the draft and insert into the report
  o Report to include the details and exhibits
- Steps and process to create the Memorandum and Report
  o Memo/Executive Summary should include recommendation(s)
Chair Aderhold requested two motions on the mitigation strategies and the preferred location so they can be included in the report.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT THE LONG TERM INCREMENTAL MITIGATION STRATEGY.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO ADOPT AS A PREFERRED LOCATION THE PROPERTY ON LAKE STREET AS IDENTIFIED BY CAREY MEYER AS A POTENTIAL SITE.

There was a brief discussion to amend the motion to show that it was due to the analysis performed by the Task Force not Carey Meyer for the basis of selecting that particular location.

KEISER/ENGBRETSEN MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO STATE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF THE TASK FORCE THAT THE LAKE STREET PROPERTY.

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment). NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

There was no additional discussion on the motion as amended.

MOVED TO ADOPT AS THE PREFERRED LOCATION IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF THE TASK FORCE THE LAKE STREET PROPERTY.

VOTE. (Main) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Member Slone inquired about including the Listing of Mitigation Strategies in the report as an exhibit.

Member Keiser responded that it is included in the report and showed Member Slone where it was located.

A brief discussion ensued on including recommendations on verbiage from Members Slone and Keiser; that the memorandum and report would be amended and edited to remove redundant information and the memorandum would serve as an executive summary for the report; Members Slone and Keiser would perform the editing tasks and submit to the Clerk for inclusion in the packet to be distributed by the Friday before the next meeting for final review; additional amendments can be presented to the Clerk for a laydown document or submitted during the meeting.

Chair Aderhold expressed appreciation to the Staff for getting the amount of information together and everyone contributing to the report.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Memorandum from Public Works Director re: Inefficiencies of the Existing Public Works Campus

This Item was moved to Pending Business item B.

B. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold noted that they briefly discussed the Powerpoint Presentation to Council and they need to determine who will do that.

Member Engebretsen will create the Powerpoint Presentation and provide a draft for the next meeting. Member Barnwell will assist in presenting to City Council.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED THAT MEMBER ENGBRETSEN AND BARNWELL PRESENT THE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION TO CITY COUNCIL.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECT. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

The Task Force reviewed the exhibits that were to be included with the report. It was determined to have the following:

- Risks - Evaluation and Mitigation Spreadsheet
- Memorandums provided by Public Works Director Keiser – latest versions
- Resolution 20-125
- Inundation Map
It was determined that a webpage can contain a link to the minutes for the Task Force and the main report from DGGS.

Further documents to be added as exhibits to the main report were:
- Memorandums from Member Engebretsen on site recommendations

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

A. Resolution 20-125 Establishing the Task Force and Outlining Scope of Work
B. PWCTF Meeting Schedule
C. Draft Risks, Evaluation, & Mitigation Spreadsheet
D. 2021-2026 Capital Improvement Project Sheet - New Public Works Facility

Chair Aderhold reviewed the informational items.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented on it being a good meeting, there was a lot to take in and appreciated the comments and recommendations.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Slone expressed appreciation for the work that was done by the Clerk and Member Keiser on establishing the basic framework that they were able to build upon, there was a lot of information and believed they were going to be able to narrow it down and refine for the next meeting. He was also hoping that they did not have to have two additional meetings before presenting their final work to City Council.

Member Keiser expressed her heartfelt thanks for the support in their mission and the ability to perform the mission of the Public Works Department makes her feel good that they have that kind of community and looks forward to the next steps in the process.

Member Barnwell agreed that it was a good meeting and appreciated the hard work done by everybody. He further stated that they reviewed a lot of hard technical information he appreciated Member Keiser getting right to the punch of it on what they should do. He also noted that he will send Member Keiser the footprint maps.

Member Engebretsen appreciated that they would be wrapping it up.
Member Venuti commented that 2025 doesn’t sound too far away and as a Councilmember she never dreamed how much went on at Public Works and is in awe at how much is accomplished there. She was glad to have served on this Task Force as the information has been invaluable as a citizen but even more as a Councilmember. She stated that she is in awe of the volunteers and expressed her appreciation to Members Slone and Barnwell.

Chair Aderhold thanked everyone, announced the next meeting and adjourned the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 28, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

________________________________________

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: ________________________________
Session 21-11, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:32 p.m. on July 28, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room Upstairs located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

**PRESENT:** MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, BARNWELL

**STAFF:** RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

**AGENDA APPROVAL**

Chair Aderhold requested a motion.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

Angie Newby, Real Estate Broker for the City of Homer, provided information on how she can facilitate the purchase of property for the city in the future for the possible relocation of the Public Works Campus. She provided some guidelines that are followed by the City in their purchases of property and the availability of commercial property within the city limits.

Ms. Newby responded to questions regarding appraisal values and assessed property values; current status of commercial real estate sales is not an overheated market like the residential real estate market.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for July 14, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes of July, 14, 2021.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 14, 2021 MEETING.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

**VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS**
REPORTS

Chair Aderhold read into the record that the Task Force’s final report is now scheduled for the August 23, 2021 regular meeting as there are time sensitive items that need to be on the August 9, 2021 City Council meeting.¹

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Draft Memorandum for the Final Report to City Council
   - Final Revision Draft
   - Draft Memorandum from Member Slone and Member Keiser

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and requested clarification from Deputy City Clerk Krause.

Deputy City Clerk Krause explained that pages 10-14 in the packet was the final version of the memorandum containing the edits of Member Slone and Member Keiser. This memorandum was submitted by Member Keiser. The document in the packet on pages 15-18 contained all three recommended versions from Member Slone to the memorandum. Ms. Krause stated that it was included as a reference for the Task Force. She further stated for clarification that Member Slone provided further edits to the memorandum and these are provided as a laydown for this meeting.

Chair Aderhold facilitated discussion and the Task Force addressed the Memorandum section by section amending the following:

- Introduction and Background Section of Memorandum:
  - Second paragraph remove duplicated “A” first word
  - Second paragraph, sixth line, replaced the word “obviating” with the words “severely restricting”

- Task Force Evaluation & Recommendations:
  - Under Section III. Ranking Scale Delete Second and Third Sentence in their entirety.
  - Clarification was provided on the ranking scale and it was noted that the table was on page 70 of the packet.

B. Draft Final Report to City Council on Tsunami Risk to Public Works Campus
   - Exhibits proposed to be included (not in prioritized order)

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading the title and requested clarification on the documents in the packet.

Deputy City Clerk Krause provided the following clarification:

¹ Information from the City Manager through Deputy City Clerk Krause
Chair Aderhold facilitated discussion and additional edits to the draft document on pages 26-38 of the packet as follows:

- Line 13, Correct elevation should reflect 35 feet and the correct terminology for high tide
- Line 52 through 59 bullet points
- Line 64, change the word “hard” to “identify”
- Line 64-66, delete and replace with “If Homer is struck by an unexpected geological event then the City could incur significant long-term costs in terms of private and municipal property damage, as well as potential loss of life.”
- Line 81-82 Delete sentence and replace with “Just as we cannot predict earthquakes or landslides with any accuracy, in the same manner we cannot predict a tsunami.”
- Line 87-88, Change the word “could” to “would”
  - The Task Force did not agree with adding a sentence regarding the effect of submarine landslides to the Homer Spit citing that it was irrelevant to the Public Works Campus.
- Commissioner Barnwell brought forward the terminology used in the report was maximum wave height above Mean Higher High Water (MHHW). This is defined as the average of the higher high water height of each tidal day observed over the national tidal datum.
  - Line 13 would be edited to read 35 feet Mean Higher High Water
  - This is not 35 feet above zero
  - Referring to the Inundation Map and the 35 foot is just above that so it takes into account that MHHW
  - Reference the terminology so that the general public can use it Member Engebretsen will provide some terminology for them to use in the report.
- Line 159, correct the word “is” to “in”
- Line 162 incorporate with Line 161, edit to read “and too few in number”
- Line 169, Delete the words “The City” and the “s” from the word “take” and the period at the end.
- Line 173 add the word “entire” in front of the words “Public Works Facility” for more clarity
- Line 176-179, Order is as suggested, add the word “strategies”
- Line 181 -188 correct all capitalization

Chair Aderhold called for a recess at 5:35 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 5:41 p.m.

Chair Aderhold continued the discussion and editing noting that Member Slone suggested removing the comma after the word danger in line 185. Member Slone noted that there were several grammatical edits that he would like to recommend.

A brief discussion ensued on focusing on addressing the substance edits and to leave the final edit to one person as it was too difficult to perform by committee.
Chair Aderhold continued the editing by progressing to page 32 of the packet and addressing the following:

- Line 199, add the words “worst case” before tsunami
- Line 221-222, remove “sand and gravel”
- Line 222, insert the word “essential” before the word equipment
- Line 224, recommended adding the words “such as rolling stock and the Maintenance Shop” after the word campus
  - Appears redundant since items are listed in the previous bullet point
  - Is the Mechanic’s Shop and Motor Pool Shop two different or the same
    - Different shops one is used for repair of the vehicles and the other is used for the equipment operators to bring in the equipment to get it ready for use – such as installing chains, etc.
- Line 224, Change the word “essential” to “these”

Member Engebretsen requested clarification on the recommendation to relocate the Mechanic’s Shop to the Heath Street location and this is the first time that she fully understood the Motor Pool Shop is a separate facility. She then provided a scenario of her understanding.

Member Keiser explained that the Motor Pool would also be moved to the new location.

Member Engebretsen noted that they did not make the connection in their memorandum to Council or in the document.

Member Keiser recommended that they amend the bullet point, Relocate the Campus, reflect that information regarding two of the most critical spaces are the shop for the mechanics and the separate shop for the operators both of which are being recommended to be moved.

Member Engebretsen then noted that her presentation will show that by moving those services to the new location, it would open the area at the existing facility for the use of the Parks and Building Maintenance Departments.

Member Keiser concurred stating that all heavy equipment maintenance will be moved to the new location and those working with small engines will stay in the existing facility.

- Line 222, Add the words “Mechanics Shop”
- Line 220, rename the title to “Relocate the Mission Critical Portions of the Campus”
- Include the equipment barns in the listing
- Address the capitalization of the word tsunami throughout the document
- Address the capitalization of the word department throughout the document
- Line 275 to 286 were previously identified on line 166-179 and there are differences
  - Remove Lines 275 through 286 due to redundancy
  - Removing these lines negates the explanation of the defined goals of two and three
  - Further review and comparison the lines 166-188 should be deleted as it is too early in the document, additional comments on removing the Lines 157 through 188
- Line 305, Insert the Table from page 70 in the packet
- Remove as Exhibit Memorandum on pages 68-70 of the packet
- Line 308, Section reflects the memorandum on pages 57-59 of the packet and that memorandum should be removed as an exhibit.
  o Paragraph defining the Motor Pool similar to the Mechanics Sop to provide clarification
  o Paragraph on the magnitude of scale to aide in the visualization of the space required is needed
    ▪ Incorporating the square footage information provided on pages 60-62
- Line 314, delete the words, “The purpose of this Memorandum is to identify” and insert the words, “The Task Force identified”
- Lines 310-313, Morph some of the content into the following paragraph that starts at Line 314 and delete remaining verbiage.
- Line 425-426, Delete the verbiage up to “The Task Force”
- Line 428, delete the words as a practicable matter”
- Line 430, Add language, “This recommendation allows for the Parks and Building Maintenance Departments to be relocated from the Homer Education & Recreation Complex (HERC) to the existing Public Works Campus Facility” or similar language.
  o Change the language to “Following the Task Force recommendations will allow for the Parks and Building Maintenance Departments to be relocated to the existing Public Works Campus”

Chair Aderhold confirmed that when they decide on the final recommendations they will be copied to the final draft. She then confirmed that the Clerk will compile the document with all edits and submit for final review and proofing and the document will then go into the packet for Task Force review and approval.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Draft PowerPoint Presentation to City Council

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Member Engebretsen to provide her draft PowerPoint presentation.

Member Engebretsen provided the following information while showing her draft slides to the Task Force:

- Cover page
- Recommendation first
  o Level of Specificity will be provided later in the report
- Background
  o Tsunami Report
  o Task Force Formed
- Research
- Site Selection process
- Considerations
- Conclusion
  o Moving only a portion of public works
  o Value in using the existing facility
Member Engebretsen reported that she envisions no more than ten slides at three minutes per slide.

Member Barnwell recalled a former employer who was a Colonel and he strongly emphasized that a presentation should be no more than eight slides.

Chair Aderhold recalled a photo of a piece of equipment that could not fit into the Mechanic’s shop which would be a great focal point showing that they have outgrown the facility.

Deputy City Clerk Krause suggested a different color pallet.

Member Barnwell requested that Julie schedule a time that they can meet to review and discuss the presentation the week of August 2, 2021.

B. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold reviewed the following for the next meeting:
- Review of final draft memorandum and report
- Review of final draft presentation
- The task Force will disband after the final report to Council unless directed by Council to perform additional work.
- The next meeting will be available by hybrid as well even from the Council Chambers.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause commented that it was a very good meeting, the Task Force got through a heck of a lot of materials, and it is really appreciated.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Venuti appreciated being able to attend the meeting in this manner and as long as the numbers of COVID are high she will choose to attend meetings by Zoom. She acknowledged that it was a long meeting but is energized and really appreciates everyone being here.

Member Slone was unable to unmute his connection to comment.

Member Barnwell commented good meeting, a lot of work we got it done. He additionally thanked Member Engebretsen and Deputy City Clerk Krause for their long hours.
Member Keiser commented that she was so impressed by everyone and their attention to details and support. Thank you.

Member Engebretsen commented that it was great to get to the finish line and after participating on two task forces now it is most difficult at the end to get the wording how you want to present your work, so she expressed her appreciation for the effort and believed it would be really nice to present this information to Council.

Chair Aderhold tried Member Slone one more time but he was still unable to be un-muted. She then thanked him for hanging on and enduring the technological issues to attend meetings and encouraged him to stick in there and providing his comments in writing so the Task Force had them to work with.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 11, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

______________________________
RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved:________________________
Session 21-12, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 4:33 p.m. on August 11, 2021 from the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska, and via Zoom webinar. One seat is vacant due to resignation.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSEN, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, BARNWELL

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for July 28, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes of July 28, 2021.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

A. Draft Final Memorandum to City Council re: Executive Summary

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title. She inquired if everyone received the edits provided by Member Slone.
Member Venuti inquired if everyone was agreeable to Line 49, in the revised memorandum believing it was more opinion than fact.

Member Slone stated that his intent was to provide clarification on what happened in Japan at that time.

A discussion ensued on editing the sentence so it was not as long, amending the verbiage to inadequate knowledge or “technical knowledge” for the word “appreciation”.

Member Keiser disagreed with the proposed amendment to lines 42-44 regarding no threat to personnel.

Member Slone argued in favor of the proposed amendment stating that personnel would have ample time in all the scenarios before a wave reached the Campus.

Further discussion ensued on what was most important to the public perception, the accuracy of available instrumentation; that the time is just not as accurate; recommendation to strike the sentence since the spreadsheet did not show that there was a great concern for the loss of personnel; lack of notice for a recent a tsunami warning; reliance on conflicting information in current practices; reference should be made since it was outlined in the resolution regarding the scope of work.

Member Keiser stated that they could list what they know:
1. Instrumentation is not perfect
2. Information received from authorities is conflicting
3. Event would happen quickly
4. Personnel would be onsite and affected when a worst case scenario occurred

Chair Aderhold agreed that the information should be included in the report and not in the executive summary.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED TO INSERT THE WORDS “TO LIFE” TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE POTENTIAL THREAT.

Discussion ensued on the appropriateness of including language regarding the importance of life in the executive summary as long as it was consistent with the information on the spreadsheet provided by Member Engebretsen.

Chair Aderhold restated the amended line to read, “The Task Force determined that the greatest risk of a tsunami inundating the Public Works Campus would be to life, and to the damage and loss of buildings, equipment and materials on Line 41”

Additional discussion calling out the reference in the executive summary.

VOTE. (Amendment) YES. BARNWELL, KEISER, SLONE
NO. VENUTI, ENGBREITSEN, ADERHOLD
Motion failed.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to adopt the memorandum provided in the Supplemental Packet.

KEISER/VENUTI MOVED TO ADOPT THE MEMORANDUM WITH PROPOSED EDITS BY MEMBER SLONE PROVIDED IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL PACKET.

Chair Aderhold asked if there was any motion to amend Lines 42-44.

KEISER/BARNWELL MOVED TO DELETE THE LAST SENTENCE IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH ON PAGE TWO OF THE MEMORANDUM.

There was no additional discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to amend Line 49.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO DELETE THE WORD “APPRECIATION” AND INSERT THE WORDS “TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE” ON LINE 49.

Discussion ensued on the use of the word “inadequate” refers that there was something else that could have been done.

Member Barnwell suggested the word “unanticipated”.

Further discussion on the verbiage being awkward and withdrawing the motion and the Clerk recommending that the motion be voted down.

Further verbiage, “because of the unanticipated magnitude of the tsunami’s potential” was suggested.

Chair Aderhold provided clarification that in order to get to the recommended amendment they need to vote this amendment down.

VOTE. (Amendment) NO. SLONE, BARNWELL, KEISER, VENUTI, ENGBRETSEN, ADERHOLD.

Motion failed.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND LINE 48 THROUGH 50 AS FOLLOWS: THIS SOLUTION WAS TRIED IN JAPAN AND FAILED DURING THE EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI BECAUSE OF THE UNANTICIPATED MAGNITUDE OF THE TSUNAMI’S POTENTIAL. THE STRUCTURES WERE DESIGNED FOR A SMALLER EVENT THAN OCCURRED, AND BECAUSE THE STRUCTURES WERE TOO SMALL THEY MERELY DELAYED AND THUS ACCENTUATED THE WAVE BUILD UP RESULTING IN SOME INSTANCES IN DAMAGE GREATER THAN MAY HAVE OCCURRED WITHOUT THE STRUCTURES IN PLACE.
There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

KEISER/VENUTI MOVED TO DELETE THE WORD “IT” ON LINE 56 OF THE MEMORANDUM.

There was brief discussion on the proposed amendment.

VOTE. (Amendment) NO. KEISER, VENUTI, ADERHOLD, BARNWELL, SLONE, ENGBRETSEN.
Motion failed.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO AMEND LINE 56 TO READ, BECAUSE THE UNDERLYING FILL MATERIAL HAS NOT BEEN DESIGNED TO RESIST THE TYPE OF INUNDATION THAT COULD OCCUR IT COULD THEREBY FAIL.

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Member Engebretsen did not agree with adding the proposed amendment to Line 148 due in the context of the report, the Task Force looked at the cause (tsunami) but in conjunction to the tsunami the Task Force reviewed these other factors since the City Council may make decisions not based on the driving factor of a tsunami.

Member Slone argued his point to keep the amendment “in the event of an inundating tsunami” to line 148 stating that it brings the summary full circle as directed in the resolution. Further noting the next recommendation addresses the issues of obsolescence.

Further discussion ensued on the verbiage contained in the recommendations with the Task Force working in consensus on drafting a whole new section as follows:

Changing the Section Title to “Conclusion”. Listing the two reasons under subtitle of “Findings” and then the Task Force’s “Final Recommendation”.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND LINES 146 TO 151 TO REFLECT CHANGING “FINAL RECOMMENDATION” TITLE TO “CONCLUSION” ADDING THE WORD “FINDINGS” AS A SUBTITLE AND LISTING THE FINDINGS AS ONE AND TWO THEN THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE TASK FORCE.

Findings:
1. There is risk to the Public Works campus under the worst case scenario in the event of an inundating tsunami.
2. The Public Works campus is suffering from obsolescence due to growth and technological changes, triggering the need for facilities planning and subsequent implementation.

Final recommendation:
The Task Force recommends the Long Term Incremental Plan be adopted as best suited to address the findings above and serve the needs of Homer.

Further discussion ensued on the verbiage used in the amended language.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chari Aderhold requested clarification from the Clerk on the process to adopt the memorandum with all amendments.

There were no further amendments or discussion on the Memorandum as amended.

VOTE. (Main) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

B. Draft Final City of Homer Public Works Campus Tsunami Hazard Report

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title. She requested a motion and second.

KEISER/VENUTI MOVED TO BRING THE DRAFT FINAL REPORT TO THE FLOOR FOR DISCUSSION.

Chair Aderhold provided a summary of the actions that were taken to present the document contained in the packet. She noted that the tracked changes she did are shown but those changes that are not shown consisted of removed language that was from various memorandums and provided alternate verbiage; formatting to provide consistency; grammatical corrections; and removal of redundancies. Chair Aderhold noted that they should review the exhibits and the Clerk has recommended a modification to the document title.

Chair Aderhold confirmed with the Clerk they should make motions to amend the document as they proceed through it.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO DELETE THE WORDS “HAZARDS TO THE” AND INSERT THE WORDS “CITY OF HOMER” ON THE DOCUMENT TITLE PAGE.

Discussion ensued on the inclusion of obsolescence in the title of the report and that would be better focused within the document at the appropriate place and at this time the title represents that which is what the Task Force was given as a scope of work.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Krause clarified that the documents in question were attachments to Memorandum 20-194 in response to Chair Aderhold comments regarding their inclusion in the exhibits to the report.

BARNWELL/VENUTI MOVED TO CORRECT THE TERM 35 FEET ABOVE MEAN HIGHER HIGH WATER TO 50 FEET ABOVE MEAN HIGHER HIGH WATER THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT.

Discussion ensued on the changes at the last meeting to 35 feet and the additional research after the meeting to verify that the inundation line was actually at 50 feet and including the elevation of the Public Works complex to provide context to the height of a tsunami.

Chair Aderhold requested a separate motion since this motion will provide amendments throughout the document.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND LINE 13 BY INSERTING THE WORDS “LOCATED AT 35 FEET ABOVE MHHW,” AFTER THE WORDS “HOMER PUBLIC WORKS CAMPUS”.

There was a brief discussion on inserting the appropriate punctuation and this will clarify that the Campus was at 35 feet.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Krause confirmed that the amended paragraph will be adopted when the final amended document is adopted as a whole unless someone wants to amend lines 15-22.

There were no amendments to the Sections entitled “Purpose and Scope” through “Secondary Tsunami Impacts”.

KEISER/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND LINE 143 TO ADD A BULLET POINT, “OPERATES AND MAINTAINS THE CITY’S WATER SUPPLY AND WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT”.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
A brief discussion ensued on providing further clarification on mission critical items such as replacement of vehicles or the parks maintenance equipment.

ENGBRETSEN/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND LINE 134 TO READ, “MAINTAINS AND REPAIRS THE CITY’S ROADS, DRAINAGE, WATER DISTRIBUTION AND WASTEWATER COLLECTION, BUILDINGS, FACILITIES, PARKS, AND MOTOR VEHICLES.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested additional amendments to the Mission Critical Section. No additional amendments were made.

Chair Aderhold stated that she amended this section of the evaluation as Part A, explaining that it previously was not aligning. She requested any amendments to Lines 150 through 192.

KEISER/ENGBRETSEN MOVED TO DELETE THE WORDS “WHILE EXPENSIVE” FROM LINE 189.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold stated that while the memorandums used the word “we” she opined that the report should reflect the word “City” and that any “we” be amended to reflect that throughout the document.

Discussion ensued on amending the word “we” in next section to “The City” “City” or “Task Force” Line 222, should be edited to make a statement, “It is not enough to compute the expected costs of a particular strategy.”

Line 223 should be edited to delete the words, “we must quantify” and insert the verbiage, “must be quantified” before the word, “because”

Line 224 should be edited to change the first “we” to “The Task Force”

Chair Aderhold inquired if that was a motion.

ENGBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND LINES 222 THROUGH 224 TO MAKE THE FIRST PART OF LINE 222 A STATEMENT, EDIT LINE 223 TO DELETE THE WORDS “WE MUST QUANTIFY” AND INSERT THE WORDS “MUST BE QUANTIFIED” BEFORE THE WORD “BECAUSE” AND CHANGE THE WORD “WE” IN LINE 224 TO “THE TASK FORCE”.

There was no further discussion.
VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

KEISER/ENGBRETSEN MOVED TO INSERT THE WORD “THE” IN FRONT OF THE WORD “EXTENT” ON LINE 228.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold noting there were no additional amendments for the section proceeded to the next section Additional Considerations: Obsolescence – Part B of the Mitigation Strategy Report.

SLONE MOVED THAT THE TASK FORCE ADOPT OBsolescence AS an ADDITIONAL COMPELLING REQUIREMENT IN SUPPORT OF A LONG TERM INCREMENTAL PLAN.

Chair Aderhold was not sure where this motion would amend the document.

Member Slone agreed with that statement, he opined that it is a general clarification of what he believes the Task intends with regards to the subject of obsolescence.

Member Keiser believed that the statement that Mr. Slone was trying to convey has been embodied in this document by the way the Task Force has focused on obsolescence through this section of the document and in the final recommendation or findings.

Member Engebretsen believed that the Task Force has laid out the argument but have not stated what the argument is, so a bridging sentence is required. She recommended inserting a sentence at Line 279 of the document.

Member Slone recommended the following: The Task Force identified obsolescence as an additional issue critical to the functionality of the existing Public Works Campus.


Discussion ensued on this serving as the “why” they are presenting the evidence on obsolescence and that it replaces the first sentence in the paragraph leading to the remaining content.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
Chair Aderhold stated that they haven’t addressed the amendments that were made in the memorandum and will need to address those after they finish with the final report.

There were no additional amendments to the section.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to amend the Final recommendations section to match the amendments in the memorandum to City Council.

KEISER/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY MEMORANDUM.

Discussion ensued on amending Lines 391 to change “Final Recommendation” title to “Conclusion” adding the word “Findings” as a subtitle and listing the findings as one and two then the subtitle “Final Recommendation” as drafted for the executive summary memorandum.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold referring to page 19 in the packet, Lines 169 to 177 stated the Task Force amended the executive summary memorandum, lines 47 through 57 and believed that should be reflected in the Final Report document.

Member Engebretsen requested a brief recess to allow her to draft those amendments.

Chair Aderhold called for a recess at 6:45 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 6:50 p.m.

Deputy City Clerk Krause suggested making a motion that would cover all amendments made to the executive summary memorandum be incorporated into the entire document in response to a query from Chair Aderhold.

ENGEBRETSEN/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND LINES 170-192 TO READ AS FOLLOWS: “THIS SOLUTION WAS TRIED IN JAPAN AND FAILED DURING THE EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI BECAUSE OF THE UNANTICIPATED MAGNITUDE OF THE TSUNAMI’S POTENTIAL. THE STRUCTURES WERE DESIGNED FOR A SMALLER EVENT THAN OCCURRED, AND BECAUSE THE STRUCTURES WERE TOO SMALL THEY MERELY DELAYED AND THUS ACCENTUATED THE WAVE BUILD UP RESULTING IN SOME INSTANCES IN DAMAGE GREATER THAN MAY HAVE OCCURRED WITHOUT THE STRUCTURES IN PLACE.”

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to include all amendments made to the executive summary memorandum be incorporated into the final report document.
ENGEBRETSEN/VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE DRAFT FINAL REPORT TO INCLUDE THE AMENDED LANGUAGE FROM THE APPROVED AMENDED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY MEMORANDUM.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. (Amendment) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Venuti questioned if amendments were needed to replace the word “we” on line 357 and 361.

ENGEBRETSEN MOVED TO AMEND THE WORD “WE” IN LINE 357 AND 361 AND REPLACE WITH THE WORDS, “THE CITY”.

There was a brief comment on deleting line 357.

VENUTI MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO STRIKE LINE 357 AND LINE 361 CHANGE “WE” TO “THE CITY”.

SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE DOCUMENT TO REFLECT THE APPROPRIATE PRONOUNS THROUGHOUT.

Discussion ensued on the motions and amended motions on the floor. It was recommended to remove the motions from consideration.

VENUTI/ENGEBRETSEN MOVED TO REMOVE THE WORD “WE” AND USE THE APPROPRIATE PRONOUN THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT AND STRIKE LINES 357 AND 358.

Discussion ensued on the importance of the information that there is no place for these functions, building maintenance and parks to move to once the HERC was closed and demolished.

SLONE/KEISER MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO AMEND LINES 357 AND 358 TO THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE, “PUBLIC WORKS CURRENTLY HAS NO ALTERNATIVE LOCATION FOR THESE FUNCTIONS.”

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Secondary Amendment). NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Motion as amended on the floor is as follows: 
MOVED TO AMEND THE WORD “WE” AND USE THE APPROPRIATE PRONOUN THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT AND AMEND LINES 357 AND 358 TO READ “PUBLIC WORKS CURRENTLY HAS NO ALTERNATIVE LOCATION FOR THESE FUNCTIONS”

There was no further discussion.

VOTE. (Primary Amendment as Amended) NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested additional amendments, hearing none she requested a motion and second to approve the final report.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED TO APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT AS AMENDED.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Keiser noted that they did not address the exhibits and there is one entitled Exhibit G but it is not reflected in the final report that she could find.

Chair Aderhold reviewed the exhibits for the Task Force.

Deputy City Clerk Krause noted that Exhibit G was overlooked and that she included it but omitted listing it on the last page of the report.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to insert the reference to Exhibit G within the report.

Discussion ensued on placement within the document noting that the Lock Stock & Barrel is Exhibit A and the Long Term Incremental Plan is Exhibit G. These exhibits reflects the cost consequences related to these strategies. Reference to the Exhibits can be inserted in Lines 206 to 216 and it was determined that individual statements for the Limp Along there was no costs associated.

Chair Aderhold requested clarification on how they can go back to make the changes since they already approved the final report.

Deputy City Clerk Krause stated a motion to amend something previously approved can be used.

SLONE/ENGBRETSEN MOVED TO AMEND THE FINAL REPORT PREVIOUSLY APPROVED.

There was a brief discussion on why they are going back to amend the final report further to include the costs associated with the strategies as outlined in Goal 2 of the Scope of Work.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED TO ADD ON LINE 198 THE WORDS “INCLUDING THE PROJECTED COSTS” AT THE END OF THE FIRST SENTENCE.
There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

BARNWELL/VENUTI MOVED TO ADD “REFER TO EXHIBIT G FOR ASSOCIATED COSTS”

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold explained that they previously discussed Exhibit A being referenced for the Lock Stock and Barrel.

VENUTI/KEISER MOVED TO ADD “REFER TO EXHIBIT A FOR ASSOCIATED COSTS” ON LINE 210

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

KEISER/BARNWELL MOVED TO ADD ON LINE 208 “IN THE EVENT OF A WORST CASE SCENARIO THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE “DO NOTHING” STRATEGY COULD BE CATASTROPHIC AND THE COSTS ARE INCALCULABLE.

There was a brief comment on the verbiage “do nothing”.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to add Exhibit G to the document.

SLONE/VENUTI MOVED TO ADD ON LINE 408 EXHIBIT G ESTIMATED COSTS FOR PHASED PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
Chair Aderhold requested any additional overlooked corrections to the document before they approved it.

There were no further changes.

SLONE/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT WITH ALL AMENDMENTS.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

C. Draft Final Task Force Presentation to City Council - Review and Approval

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and Invited Member Engebretsen to review the draft presentation.

Member Engebretsen and Barnwell facilitated discussion and recommendations on edits to the draft presentation by the Task Force:
- Spelling
- Formatting
- Pinpoint primary identify landmarks
- Darken for visual clarity
- Pictures to show issues clearly
- Anticipated questions or topics that would be of concern from Council
  - The Spit is important but if we do not have Public Works then we cannot repair the Spit
  - Having the Public Works Director available to respond to questions

NEW BUSINESS

A. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold noted that the Task Force will make their report and presentation to City Council on August 23, 2021 and they will be done.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

COMMENTs OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTs OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause thanked the Task Force for all their efforts, hard work and that they should give themselves a pat on the back for a job well done. She appreciated their dedication and edits in getting this done.
COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Slone commented that it has been an interesting process, appreciated all the input from everybody and believed they created a pretty good product.

Member Engebretsen commented that she was emailing the City Clerk and City Manager to confirm that they were on the Council agenda. She noted that it is always difficult working by committee and she learned some new skills working via Zoom this time around. It is excited to be finished and expressed her appreciation for everyone’s work.

Member Barnwell commented that he learned some new things likewise on this Task Force and it was very interesting. He commented further on the time it took to get through the final editing of the memorandum and the report but they did it by committee and have a good work product.

Member Keiser commented that she was impressed and grateful for the work, diligence, dedication and passion that the members of the Task Force brought to this process and that it has exceeded her expectations beyond words. She wins no matter what happens next. She expressed her appreciation for the work that each member put into the task and believed that the needs of the Public Works department have been validated and acknowledged and she will report that to her staff the following day. She further commented that she believed it would go a long way towards helping her staff feel appreciated and valued in the heart and dangerous and sometimes disgusting work that they do. Thank you.

Member Venuti commented that she appreciated hearing Members Barnwell and Keiser experiences of the earthquake in 1964 and her experiences losing their home in Kodiak which was very traumatic thing for a young person to experience and believed serving on this Task Force was cathartic for her. She appreciated being able to do something for the City of Homer to enable the city to be better prepared. She expressed her enjoyment working with each of the members and getting to know them a little better and was amazed at the city staff and what they brought to the Task Force. Member Venuti complimented the Chair for doing a wonderful job and believed she was the right person for the task.

Chair Aderhold downplaying her performance as Chair and commented that they muddled through and who knew you could create a document through committee via Robert’s Rules of Order. She expressed her appreciation for everyone’s work and service on the Task Force and noted that unless additional direction was given by Council they would be officially disbanded after giving the report to City Council at their next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. The Public Works Campus Tsunami Hazard Report and Presentation will be given Monday, August 23, 2021 at the regular City Council meeting at 6:00 p.m.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved:______________________________