

2018 03 27 Langley Infrastructure Meeting Notes, City Hall Upstairs, taken by Peter Morton
Corrected at meeting 3/27/18, revised to clarify number of homes hooked up and eligible for Langley city water, and removed spurious comment on capital funds.

Committee members present:

- Dominique Emerson, Langley City Council, Chair
- Peter Morton, Langley City Council
- Susan Tomic, East Langley resident
- Jim Dobberfuhl, East Langley resident
- Stan Berryman, Langley City Staff, Director of Public Works
- Randi Perry, Langley City Staff, Utilities Supervisor

Guest: Tim Callison, Langley Mayor

Meeting started at 3:35 pm. We introduced Jim & Susan to Mayor Tim Callison

Next two meetings set as April 3 and 10 same time same place. Peter will be absent on 10th.

Randi passed out a spreadsheet of estimates clarifying scenario costing. This was based on an email suggestion from Hal Seligson, [“Would be helpful to have one chart including all options with cost comparisons across choices.”](#)

Discussion on impact statements took place, covering the impact of doing nothing, expected improvements achieved by successful completion of each project option, remaining problems if full remedy is not chosen, and expected adverse impact(s) on community during work period.

Discussion highlights:

- Synergy of doing several improvements simultaneously compared to separate.
- Jim raised a number of questions affecting the scoping of estimates. Later, we agreed that next meeting will start focusing on details of Edgecliff configuration and engineering, including extension of storm water management to city limits.
- Susan asked that estimates contain contingencies such as including in the do-nothing scenario the cost impact to homeowner of a septic failure, and bluff property exposure to costs from slides. Laurie Davenport on Decker has recently had a septic failure, so there may be recent relevant data on this subject. Susan has possibility of gathering such data; will work through Dominique.
- Discussed the studies already in place by the city, priorities of those improvements, and span of time to improve. We discussed how the scenarios should treat those studies because project commitments are a part of the annual city budget planning process.
- Discussion on synergy of doing storm, water, and sewer concurrently including road repair. From the point of view of eventual presentation to the public, we need to capture if the savings of all three done concurrently is particularly significant.
- Dominique: scenarios templates will be adjusted to capture above ideas.
- Tim discussed financing, means of estimating impacts, how to present to citizens.

- Funding alternatives; Tim shared the material he presented at Feb public meeting and advised he would provide electronic copy to add to these notes.
- Opportunities for grant applications may depend on the content of scenarios.
- Water discharge quality to Saratoga Passage may affect grant source opportunity.
- Discussed how the city residents might react to infrastructure initiatives, especially if there are city-wide improvements in a package.
- Loan approval procedure: city council & 60% approval primary or general election.
- Number of homes hooked up to city water re Furman, Decker, & Edgecliff is significant, 62 metered connections, current zoning allows for up to 94 connected homes.
- Borrowing rates and tax impact of bonding versus LID options.
- Bonds may be a tax favored vehicle
- If we secure grants it can offset the bond indebtedness.
- Currently the city is paying off second street, will be complete before this project.
- Current property tax pays for bonds under general obligations as a city tax.
- Funding sources are city property tax, excise tax, assessments, utility rates.
- Most promising might be the community block grants; including a general-purpose grant for public facilities, etc.
- HUD money comes through state. Rural County economic grants; comes from the .09% sales and use tax generated by Island County. They are looking for infrastructure projects this year; but it may be competitive. \$1.6M will be awarded this year. Oak Harbor has plans for a large (\$110M) project.
- USDA has money, but our utility rates are *too low* to qualify.
- CERB are tied to economic development. (I did not capture what CERB stands for)
- Tim would like Committee to provide a scoping number regarding the size of the financing package to seek.
 - Randi: \$5M is a current placeholder for this size project.
 - Discussion took place on whether that includes Edgecliff to city limits?
 - Possibly use \$6M as a scoping figure?
- Jim: grant writing is a challenge; could we possibly access some grant application expertise in Langley? Jim will include this in his next neighborhood report.
- Extensive Edgecliff discussion took place on bluff vulnerability, and on validity of engineering solution currently proposed to storm water on extended Edgecliff.
- First topic on next meeting will be the utility configurations, including Edgecliff extension to city limits.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.