

Committee of the Whole

Monday, October 10, 2022, at 6:30 P.M.
Library Meeting Room in Five Points, Washington,
380 N. Wilmor Road, Washington, IL

Mayor Manier called the regular Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

Present: Alderpersons Adams, Blundy, Brownfield, Butler, Dingledine, Schone, Stevens and Yoder

Also Present: City Administrator Snider, P & D Director Oliphant, City Engineer Carr, Public Works Director Rittenhouse, Police Chief McCoy, City Treasurer Strubhar, Deputy City Clerk Anderson, Attorney Derek Schryer and Press

MINUTES

1. *Aldermen wishing to be heard:* Nothing provided at this time.
2. *Public Comments:* Mayor stated that public comment will be limited to three minutes. Case Pudik expressed that he was going to get cut off with the rule being applied. Case, Troy, and Brett Pudik proceeded to take turns reading a statement regarding the Phase 2B Trunkline Project. Their statement is attached and made part of these minutes. After the nine-minute mark, Alderperson Stevens called for point of order stating that according to the rules and procedures the Mayor can grant an extension of time for the speaker. She added that if he chooses not to, the Council could make a motion and second with majority vote to allow the speaker to finish. Mayor addressed Case Pudik to inquire how much they had left. Case responded that there were two paragraphs remaining and Mayor agreed to let him finish.

Allison Montgomery of Washington Township was present and shared her comments regarding meeting procedures including the allotted public comment speaking times and the responses used when a vote occurs. Ms. Montgomery shared that she has stood up at Public Works and City Council meetings to ask when does Council decide when to apply the rules. She then addressed the Cruger Rd. Recreation Trail saying she has a document stating the road was raised eight inches but it didn't occur. Mayor Manier intervened to stop the attack of a city employee adding that Ms. Montgomery is welcome to talk about her subject. Ms. Montgomery concluded by expressing her discontent and asked the following questions: A citizen cannot challenge anything written by staff? When are rules applied, when are they not? When are codes applied, when are they not? When are laws apply, when are they not?

Joyce Blumenshine, a resident of Peoria, spoke regarding the archaeological study discussed at the previous City Council meeting and the vote to proceed with the archaeological study. She expressed concerns for the environment, the quality of Farm Creek, and the public expense for sewer fees.

3. *Approval of Minutes:* Alderperson Dingledine motioned to approve the September 12, 2022 meeting minutes, Alderperson Brownfield seconded. Motion passed by voice vote.

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. *Review of Updated Employee Handbook* – City Administrator, Jim Snider shared that Human Resources Manager Maureen Chambers has been working with Keith Braskich of Davis and Campbell to codify the structures and policies approved by Council over the years in an updated employee handbook. Mr. Snider shared that the document represents the collaboration between individuals and that policies and existing benefit structure aren't changing. The handbook is codifying what is already in place. He noted that the economic impact is what's brought forth in the budget each year. Mr. Snider said that there are several state and federal laws under FMLA and ADA that have been brought forth, adding that most recently the state of Illinois passed the Whistleblower Act for cities to accept and acknowledge, which is also included in the handbook. He mentioned that the Gift Ban Act referenced in the city code needs to be added and was not included in the current document. He shared that the labor unions have reviewed the agreements and explained that with unions, several items in each agreement are more specific for particular operations such as the police department or public works employees. He shared as an example, collective bargaining includes cost of living agreements which include increases set forth for future fiscal years, along with step increases. He explained that this handbook applies to employees where it can apply unless it's conflicting or part of a collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Snider shared that he did have one question about a city code reference and welcomed further questions. The plan is to bring the employee handbook forward as a resolution. He expects that going forward there will be continual updates and additions to the policy. He shared that this is his fourth personnel policy review and illustrated that like an octopus, you're always reaching out to find more boxes to check. Mr. Snider expressed his appreciation for the work of the unions, Ms. Chambers, and Attorney Keith Braskich. He invited questions. Alderperson Brownfield asked if the unions will have anything to add to the handbook. Mr. Snider said that they have reviewed it and provided feedback and there is nothing they object to. He explained that the unions negotiate their own contracts/collective bargaining agreements, which is why the language in the handbook states that if anything is conflicting, those contracts take precedence. Alderperson Stevens shared that she visited City Hall with her concerns that morning.

B. *Review Committee of the Whole Meeting Structure and Alignment with State Statute* – City Administrator Snider gave the floor to Alderperson Stevens to present her agenda item. Alderperson Stevens expressed frustration that staff didn't prepare documents for the topic. She began by referencing the meeting section of municipal code 31.02 and read aloud section number two. She stated that she attends all of the committee meetings to stay informed. Alderperson Stevens feels there needs to be clarification in the structure of standing committee meetings with regard to how information carries over to Council and people become informed. She mentioned that City Administrator Snider has shared a few ideas to streamline the process. Alderperson Stevens again expressed her disappointment that Attorney Miller and staff didn't prepare for her item and hopes that they will come up with something appropriate to refine the process.

C. *Section 31.58/Rules of Procedure Review* – City Administrator Jim Snider referenced the red portions in the provided copy of Section 6.7- City Council Rules of Procedure document. Mr. Snider said that based upon discussion at Council, the code had been brought forth for amendment and Attorney Schryer is providing information about removing section 6.7 as it's redundant with section 31. Attorney Schryer explained that at the September Committee of the Whole meeting, Council provided direction to staff to require a majority of City Council present at a meeting of Council to pass any ordinance, resolution, or other motion unless otherwise required in city code or by state statute. Mr. Schryer then referred to the additional language provided in document C.2. of the agenda, which is based upon the discussion from the September meeting concerning the impact of abstention for a no vote. Attorney Schryer added that what is before Council for discussion is the circumstance when a council member abstains due to a conflict of interest and provided the example of Alderperson Yoder abstaining for any vote involving liquor licenses due to employment. He explained that based upon feedback, this abstention is the functional equivalent of a no vote. It's the view this type of abstention should not be considered in the Council votes but rather only an abstention. The request is direction from Council about proposed language for the first reading of an ordinance as soon as the October 17 Council meeting. Alderperson Stevens read aloud the last sentence and asked for more explanation about the portion stating the presiding officer determines whether the abstention is for a conflict of interest. Attorney Schryer explained that regarding section 31.07, Council had provided direction to staff at the September meeting that this would be the impact on how to handle an abstention. He said that in roll call vote this differs from Robert's Rules of Order, which is why they wanted to make it clear this was an intentional decision by Council. Alderperson Stevens stated she doesn't recall Council asking the presiding officer to determine the purpose of the abstention and expressed concern whether this goes against Robert's Rules. Attorney Schryer reinforced that the entire addition beginning with "A member of City Council may abstain..." represents a deviation from Robert's Rules of Order. Alderperson Stevens asked for clarification if this in fact means she has to state why she's abstaining on a vote, to which Attorney Schryer responded in the affirmative. Alderperson Stevens expressed "that she doesn't think that's a good thing." Attorney Schryer explained further that Robert's Rules of Order provides the item with discretion to require a member of the body to explain the basis for their abstention and again provided the example of Alderperson Yoder abstaining due to employment. Alderperson Yoder demonstrated that all he has to say is "employment". Alderperson Stevens said she's not familiar with this and asked for direct references from Robert's Rules of Order. Attorney Schryer said citations can be provided in the staff memo. Alderperson Blundy asked for clarification on a pass option previously mentioned and whether it's needed. Attorney Schryer said he didn't see a need for a pass and Alderperson Blundy asked if it's in Robert's Rules of Order. Mr. Schryer said that it is not in Robert's Rules and Alderperson Stevens shared that she believes pass is one of the choices. Attorney Schryer asked Alderperson Stevens to clarify whether she is referring to a pass as being an opportunity to vote after passing. Alderperson Stevens explained she thought that if she wasn't sure how to vote at the point it was her turn, she could pass and the City Clerk would come back around to her. Mr. Schryer believes that would be highly unusual and would defeat the purpose of alternating the roll call vote. Alderperson Stevens asked for more clarification with Robert's Rules of Order. Alderperson Blundy expressed concern with the majority vote and the possibility of Council members being out of town resulting in missing out on someone's opinion when Council is supposed to represent all people equally. Attorney Schryer stated it's a policy discussion and recounted the September meeting where a majority of Council wanted it to be majority of the members present where a quorum was established. He stated that it was a policy decision. Alderperson Blundy asked if anyone else felt the same way. Alderperson Stevens began reading aloud a portion of document C.2. that notes when there is an abstention related to a

conflict of interest, the abstaining member shall not be deemed present for purposes of determining the result of the vote. Alderperson Stevens asked what that would mean and provided an example inquiring if eight Council members were present and four abstained, whether only four members would be considered present. Mr. Schryer responded by asking if the four members in the hypothetical example can abstain because of a conflict of interest. Alderperson Stevens said that would be up to the Mayor to decide and expressed her confusion. She went on to say that if she abstains, she abstains and shouldn't have to give a reason. Alderperson Butler explained that a conflict of interest doesn't go away, whether it's an ethical or financial conflict. He demonstrated that if you have four members who abstain because of a conflict of interest that doesn't go away but they are still qualified to serve, then you have only four members who can vote. So, you have to have a majority of those four members or you'd never get anywhere and would remain in limbo forever. He added that if you want to abstain because you don't want to make a neighbor look bad, do it and give whatever reason but it's the same as a no vote. He went on to clarify that's why Roberts Rules of Order provides for the chair to ask for the reason. He said that a conflict of interest doesn't go away and you can't vote on it today, tomorrow, next week, or whenever. Alderperson Stevens again questioned Robert's Rules of Order in regards to abstaining to which Alderperson Butler responded Council has to conduct business. Alderperson Stevens referenced the Trails Edge vote saying they didn't have to say why they were abstaining then, so this is new territory. Alderperson Butler empathized that Robert's Rules of Order can be complicated but this involves a fundamental issue that needs to be nailed down and done right. He added that abstentions are a big deal because they are serving on the Council to make decisions. Alderperson Adams shared that if he wants to abstain from a vote he's willing to state why and agreed that it's a big deal to abstain. Alderperson Stevens agreed that as long as it's part of Robert's Rules of Order she's fine with it and doesn't want anything that goes against that.

- D. *Review of Robinson Engineering Smoke Testing Report* – City Engineer Dennis Carr provided a packet of informational slides to answer questions he had received throughout the week. Engineer Carr proceeded to walk Council through the provided information including characteristics of the existing trunkline, flow metering from Strand and storm events that exceeded the trunkline's capacity. Mr. Carr continued through the informational packet sharing information that spells out the I & I problem and illustrating the area in red, in which Robinson was contracted to smoke test. He explained that smoke testing targeted the biggest issues in old areas in hopes of finding what is happening. He referenced the packet showing an example of what an IEPA violation looks like explaining the consequences of not correcting the issue, which will be doing what the IEPA orders. He emphasized that cleaning up and remediating the problem is a must and that smoke testing didn't identify enough issues to correct it. He said the trunkline isn't large enough to handle even a two-year rain event and directed attention to the data provided in the slides. Engineer Carr advised that the solution to carry more capacity is a bigger pipe. He said smoke testing demonstrated the issue cannot be resolved through I & I. He reminded Council that a 40% outcome would have been the gold standard but the results are well under that. He explained that I & I and the trunkline are two separate issues. City Administrator Snider addressed Robinson's smoke testing to say Council saw value in it and thought maybe it would work. Other engineers cautioned that it wasn't going to find enough issues to remedy the problem. He added that reports show that this is indeed the case and we are nowhere near what is needed to solve the problem. He explained that Hamilton's continuation of work is based upon a plan that cannot go into effect and nothing is undone because there is nothing to complete. Alderperson Stevens asked for clarification about smoke testing and how much storm water is going into the sanitary sewer

system. She referenced a manhole at the end of Jackson Street with cement buildup that had smoke coming from it and said that a neighbor asked the testers to check the pipe and found it was being infiltrated. It wasn't originally part of the areas mapped for smoke testing so she questioned other parts of the creek. Engineer Carr explained that the GIS system determined the areas to be tested to which Alderperson Stevens responded she doesn't think GIS is right. Mr. Carr said that's why a GIS employee had recently been hired and to be fiscally responsible, older neighborhoods were targeted for the smoke testing. Alderperson Stevens further questioned the data provided. Alderperson Blundy asked for explanation about flow metering and the areas that were smoke tested. He asked how long the flow has been over capacity because the significant jump in volume happens almost every time it rains. Mr. Carr described that with older systems, the pipes were laid side by side rather than within each other. Water is getting in the cracks and pipes settle over time. He explained that engineering gets to a point where it's cheaper to put in new pipe rather than chasing down issues to replace parts. He said he imagines it's been discharging into the creek for a long time. Alderperson Schone agreed that it's been an issue for as long as he worked for the city and recalls that a report for the state water survey shows that rain events are becoming more intense, with more rain in a shorter period of time. Alderperson Blundy said that to fix the problem the city would be torn apart chasing issues and acknowledged that 11,000 gallons per minute is a massive amount of water. He said it seems like it would be easy to find. Alderperson Butler and Engineer Carr discussed the defects in relation to peak flow and the timing for stormwater and sewage to reach STP 2. Alderperson Butler expressed that the smoke testing was their best opportunity, hoping to find something that wasn't found. Engineer Carr recommended sending out letters to inform residents who had violations show up during smoke testing, explaining how they may proceed in correcting them. He mentioned possible grant programs that can be budgeted for next year. Alderperson Stevens suggested notifying residents with a newspaper article and Mr. Carr shared an idea to place a presentation on the city website. City Administrator Jim Snider asked Council if they want to place the repair costs on the homeowners. Alderperson Blundy said that the only solution is they put a pipe in the ground and everyone will pay for it. He said a new pipe will have the capacity to handle the flow. Mr. Snider emphasized that Engineer Carr is requesting clear policy direction. He asked what type of implementation Council wants. Alderperson Blundy said that they can't have residents paying twice and stated the only fix is a big pipe. Alderperson Butler recommended that downspouts should be fixed by homeowners but he doesn't see Council forcing lateral repairs. Mayor Manier said the price tag would be big and shared that several citizens have called with concern trying to save money for such repairs. Alderperson Brownfield agreed that residents should be notified so they can make the repairs they're able to and that awareness of the issues will help in the long run. Alderperson Stevens suggested work start with manholes in the creek area and asked for priorities. Mr. Snider clarified that Council directed him as the City Administrator to pursue looking into the archaeological study. He said his goal is to help Council serve the people and address these issues. Alderperson Butler addressed the audience comments made at the beginning of the meeting. Alderperson Butler, Alderperson Adams, and Alderperson Stevens discussed Council processes in regard to making motions and the ability to table or vote on issues brought forward.

- E. *Trunkline Archaeological Study* – City Engineer Dennis Carr explained that the Phase 2B project falls under a Statewide Permit. He said that while permitting was originally approved and the Illinois State Historical Office had provided archaeological sign-off, complaints from a property owner led the Army Corp to withdraw the permit. As a result, a full archaeological study is being required for the trunkline and permission is being requested to proceed with the

required study. He stated that last year the proposed cost was \$10,288.80, which has gone up some this year. Mr. Carr explained if the study takes place without issue, the next steps would be to start looking at easements. He said if something does arise in the study, then the work toward easements would be for not. He recommended the next step is performing the study on the corridor adjacent to the railroad right of way. Engineer Carr feels there is a fairly good chance nothing will pop up but the study needs to be done regardless and is seeking discussion. He added that the cost is within the City Administrator's spending authority and the study can begin within a few days of Council's approval. Alderpersons Brownfield and Dingledine both expressed their approval. Alderperson Stevens asked questions about the area the study applies to and asked if this implies that we've chosen Route B. City Administrator Snider explained that they are trying to get guidance from Council whether to proceed or wait. He feels this is the next step to consider toward acquiring easements. Alderperson Stevens expressed confusion why it's being discussed at Committee of the Whole. She said if there was a straw poll tonight, this is the way Council wants to go and a straw poll isn't right for the situation because people need time to think about it. Mr. Snider clarified there is a quote to move forward with the study and what's being asked of Council is whether to put it on the agenda for a vote. Alderperson Yoder asked why staff is seeking consensus when the study falls within spending limits. Mr. Snider explained the study is leading to what's been an ongoing issue for months and it's important to be open. Alderperson Stevens asked about the Hamilton Third Party Analysis that's on hold and whether there's a need to review what's feasible. Alderperson Stevens, City Administrator Snider, and City Engineer Carr engaged in a discussion about previously presented information and recommendations. Alderperson Dingledine expressed that the information has been available for months and if it's not already understood then how long will Council continue talking about it. Alderperson Stevens responded that they just received the smoke testing results. Alderperson Butler explained that the smoke testing ruled out one alternative so they're back to the option they heard three years ago. He directed attention to page 10 of the Hamilton report saying there is no direct route between STP 1 and STP 2 and apologized stating they must go through private property. He concluded with saying that no one but Council can make that decision. City Administrator Snider said that he would like to place the archaeological study on the next agenda per Engineer Carr's request and plans to do so unless he hears opposition to it by the majority. Alderperson Butler sympathized that it's an emotional decision not to be based upon a straw poll. Mr. Snider recommended the study be placed on the agenda.

- F. Review of Good Energy Proposals* – City Administrator, Jim Snider shared a memo provided by Finance Director Joanie Baxter explaining that Good Energy provides electric rate consulting services and a new agreement is on hold due to the extreme spike in electric rates. Mr. Snider expressed hope that next spring Good Energy will be able to step into the aggregation market once again to provide a more reasonable rate. He explained that Good Energy also contracts electricity for city buildings and the contract ends in December. He advised Council that there will be two things to look at. Good Energy had been under .00075 per kwh consulting fee since 2011 and are looking at an increase to .001 per kwh. Mr. Snider explained that the fee rolls into the final rate and that a resolution will be brought forward to approve the increase. He added that street lights weren't covered under the previous agreement and Good Energy will provide the bid for street lights now that they can be included. An update on this cost will be provided at the next meeting as it changes daily. Mr. Snider informed Council that currently Direct Energy had the low bid at .095 for building costs. He noted that Ameren's electric rate was a head turner at .14 per kwh. He said that

historically kilowatt rates were .05 to .08 per kwh and acknowledged that electric rates are going to be a challenge for everyone.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Aldersperson Stevens, as the president of Sunnydale Estates HOA, expressed appreciation to the public works crew for cleaning the drainage area so well. She then addressed the Jackson Street Pedestrian Bridge and referenced prior conversation about extending Jackson Street to Kingsbury. Thinking it would be a good idea because she felt the streets are tight, she shared she polled residents in her ward. She said a vast majority don't want the streets extended but the pedestrian bridge upgraded instead. She added that the residents thought their street would be chipped and sealed and asked about the water main project being on hold. Public Works Director Brian Rittenhouse explained that they don't yet have the parts but hope they will arrive within the next week or month so the water main can be finished. Engineer Dennis Carr said that the streets will be chipped and sealed next year.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:22 p.m. Aldersperson Dingledine moved and Aldersperson Stevens seconded to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Lisa Anderson, Deputy City Clerk

Valeri L. Brod, City Clerk

With the Phase 2B trunkline project on the agenda this evening and in light of last week's surprise vote, I'd like to address our City leaders regarding this project. The trunkline project is the single largest project for Washington in decades, one that impacts all citizens and has been active for nearly 7 years and approaching 1 million dollars spent. Yet we are no closer to answering fundamental questions that many citizens want answered.

Why didn't we know about this?

In October of 2019 Strand Engineers presented their recommendations to City Council for a new trunkline sewer to replace the current trunkline. The following week, a resolution was passed by the City Council accepting Strand's recommended Route B under the false impression that all landowners were notified and supportive of Strand's recommendation. Not a single landowner whose land would be used for this project was present at those meetings. The reason is because the City decided not to meet with the affected landowners to inform them about the project.

It wasn't until December of 2020 when the Mayor first contacted our family about this project. On that call the Mayor voluntarily shared budget figures over \$20Million for the project, saying the City needed to move fast and they'd like to meet. Promising the City was open to all ideas.

To put this conversation into context, as of December 2020, the City had already spent 5 years working on this project, they selected Strand without conducting a qualified-based selection process, passed a resolution approving the Route B alignment, approved additional funding for Strand Engineers, submitted their application for loan approval to the IEPA and were over 50% complete with their pre-final engineering drawings. And most importantly, the US Army Corp of Engineers had just withdrawn their permit causing a significant delay in the project.

Additionally, the City had already violated our FOIA rights on three different occasions. We knew this because we sent the same FOIA requests to the IEPA and the City of Washington. The IEPA responded on-time and shared the City's Loan Application. The City simply responded to our FOIA that they had no responsive documents to share. My conversation with the Mayor concluded with him promising to address the FOIA violations and make sure the city gets it right. We planned to meet 6 weeks later in January, 2021.

After receiving no further response to our (3) FOIA requests and only a few days away from our meeting with the City, we were forced to cancel. We explained in an email to the Mayor and others that we would not participate in a meeting when we didn't have pertinent project information that we had asked for and were entitled to receive.

These are not the actions of a Mayor open to all ideas.

Why put the pipe here?

We continued looking closer at this project wondering, if putting a new trunkline pipe through 2 miles of timber property was the only and best option for Washington? We have been asked this question by fellow citizens, elected leaders, and the US Army Corp of Engineers to name a few.

We did discover the City has other options. And we hired the engineers to validate them.

Instead of tearing down 2 miles timber, the City has the opportunity to utilize adjacent properties that are planned for development (i.e. streets), properties that contain long stretches of open pasture, includes a city-owned right-of-way, and significantly less timber - that is not only common sense, it is fiscally and environmentally responsible to the citizens of Washington.

Knowing this, we felt compelled to talk with elected officials to see if they truly were as the Mayor said, "open to all ideas." I met with a city alderperson on the morning of February 1, 2021 to discuss the project and share what we knew along with alternatives that should be considered. In our discussion about the location of the new trunkline, this alderperson's was, "we didn't think it was a big deal to run it over there." There was no mention of the alternatives reviewed. No confirmation that the alternatives we were sharing had even been analyzed. I got a thanks for sharing and he would look into it.

Prior discussions with other alderpersons revealed they were being kept in the dark about the project, the problems encountered by landowners, any alternative options, and the City's unwillingness to share information with citizens. These alderpersons were open to new ideas and wanted to seek out more information.

Within the next 2 weeks of these meetings and following the February 1 City Council/Executive Session Meeting, City Alderpersons informed me that they were instructed not to speak with our family any longer about this public project.

Fast forward to July, 2021 where APTIM Engineers presents at the Committee of the Whole meeting about the trunkline project. A noteworthy exchange in the meeting occurs when Alderman Dingleline argues that the current sewer pipe is not broken it just needs more flow capacity. I'd invite alderpersons and fellow citizens to watch the video themselves, but that video along with many other city council meeting videos have disappeared from the city's website. We've made attempts of our own through FOIA to get copies of several Council meeting videos only to be told by the City they cannot be produced - to date no explanation has been provided as to where those videos are and why they aren't available. It is noteworthy to recall that a lot of citizen's went on record during these meetings and the videos capture their comments. More questions - how can the city simply get rid of these? Do they even care what their citizens have to say?

Four months later in November of 2021, a 3rd party analysis had been approved and Hamilton Engineers were hired to lead the analysis. Hamilton wanted to hear from property owners and walk the corridor with them so they held a "Property Owners'" meeting on December 14th at the Fire Station. It was during this meeting the impartiality about this project held by Alderman Butler became obvious. He was the only elected official in attendance and his comments during the meeting were clearly against any proposed alternative even though the 3rd party analysis had only just started. As an elected official of the City of Washington his mind was already made up.

Why are we not trying to solve the problem?

Hamilton Engineers presented their 3rd Party Draft Analysis Report at the February 21st, 2022 City Council meeting. The very next morning Howard Hamilton received a call from our City Engineer and the City Administrator asking him to submit his invoice and stop the project indefinitely. While the full City Council was asked to approve the 3rd party analysis project, they were disrespectfully excluded when someone cancelled the project before it was completed.

There has been no opportunity for citizens to ask questions about Hamilton's draft analysis as was promised in the scope of work. No opportunity to verify what engineering criteria was used when Hamilton altered the alignments of the alternative options resulting in increased costs. No opportunity to point out the discrepancies in Hamilton's cost analysis that resulted in incorrectly ranking the most cost effective routes. No opportunity to point out that the same criteria used in evaluating the alternative options was not used to review Strand's Route B. In fact, it's unclear what, if anything about Strand's Route B was analyzed by Hamilton. The 3rd party analysis was immediately cancelled - we don't know why. We don't know who was involved in making that decision.

Hamilton's draft analysis did provide a new option that utilizes the current sewer trunkline and directly addresses the cause of the City's massive I/I problem in a more cost effective manner than Strand's Route B recommendation. Hamilton agrees with Alderman Dingleline - the current trunkline is in good

working condition and their solution allows for additional flow capacity. In fact we learned from Hamilton that our current sewer pipe is large enough to support a city nearly 3X the size of Washington and if we address our I/I problem it could serve our citizens for another 40-50 years.

Yet, for some unexplained reason, this engineer's recommendation isn't good enough. The response heard by council: "it is too good to be true" according to Alderman Butler.

Last Monday night Alderman Blundy asked our City Administrator if it makes sense to build a new trunkline sewer that would support a city the size of Aurora. His response was, "I'm not an engineer. That's what the engineering says." That's a convenient response when something that doesn't make sense can't be justified. It begs the question, why isn't that the response to Alderman Butler when he claims Hamilton's recommendation is too good to be true?

We and so many others find ourselves with far more questions after nearly 3 years. Why is the City hiding information? Why has the Mayor stated multiple times that this project will be over \$20Million when the public is being told \$13M? How does a trunkline for a City the size of Aurora make any sense for Washington? Who's right about the condition of our current trunkline sewer - Alderman Dingledine and Hamilton Engineers or Alderman Butler and Strand? Why was the 3rd party analysis cancelled before citizens could ask questions? Why is the smoke testing cancelled when the source of the I/I hasn't been found? Why hasn't Strand's Route B been analyzed by Hamilton? Do elected officials really matter in Washington when approved projects can just be stopped without their involvement? The list of questions has only gotten longer, not shorter.

So what does all this mean?

I can only conclude that a solution for this project was determined before the engineering was performed. After all, it wasn't a big deal to put the new trunkline on the south side of the tracks. But it is difficult to justify a decision that was made on personal preference and not accurate, fact-based engineering. The strategy employed by the City all along has been to quietly and very rapidly push this project forward to a point where it cannot be changed or reversed. Just keep citizens and some elected officials in the dark and bank on them not being able to afford a fight. That is the answer that seems to explain the actions taken by a few members of our City's Government. Its government by the few for the few. Using intimidation, manipulation and deception cloaked in false promises to win at all costs. That's the legacy being left in Washington. And there are many citizens and former city employees who can relate to this experience.

The path forward should be to finish the 3rd Party Alternative Analysis previously approved by the full City Council. And do so in a manner that provides all citizens the opportunity to be heard. Any decision to move forward without public input and scrutiny over the process and content of the Hamilton Draft Report is self-serving of a few at the expense (literally) of the citizens of Washington.

Thank you for your time this evening.