



Special Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 17, 2023, at 6:00 P.M.

Wilmor Fire Station, 320 N. Wilmor Road, Washington, IL 61571

Mayor Manier called the Special Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., in the training room, with a quorum present.

Present: Alderpersons Adams, Blundy, Brownfield, Butler, Martin, McIntyre, Smith, and Stevens

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

1. ALDERPERSONS WISHING TO BE HEARD: Nothing provided.
2. CITIZENS WISHING TO BE HEARD: Case Pudik came forward on behalf of Goat Springs, LLC., and read a statement that is attached and made part of these minutes.
3. BUSINESS ITEMS:
 - A. *Phase 2B Trunkline – 3rd Party Alternative Analysis Draft Report Follow-up Presentation* – City Engineer Carr introduced Howard Hamilton who shared that their name has changed to Environmental Design International Inc. He provided a PowerPoint presentation that can be accessed via the following URL:
https://www.ci.washington.il.us/egov/documents/1689607048_18566.pdf
He provided a list of definitions that can be found in the presentation. Mr. Hamilton shared a chart detailing the Sewer Design Peeking Factor which he noted is set by law and Washington's would be 2.75. He stated that they analyzed the Farm Creek trunk sewer that connects sewer treatment plant #1 and sewer treatment plant #2. Mr. Hamilton provided the following key dates:
 - 1950 STP #1 Constructed
 - 1971 STP #2 and Farm Creek Trunk Sewer (FCTS)
 - 2015 FCTS Easements reviewed 2016 Strand retained for FCTS Replacement Project
 - 2019 Strand conducts a systemwide flow study to size FCTS
 - 2020 Property Owners adjacent to FCTS express concerns
 - 2021 Strand and Property Owner Representatives prepare competing alignment alternatives for the Farm Creek Trunk Sewer
 - 11/4/21 Hamilton was brought in to complete 12 steps.He noted that the contingency was built into the steps and shared which steps they completed. He also noted that the draft report found significant issues which is why they felt it needed it to go to Council. Alderperson Blundy asked for the purpose of a public hearing and Mr. Hamilton stated that it would layout public concerns then go into the final report. It also allows them to look at other information that they may not have heard about. Mr. Hamilton stated that they used Strand's numbers to make everything equal. Mr. Hamilton shared a map and the flow meter chart called "Key Points". He shared the graph on sewage flows that showed peak flow on Basin 9 was above 40 and Basin 7 was more than 45. Other flow rates were also provided. Alderperson Blundy asked

for information on Basin 5 and Mr. Hamilton stated that Basin 5 does not catch much flow and they were reviewing the main lines. Mr. Hamilton explained that they provided a website to share public information. The questionnaire that provided Council with information from the public. Mr. Carr clarified that Basin 5 comes in after the STP #1 and does not contribute to the flow. Mr. Hamilton stated that out of 150 residents who took the survey, only 75 residents answered the question regarding sewer backups and 1/3 of those said they've had sewer backups. Mr. Hamilton stated that they reviewed seven alternatives. He noted that the report did not include the cost of abandoning the trunk sewer and work at the lift station. Alderperson Blundy and Mr. Hamilton discussed the depth limits. Mr. Hamilton shared that Strand Route B didn't contain the abandoned line. Alderperson Blundy and Mr. Hamilton discussed building the system to accommodate 169,611 PE and noted that building a sewer bigger than it has to be is more expensive but it's cheaper to do it now than later. Mr. Hamilton noted that they reviewed the same sizes that Strand provided and found a smaller pipe needs to be steeper to keep the flow moving which may have depth concerns. Mr. Hamilton continued his presentation by reviewing Pudik Alignment L-1/Alternative B which has some information the same as the Strand Route B and stated that Pudik Alignment E-3/Alternative C does not service areas south of the railroad. He shared that he originally thought Alternative D would have costs savings but it didn't turn out that way and it does nothing to reduce the excess flows. Mr. Hamilton provided information regarding the manholes north and east of STP #1 which need to be addressed due to bottlenecks. He stated that if the two bottlenecks were eliminated, it would give better peak flow and a bypass sewer allows for a steeper pipe allowing for greater flow. He said the STP#1 bypass sewer could be built as a Phase 1 project to see if it helped alleviate some issues and get rid of the overflows. Mr. Hamilton shared that Alternative F would be to do an SSES and Alternative G is doing nothing except to evaluate and repair FCTS and take the long-term approach toward eliminating I/I, but it is not recommended. He said Hamilton recommends focusing on Alternative A or Alternative B. He also noted that the smoke test was more complicated than expected. Mr. Hamilton discussed the preliminary engineer's opinion and shared how the slope and depth of drilling and boring works. He shared the price for three options: Alternative A (Strand), Alternative B (L-1) and Alternative C (E-3). He shared that different firms could come up with different numbers. He also shared that the estimates don't include the pump station or the abandonment. Mr. Hamilton and Alderperson Blundy discussed sewer depth considerations, noting that some areas require extra effort to hold trenches back. He shared that they moved E-3 because of cost, ease of construction and acquisition of easements. He stated some people said they would never give an easement. The impact on future use of property and the possibility of expansion was noted along with the lure of a brand-new sewer attracting new development or make it worse if it is put in the wrong place. He shared that E-3 went through five properties and through tillable area, so they moved it to the property lines, however, it is deeper. Alderperson Blundy asked if this impacts floodplains and Mr. Hamilton shared that these are developable, and they are flood plains not flood ways. Regarding smoke testing, Mr. Hamilton stated that he does them all the time. He said he didn't talk about the peaking factor Basin 6 because the manhole is overflowing. He shared that they found 816 defects. He shared a map of where the defects were found. He noted that two companies have two separate evaluations for estimates. He stated that smoke testing seldom finds all the defects. Mr. Hamilton shared flow numbers and noted that 161 inflow sources were identified. He shared the breakdown of inflow sources. Mr. Hamilton's recommended steps are to move #4 to #1 because it could be done in house easily. He recommended investigating creek connections to #2 and downspouts should also be moved to the top of the list. He recommends private inspections and repairs. Alderperson Martin asked if sump pumps could cause that amount of flow during rain. Mr. Hamilton said it can be a big part of it. The timing of the tests was discussed. Mr. Hamilton also recommended a tele grouter to fill cracks in the concrete. Alderperson Adams asked if Mr. Hamilton was surprised about the smoke test results, to which he replied that he was not. He said his only surprise was that he can't connect it to the flow meter. Alderperson Adams stated that when people said they had sewer backups, it was because foundations were connected to the sewer. Alderperson Blundy stated that we have more than 2000% of I/I problems. Mr. Hamilton feels we should fix the I/I problems regardless of the trunk sewer. Alderperson Adams and Mr. Hamilton discussed the section that appears in every

recommendation, noting that it is on City owned property. They discussed the significant improvement this could have on issues in that area and Mr. Hamilton noted these are deeper manholes allowing more water. Mr. Hamilton could not confirm corrections if I/I issues were addressed, due to not knowing where all the problems are. Mr. Hamilton shared his concern that if the overflows at the plant are fixed, there could be another weak point. He noted the bottleneck behind Timber Rail. Alderperson Butler referred to slide #10, noting that the final draft took place before the presentation to Council. He also stated that Mr. Hamilton did not skip the final draft and billed us over \$9,000 and Mr. Hamilton did more evaluation than what he is giving himself credit for. Mr. Hamilton said the final draft is on the website. Alderperson Butler noted the schedule of billing and stated that dozens of alignments were thoroughly evaluated. He feels Mr. Hamilton did the work that was asked. Mr. Hamilton stated that he was accused tonight of making a multimillion-dollar mistake. Alderperson Butler stated that in the updated estimates, Strand Route B is shovel ready because it is 97% complete and there will be additional engineering costs to start over with other routes. Alderperson Butler stated that Pudik Route E-3 could cost \$4 million more than Route B. Mr. Hamilton stated that he agrees with Strand, and they are competitors. Alderperson Butler said they were accused of being biased and affected by private ownership. Alderperson Butler clarified that the estimates were off for reasons not a multimillion-dollar mistake. Mr. Hamilton shared that he looked at the why we have water issues not how to handle the water. Alderperson Butler noted that we don't know what the actual price will be. Alderperson Martin asked if in his professional opinion and if easements aren't an issue, what is his recommendation. Mr. Hamilton stated that he is a perfectionist and would fix the I/I issues, but if we have the plan in place, we should put it to use. Alderperson Blundy asked about qualifying for an IEPA loan with I/I issues. Mr. Hamilton said we would likely qualify. Alderperson Blundy asked if any routes are better for maintenance and Mr. Hamilton noted the current sewer is hard to access. He also noted that Strand also included access roads. Alderperson Blundy asked if the final draft found on the website is now finalized. Mr. Hamilton said no, but he thinks we have enough information to make a decision.

- B. *Phase 2B Trunkline* – Administrator Snider asked Council how they would like to move forward to provide direction. He shared that they are trying to gain access to do the archaeological study, but the property owners will not allow it. He invited City Engineer Carr who thanked Mr. Hamilton because it is not easy to provide information that might be contradictory. Mr. Carr stated that staff is looking for direction from Council. He shared that they are not actively looking for overflows during rains but they could do that in the future if Council wishes. He also shared that they did the smoke testing in areas that feed into STP#1. He noted the other areas don't feed into the issue. Mr. Carr shared that they smoke tested over 2,000 addresses and they can chase I/I on private and public properties. He shared that Public Works is relining some of the pipes which would help. He stated that they tried to send out letters to do some simple fixes, but Council did not receive it well. He also stated that staff has no idea what direction Council would like to move in before IEPA gives them a direction they would not like. Alderperson Brownfield said he appreciates Mr. Hamilton but he is concerned that they would have to stop doing streets in order to move funds to pay for it. Alderperson Butler noted a previously provided report that stated that the trunk sewer is exposed on the landowner's property, and it is likely allowing sewerage to spill into the creek. He shared that Mr. Moose provided photos and a comment that stated the same. He further shared that photos of trees that were uprooted and possibly affecting sewer were also shared. Another letter from Mr. Moose to Mr. Hamilton talked about scarring of the line and the idea of a new sewer, leaves this sewer in the creek forever. Alderperson Butler expressed concern about the funds needed to chase I/I issues. He also noted that that sewer is now seven years older than when it started. Adams disagrees that if we spend a lot of money on this, we can't do other things. Alderperson Adams and Engineer Carr discussed doing the relief sewer in a Phase 1 approach since this will be done regardless. Mr. Carr estimated the length would be about 1,500 feet and he cannot say if it will stop overflows or push it downstream to the next bottleneck. Mr. Carr stated that if this creates an issue with a personal property it could exacerbate the issues with the IEPA. A possible consent order from the IEPA was briefly discussed. Alderperson Blundy feels we are off the chart with I/I and we should try to address it. He stated that he can support the

bypass because every route uses it. Alderperson Blundy thinks the City should give the landowners the opportunity to explain the \$5 million discrepancy and stated that these guys are not “not in my back yard” people because they have spent some of their own money to look into this. Alderperson McIntyre agreed with Blundy. He stated that he is trying to process the \$11.3 million that must be done regardless of the route, and they then must address decommissioning the old trunk line. Mr. Carr stated that attacking I/I is using 100% funds and is not an IEPA funded project, or we can take out a large bond, but a Phase 1 section is a bondable project. He noted that the City is doing lining which is helping with I/I. Alderperson Butler feels the stub is a band aid and finishing it could delay the project another 2-3 years. He stated that we are obviously trying to avoid Route B, but now it costs more. Mr. Carr and Alderperson Martin clarified that only one route has the relief sewer. Alderperson Martin feels we can’t continue to put this off and need to make a decision. Alderperson Adams stated that this has zero to do with avoiding Route B but we can spend \$2 million instead of \$20 million. He is trying to figure out what is best for the taxpayers and is looking for the best dollar solution and not trying to avoid a specific path. Alderperson Butler agreed. He asked Mr. Carr what they would do with a 50-year event. Mr. Carr stated that they would fill out a report and send it to the IEPA. Alderperson Stevens agreed with Alderpersons Adams and Blundy. She thinks it doesn’t hurt to do the relief sewers first. After consulting with Alderperson Stevens, Alderperson Smith said she is open to Alternate E. She stated that she is concerned with acquiring the funding. Mayor Manier expressed disappointment in that we hired a qualified engineer and city administrator, and we need to listen to them. Mayor Manier stated that Mr. Hamilton stated that he is in competition with Strand, and he didn’t appreciate that. Mayor Manier said it will continue to cost us money every year we push this down the road. Alderperson Blundy stated that he took some clarity out of this discussion, he thinks this helps the new people, and he thinks they were clear on where they stand. He asked if there is opposition to having Pudik’s come talk. Alderperson Butler stated that we did everything the Pudik’s asked. He feels this is confusing because it is an engineer hired by the landowner who may be biased. Alderperson Blundy stated that we agreed to a public hearing which took away people’s chance to provide input. Alderperson Butler noted that 150 answered the questionnaire, which is more than any amount of people that have come to a public meeting. Alderperson Stevens said this meeting could have had a public component, but it was taken away. Administrator Snider stated that he doesn’t have the authority to schedule a meeting. Alderperson Martin said it would not be realistic to allow the public to speak openly and we heard the reason why the public hearing didn’t happen was because Mr. Hamilton said he had received the information he needed. He asked Alderperson Blundy what his intention is to get from the Pudiks. Alderperson McIntyre shared concern for a 3rd party analysis and if Hamilton was biased. Mayor Manier shared that Hamilton met with Pudiks one-on-one.

4. OTHER BUSINESS: Nothing provided at this time.
5. ADJOURNMENT: At 8:11 p.m. Alderperson Brownfield moved to adjourn; Alderperson Smith seconded. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.



Valeri L. Brod, City Clerk

Good evening Mayor and City Council.

My name is Case Pudik, I am a resident of Washington. I am speaking tonight on behalf of Goat Springs, LLC.

The focus of the special Committee of the Whole meeting tonight is the status of the City's 3rd Party Alternative Analysis project, partially completed by Hamilton Engineers before being placed on indefinite hold by City leadership. Unfortunately, as a landowner with a lot at stake, we only have 3 minutes to speak tonight.

Earlier this year, in March, the City Engineer reported to the Council that "significant discrepancies" in the "draft" report published on the City's project website did, in fact, exist. This confirmed the suspicion raised by Alderperson Blundy during budget talks regarding the City's sewer fund. The City Engineer claims that City staff had not reviewed the appendices to the draft report, so a multi-million \$\$ cost discrepancy went undetected for 13 months. How can this be possible, given the exchange of the draft report and associated dialogue between Hamilton and the City Engineer during the two weeks leading up to the decision by the Mayor and others to publish this erroneous document for public review? When did the City first learn of this multi-million \$\$ discrepancy?

Tonight, we are about to hear from Mr. Hamilton regarding his analysis and now re-analysis of the Trunkline project and perhaps other content in the "draft" report, which has now sat idle for 17 months running. So what about the content in Hamilton's February 2022 draft report?

1. The previously recognized route alignments presented by Aptim Engineers and Goat Springs were never analyzed.
2. Instead, the previously recognized alternative routes' were relocated, resulting in significant cost increases. In particular, Route E-3 increased by \$4M. Why not analyze these routes as presented and leave the decision-making to the City Council, especially since the stated reasons for relocating E-3 apply to all alignments in various degrees of severity? Furthermore, discarding previously recognized alignments because they may possess some flaws was not the directive to Hamilton. The assumption was that all route alignments possess certain flaws, but they all deserve to be equally evaluated and placed side-by-side for comparison.
3. Hamilton's cost calculations or EOPCCs for the alternative routes were erroneously inflated when compared to Hamilton's own plans and profiles in the same draft

report. So not only were the routes moved, but they were incorrectly estimated, resulting in a flawed ranking of the route alignments.

4. Since Strand's plans and profiles are missing from Appendix J-1 in Hamilton's draft report, it is unclear what version of Strand's work Hamilton analyzed. The EOPCC in Hamilton's Appendix J-1 appears to be the same as Strand's presentation in July 2021 and which was published on the project website. We are asking Hamilton to address our concerns regarding their evaluation of Strand's Route B tonight.
5. The engineering criteria that drove the means and methods for pipe installation are also unclear in Hamilton's report. What was the full set of engineering criteria? We are asking Hamilton to release a document clearly identifying these criteria for purposes of transparency and validation of their work.

The stated focus of the 3rd Party Analysis was to study up to five previously recognized route alignments [including Strand's Route B], prepare a draft report, engage in a public hearing, and present a final report with a recommendation. This did not happen.

With significant cost errors, routes that had been relocated and previously recognized routes discarded, and many questions about what, if anything, was analyzed regarding Strand's Route B, City leadership unilaterally canceled the 3rd Party Analysis the morning following Hamilton's draft report presentation - without so much as consulting with any council members who had collectively voted 6-2 to approve the project. City Council members were left to learn about the cancellation from concerned citizens, not City leadership.

The intent behind this strategic decision became evident when Alderman Butler made specific reference to the erroneous costs in Hamilton's "draft" report when he called for an impromptu vote to rekindle easement discussions for Route B and approve the Archaeological study. The Mayor cast the deciding vote that night when the council was in a 4-4 tie. When was the last time the City relied on a "draft" engineering document to make a policy decision, let alone a draft document containing a multi-million \$\$ cost discrepancy?

City Council members - since the start of the 3rd Party analysis, you have been given three different sets of costs for the same routes. Each time you receive those costs, the engineering criteria have been changed. The most glaring change is the depth at which open-cut installation methods transition over to trenchless installation methods - this has a significant cost impact. The latest memo supplied by Hamilton has now set the depth

for a 3rd time at 22'-24'. It should be noted that both Strand and Aptim Engineers are in agreement to use 30' depth as the criteria.

What you don't have in the latest memo is any analysis or verification that the same criteria - meaning all of the engineering criteria - were also applied equally to Strand's Route B. In fact, if Strand's Route B plans and profiles were to be analyzed using the same criteria equally and consistently applied to the other route alignments, the results would reveal the fact that this route is conservatively estimated to cost nearly \$2M more than the previously recognized alternative routes developed by Aptim Engineers and Goat Springs.

We have done the work in coordination with Aptim Engineers. Four of the previously recognized route alignments [including the Strand Route B alignment] have been studied utilizing equal and consistent application of design criteria, among which include consideration of pipe installation means and methods, property lines, creek and RR crossings, flood plains, property use/value, and more. We have the plans and profiles - also using the same LIDAR technology as Hamilton - to support our findings and conclusions. And we are sharing these with the council tonight in good faith to demonstrate credibility, consistency, and transparency.

The actions taken by city leadership to hide information, manipulate city council decisions, and ignore the pleasure of the council has to be met with accountability. That is the reason we are asking for an opportunity to present and reveal the results of a complete study performed by Aptim Engineers and Goat Springs. Since we cannot have that tonight with Howard present, we ask for that opportunity with the council and staff before further decisions are made about this project.

Thank you.