

COUNCIL PACKET JUNE 14, 2011 GENERAL MEETING



CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA GENERAL MEETING JULY 14, 2011 7:00PM @ CITY HALL

Jim Mackovjak
Mayor
mayor@gustavus-ak.gov
Mayor Term Expires 2011
Council Seat Term Expires 2013

Lou Cacioppo Vice Mayor lou.cacioppo@gustavus-ak.gov Vice Mayor Term Expires 2011 Council Seat Term Expires 2013

Joe Lassiter Council Member joe.lassiter@gustavus-ak.gov Term Expires 2011

Melanie Lesh Council Member melanie.lesh@gustavus-ak.gov Term Expires 2012

John Nixon Council Member john.nixon@gustavus-ak.gov Term Expires 2011

Tim Sunday Council Member tim.sunday@gustavus-ak.gov Term Expires 2012

Karen Taylor Council Member karen.taylor@gustavus-ak.gov Term Expires 2012

COUNCIL MEETINGS:
Work Sessions:
1st & 3rd Thursdays
General Meeting:
2nd Thursday

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Approval of Minutes:
- 4. Mayor's Request for Agenda Changes
- 5. Committee Reports:
 - A. DRC
 - B. Road
 - C. Marine Facilities
- 6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items
- 7. Consent Agenda:
 - A. Hire Daniel Glasmann as DRC Assistant Operator @ \$15.00 per hour
 - B. Ordinance for Publication: FY12-01NCO Amending DRC FY12 Budget
 - C. Berry Driveway Fish Passage RFQ
- 8. Ordinance for Public Hearing: None
- 9. Unfinished business:
 - A. Resolution 2011-17 GVFD Fire Hall Remodel
- 10. New Business
 - A. DRC Facilities Improvement Scoping Form
 - B. Ordinance for Publication: FY12-02NCO An Ordinance of the City of Gustavus Placing an Advisory Ballot Question on the October 4, 2011 General Election Ballot - VPSO
- 11. Staff Reports:
 - A. DRC Paul Berry
- 12. City Council Reports
 - A. Mayor's report
 - B. City Clerk report
- 13. City Council Questions and Comments
- 14. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items
- 15. Executive Session
- 16. Adjournment

City Council General Meeting June 9, 2011

1. Call to Order: A General Meeting of the Gustavus City Council was held on June 9, 2011 at 7:00PM.

Mayor Mackovjak called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

2. Roll Call:

Comprising a quorum of the Council the following were present:

Mayor Mackovjak Vice Mayor Cacioppo Council Member Lassiter Council Member Lesh Council Member Nixon Council Member Sunday

Council Member Taylor -Via Teleconference

3. Approval of Minutes

A. April 14, 2011 General Meeting

Minutes of the April 14, 2011 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

B. May 2, 2011 General Meeting Minutes of the May 2, 2011 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

C. May 5, 2011 General Meeting Minutes of the May 5, 2011 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

D. May 12, 2011 General Meeting

Motion: Council Member Lassiter moved to approve the

May 12th minutes with changes.

Seconded by: Council Member Lesh

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 7/0

E. May 16, 2011 General Meeting

Minutes of the May 16, 2011 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

4. Mayor's Request For Agenda Changes:

Mayor Mackovjak requested that Consent Agenda Item 10G be removed.

5. Committee Reports:

- A. Library Board written report given.
- **B.** Planning Committee report given by Nate Borson.

6. Public Comment On Non Agenda Items:

- 1. Tom Scott
- 2. Becky King
- 7. Consent Agenda: None

8. Ordinances for Public Hearing:

A. FY11-30 Amending 6.05

Public Hearing: With no one who wished to be heard the public hearing

was closed.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Council Member Nixon declared a conflict

of interest due to the fact that he rents to

Corvid Computing.

RULING: Mayor Mackovjak ruled that there was a

conflict of interest.

Motion: Vice Mayor Cacioppo moved to accept ordinance

FY11-30 and adopt it.

Seconded by: Council Member Lesh

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Recused: Nixon

Motion Passes: 6/0 with 1 recused

B. FY11-31NCO Amending FY11 Library Budget

Public Hearing: With no one who wished to be heard the public

hearing was closed.

Motion: Council Member Taylor moved to approve

FY11-31NCO.

Seconded by: Council Member Lasiter

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 7/0

C. FY11-32NCO FY12 Budget

Public Hearing: With no one who wished to be heard the public

hearing was closed.

Motion: Council Member Lesh moved the City Council adopt

FY11-32NCO.

Seconded by: Vice Mayor Cacioppo

(Clerk's Note: Council Member Taylor stated for the record that she is not in favor of the \$25,000.00 Clinic donation.)

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: Lassiter

Motion Passes 6/1

9. Unfinished Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Fire Chief Position—Full Time

Public Comment:

1. Mike Taylor

Motion: Council Member Taylor moved that the paid regular

fulltime Fire Chief position that already exists, heretofore described variously as 30 to 40 hours per week, be established as a regular full-time, overtime-exempt position of 40 hours per week with on-call positions in the event of an emergency.

Seconded by: Council Member Lesh

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: Lassiter

Motion Passes 6/1

B. Fire Chief Hiring of Steve Manchester

Public Comment:

1. Toshua Parker

2. Linda Parker

3. Mike Taylor

4. Craig Murdoch

Motion: Council Member Taylor moved that we promote

Mr. Steve Manchester to the position of regular fulltime Fire Chief, an overtime-exempt position of 40

hours per week.

Seconded by: Council Member Lesh

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 7/0

C. DRC-Wage Increase Brandon Mullis

Public Comment:

1. Paul Berry

2. Kim Ney

Motion: Council Member Taylor moved to approve a pay

NOT YET APPROVED City Council Minutes City of Gustavus, Alaska

raise for Brandon Mullis of 1.50 which would raise

his wage to \$16.50.

Seconded by: Council Member Lassiter

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 7/0

D. GCN Administrator— Temporary

Public Comment: None

Motion: Council Member Lesh moved to extend the current

contract with Corvid Computing for administration of the Gustavus Community Network through June 30, 2012, or until a new contract is awarded, whichever

comes first, with no other change in terms.

Seconded by: Council Member Lassiter

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Council Member Nixon declared a conflict

due to the fact that he rents office space to

Corvid Computing.

RULING: Mayor Mackovjak ruled that there was a

conflict and the Council Member Nixon

should not vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None Recused: Nixon

Motion Passes 6/0 with 1 Recused

E. GCN Administrator—Approval of Notice

Public Comment: None

Motion: Council Member Lassiter moved the Council adopt the

NOT YET APPROVED City Council Minutes City of Gustavus, Alaska

	GCN Administrator Notice.	
Seconded by:	Vice Mayor Cacioppo	

Motion: Council Member Lesh moved to postpone the item

until the next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Council Member Lassiter

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO POSTPONE:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Nixon, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 7/0

F. GCN Maintenance & Operations—Temporary

Public Comment:

1. Kim Ney

Motion: Council Member Lesh moved that the Council approve the GCN Maintenance and Operations temporary

the GCN Maintenance and Operations temporary

extension.

Seconded by: Vice Mayor Cacioppo

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Council Member Nixon declared a conflict

of interest due to the fact that he rents to

Corvid Computing.

RULING: Mayor Mackovjak ruled there was a

conflict.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None Recused: Nixon

Motion Passes 6/0 with 1 Recused

-G. GCN Maintenance & Operations-Award Contract

(Clerk's Note: Item 10G was removed during Mayor's Request for Agenda Changes.)

H. Resolution 2011-18—Charter Fishing Resolution 2011-18 was read by Council Member Nixon

Public Comment:

Devon Brown
 Judy Brakel

3. Mike Taylor

4. Josh Cosby

5. Kim Ney

6. Pep Scott

7. Kim Heacox

Motion: Council Member Lassiter moved the Council adopt

Resolution 2011-18.

Seconded by: Council Member Nixon

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Lassiter, Lesh, Nixon

No: Cacioppo, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

Motion Defeated 3/4

I. Tower—Approval of Contract Amendment & Payment

Public Comment:

1. Kim Ney

Motion: Council Member Lassiter moved that the Council

approve the payment and contract amendment to Glacier Bay Construction concerning the tower

component.

Seconded by: Council Member Lesh

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Council Member Nixon declared a conflict

because he is a sub to the contractor on

this project.

RULING: Mayor Mackovjak declared a conflict.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None Recused: Nixon

Motion Passes 6/0 with 1 Recused.

J. Council Member Nixon—Conflict of Interest Tank Farm

Public Comment: None

RULING: Mayor Mackovjak ruled that there is not a conflict of

interest.

11. Staff Reports: None

12. City Council Reports

A. Mayor's Report

• Stated he has talked to Representative Thomas and Rep. Thomas thanked Gustavus for their support.

B. City Clerk's Report:

13. City Council Questions & Comments

- Council Member Nixon talked about training with Jim Van Altvorst and asked that questions be submitted to the City Clerk by Friday.
- Council Member Sunday said he would like for the training to occur after the election.
- Vice Mayor Cacioppo stated this is a busy time of the year and is a difficult time of the year to have training.
- Council Member Lesh thought it would be helpful to sit down and talk respectfully.
- Council Member Taylor said Jim Van Altvorst would be here in August for the LBC training and the training could be done then or when the new Council is in place in October.
- Mayor Mackovjak thought it would be a good thing to do, but the demands on time are unlimited. Tonight was a good example of the Council working together.
- Council Member Lesh discussed the energy audit.

- Council Member Taylor thanked Steve Manchester for his efforts and achievements. Also thanked volunteers for their time.
- Council Member Lassiter discussed the FY12 Road Maintenance contract.
- Council Member Sunday stated the repairs at the Boat Harbor ramp were complete. That the logs had been moved, but that the boom sticks were still there. Also the Long Term Storage Area was discussed.
- Council Member Lesh commented about vacancies on committees.

14. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items: None

15. Executive Session: None

16. Adjournment:

With no further business before the Council the meeting was adjourned at 9:17PM.

City Council Special Meeting June 16, 2011

1. Call to Order: A Special Meeting of the Gustavus City Council was held on June 16, 2011 at 6:45PM.

Acting Mayor Cacioppo called the meeting to order at 6:50PM.

2. Roll Call:

Comprising a quorum of the Council the following were present:

Mayor Mackovjak -Via Teleconference

Vice Mayor Cacioppo Council Member Lassiter

Council Member Nixon -Via Teleconference

Council Member Taylor

Council Members not in attendance:

Council Member Lesh Council Member Sunday

3. Approval of Minutes: None

4. Mayor's Request For Agenda Changes: None

5. Committee Reports: None

6. Public Comment on Non Agenda Items: None

7. Consent Agenda: None

8. Ordinances for Public Hearing: None

9. Unfinished Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Award of FY12 Road Maintenance Contract

Public Comment:

1. Mike Taylor

Motion:	Council Member Lassiter moved the Council award the
	contract to Glacier Bay Construction for FY12.
Seconded by:	Council Member Taylor

NOT YET APPROVED City Council Minutes City of Gustavus, Alaska

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Mackovjak, Nixon, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 5/0

11. Staff Reports: None

12. City Council Reports

A. Mayor's Report: None

B. City Clerk's Report: None

13. City Council Questions & Comments: None

14. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items: None

15. Executive Session: None

16. Adjournment:

With no further business before the Council the meeting was adjourned at 6:56PM.

City Council Special Meeting June 30, 2011

1. Call to Order: A Special Meeting of the Gustavus City Council was held on June 30, 2011 at 7:00PM.

Mayor Mackovjak called the meeting to order at 7:03PM.

2. Roll Call:

Comprising a quorum of the Council the following were present:

Mayor Mackovjak Vice Mayor Cacioppo Council Member Lassiter Council Member Lesh Council Member Sunday Council Member Taylor

Council Members not in attendance:

Council Member Nixon

3. Approval of Minutes: None

4. Mayor's Request For Agenda Changes: None

5. Committee Reports: None

6. Public Comment On Non Agenda Item: None

7. Consent Agenda: None

8. Ordinances for Public Hearing: None

9. Unfinished Business: None

10. New Business:

A. Tank Farm Completion – Discussion With City Attorney Regarding Legal Matters.

Public Comment: None

Motion:	Council Member Lassiter moved the Council go into
	executive session for Tank Farm completion,
	discussion with City Attorney regarding legal matters.
Seconded by:	Council Member Taylor

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: Lesh

Motion Passes 5/1

(Clerk's Note: The Council entered into executive session with the City

Attorney and City Clerk present.)

Motion: Council Member Sunday moved to adjourn from

executive session and convene back into the meeting.

Seconded by: Vice Mayor Cacioppo

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 6/0

Motion: Council Member Lassiter moved the City's Attorney

is authorized to communicate the City's legal concerns

to the Gustavus Drav.

Seconded by: Council Member Taylor

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION:

Yes: Cacioppo, Lassiter, Lesh, Mackovjak, Sunday, Taylor

No: None

Motion Passes 6/0

11. Staff Reports: None

12. City Council Reports

A. Mayor's Report

 Discussed the request by AEA for a grant amendment.

B. City Clerk's Report: None

13. City Council Questions & Comments: None

14. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items: None

15. Executive Session:

(Clerk's Note: Executive Session occurred for New Business Item 10A.

16. Adjournment:

With no further business before the Council the meeting was adjourned at 9:07PM.

Staff Request for Agenda Item City of Gustavus

Staff Name: Paul Berry

Explanation of Request:

Last month the DRC advertised for a new DRC Assistant Operator. Daniel Glasmann applied for the position and was interviewed by myself and a member of the DRC Committee. The DRC Committee and myself are recommending that he be hired for the position.

Request for council work session attention: Month July, 2011

1st Thursday work session X or X or X or X Thursday work session_____

General Meeting Date: July 14th, 2011

Action Staff would like the City Council to take:

Placement on the Consent Agenda: To hire Daniel Glasmann as DRC Assistant Operator at \$15.00 per hour.

Supporting Documents attached: N/A YES NO

If supporting documents are not attached, supply date documents will be supplied. (Deadline is Monday before General Meetings)

Contact Person: Paul Berry DRC Manager/ Operator 697-2188/697-2118 dumpmaster@gustavus-ak.gov

Staff Request for Agenda Item City of Gustavus

Staff Name: Paul Berry

Explanation of Request:

I will be attending training in Nashville, Tennessee next month (specifically, recertification training for my SWANA Manager Of Landfill Operations recertification) and the \$\$ amount for class registration is \$165.00 greater than originally budgeted in the DRC's FY12 budget. This NCO moves \$165 from the Travel expense category to the Training expense category.

Request for council work session attention: Month July, 2011

1st Thursday work session X or 3rd Thursday work session____

General Meeting Date: July 14th, 2011

Action Staff would like the City Council to take:

Placement on the Consent Agenda: Ordinance for Publication: FY12-XX NCO DRC Budget Amendment (NCO needs a number)

Supporting Documents attached: X YES NO

If supporting documents are not attached, supply date documents will be supplied. (Deadline is Monday before General Meetings)

Contact Person: Paul Berry DRC Manager/ Operator 697-2188/697-2118 dumpmaster@gustavus-ak.gov

City of Gustavus, Alaska Ordinance No. FY12-01NCO

AN ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY OF GUSTAVUS PROVIDING FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE DISPOSAL & RECYCLING CENTER (DRC) BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GUSTAVUS CITY COUNCIL AS FOLLOWS:

- Section 1. Classification. This is a Non-Code Ordinance
- **Section 2.** For the Fiscal Year of 2012 estimated expenditures have changed from the estimates in the approved budget.
- **Section 3.** For the current fiscal year the budget is amended to reflect the changed estimates as follows:

Budget Category	Amo		
	Original Budget	Amended Budget	Change
EXPENSE			
Training Travel	\$ 950.00 \$2,500.00	\$ 1,115.00 \$ 2,335.00	+\$ 165.00 - \$ 165.00

Section 4. The budget is hereby amended as indicated and any portion of the approved budget inconsistent with this amendment is repealed.

Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance becomes effective upon its adoption by the Gustavus City Council.

DATE INTRODUCED: July 14, 2011

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: August 11, 2011

PASSED and APPROVED by the Gustavus City Council this _____ day of ______,

2011.

Jim Mackovjak
Mayor

Attest: Kapryce Manchester, CMC

City Clerk

CITY OF GUSTAVUS, ALASKA RESOLUTION NO. 2011-17

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF GUSTAVUS IN SUPPORT OF THE GUSTAVUS VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT'S FORCE ACCOUNT WORK ON THE FIRE HALL UPGRADES WITH CIP FUNDS

WHEREAS, City of Gustavus Ordinance 4.16.020 (a) Competitive Bidding requires all purchases over 5K to be put out to written bid and the lowest responsible bidder awarded the contract and approved by the Council before purchase and

WHEREAS, the Gustavus Volunteer Fire Department (GVFD) seeks to upgrade its Fire Hall using these procedures for the procurement of materials and subcontracts and while employing City-hired carpenters and

WHEREAS, the GVFD Fire Chief will be overseeing any and all employees and subcontractors on the CIP work and be responsible for the execution thereof and

WHEREAS, the Fire Chief will submit to the Mayor the lowest responsible quote on all items for his approval before purchase, but will not bring each individual item before the Council for approval in order to expedite the process and complete the CIP work this summer and

WHEREAS, the Fire Chief will follow all City published purchasing Ordinance and guidelines in this process and

WHEREAS, the Fire Chief intends to use the whole CIP amount of 101,000.00 this summer renovating the building, septic system and fire alarm system and can only accomplish this thru force account and the competitive bid process on all materials and services and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Gustavus City Council supports the request by the GVFD to bypass the Council approval process on each individual item purchased and

- 1) The competitive bid process will be followed for each purchase over 5K.
- 2. The Mayor shall approve each purchase after being shown the list of prices received.

\$101,000.00 as shown in his budget.

4. Local vendors will be used wherever possible and a 5% bidders preference will be given to local vendors for materials and services.

PASSED and APPROVED by the Gustavus City Council this _______day of April, 2011.

Jim Mackovjak, Mayor Louis Cacioppo, Vice Mayor

Melanie Lesh, Council Member Tim Sunday, Council Member

John Nixon, Council Member Joe Lassiter, Council Member

Karen Colligan-Taylor, Council Member Attest: Kapryce Manchester, CMC City Clerk

3. The Fire Chief shall not spend more then the allowed amount in the CIP of

City of Gustavus, Alaska

CITY OF GUSTAVUS PROJECT SCOPING and DEVELOPMENT FORM

DISPOSAL & RECYCLING CENTER Facility Improvements

This form is to be used for project planning documentation and approval to assure that project options are well-considered, the best option is put forward, initial and continuing costs and funding are addressed and that Council approval has been given for implementation. This project scoping form is intended to be used in conjunction with the flow chart for Project Planning and Approval Process.

Project scope: what the project is supposed to accomplish (its goals and parameters; its social, environmental, and financial impacts) and the budget (of time and money) that has been created to achieve these objectives.

Answer the questions that pertain to your proposed project. Attach additional narrative pages if necessary. Type in the electronic form using whatever space you feel is necessary.

Part 1. Project Identification

Name of project: Facility Improvements

Committee: Disposal & Recycling Center Committee/Staff Contact: Paul Berry

Email: dumpmaster@gustavus-ak.gov Phone: 907-697-2188

Part 2. Project Planning and Description

1. What is the project?

The project replaces the DRC's earlier office improvement project, for which CIP funds were not awarded, with a smaller building addition housing a heated scale house, bathroom. There will also be increased room for recycling bins. A heated eyewash station will be provided in the tipping floor. Customer and employee safety and efficiency will be enhanced with a drive-through offloading area and new exit to Boat Harbor Road.

2. Why is the project needed? What community problem, need, or opportunity will it address? What health, safety, environmental, compliance, infrastructure, or economic problems or opportunities does it address?

This project will benefit Gustavus public health and safety by improving efficiency and safety provisions at the DRC. Presently the DRC has no on-site office, and no sink, toilet or changing room for DRC employees and no heated area for the operator and for computer equipment use in cold weather. Sanitary deficiencies place the DRC out of compliance

with OSHA safety and health protection regulations and represent a serious inconvenience for DRC staff. For a toilet an employee either has to "use the bushes" or drive to a location where there is a toilet. While the DRC maintains a very small emergency eye-wash station the amount of water available is very limited and doesn't meet the minimum flow requirements. These conditions limit the pool of local people willing to work at the DRC.

Further, the current customer offloading area is congested and mixes customer traffic and activities with worksite activities, creating safety and efficiency problems.

3. Where did the idea for this project originate? (Public comments, Council direction, committee work?)

City staff - DRC Manager/Operator, and Committee discussions

4. Is this project part of a larger plan? (i.e. The Gustavus Community Strategic Plan, or committee annual work plan?

A project to provide for a larger office, bathroom, changing facility, and training room was a component of the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) submission to the State for FY09, 10 & 11, but funding was not awarded for that project. This project is being re-scoped to reduce the size of the office, while improving safety and providing for better customer and process flow at the facility.

5. What alternative approaches were considered? What were the pros and cons of each? Was there a business case written for each?

The DRC committee originally proposed a larger, separate office facility but CIP funding was not awarded. The committee had also intended to revamp customer and work flow through the facility as a separate later project. This re-scope combines the most essential improvements of the two larger projects in a more compact and less expensive improvement.

Heated building addition options

The committee has discussed various means of adding on a small, heated operator office/scale house with a small bathroom, to the existing structure.

- Addition on the west side: This would require extension of the existing roof on the west side to cover a narrow add-on space. A new concrete pad would be needed.
- Addition on half of the south side: This option would be a shed roof addition located on the west half of the existing concrete pad but would require a change to the sliding door on that end of the building to an overhead door.
- Addition on full half of the south side. This option would extend the existing structure by ten feet to cover the existing cement pad on the south side. A heated scale house with a small bathroom

would be built inside the west half of the extension. The sliding door would be replaced with a narrower roll-up door with additional room for recycling bins in the extended area.

<u>Customer offloading options</u>

- Retain existing arrangement without change.
- The customer offloading would be moved from the south side of the building to the west side with a one-way drive through path through the existing entry, with drop off on the west side of the building, and exit directly north to Boat Harbor Road. This option may require construction of a snow-shed roof entry on the west side of the building.
- 6. What solution was chosen as the best and why is it the best?

The Committee and DRC Manager believe the best means of including the essential needs of heated workstation space, toilet, sink and improved customer process flow would be to extend the existing building on the south end and build the insulated and heated space in the western half of the addition. Because the space is small, a portable electrically-heated eyewash station suitable for freezing weather will be purchased and installed in the tipping floor area. The insulated workstation space will be heated electrically only when needed during use in winter.

A revamped customer offloading with one-way flow by the west side of the building is the choice of the Committee and DRC Manager as it improves efficiency and separates customer traffic from worksite employee activities and skid-steer loader operations and eliminates backing and maneuvering by customers in the drop off area. 7. Project Impacts Checklist

7. Project Impacts Checklist	1	1	
Will this project affect:	No	Yes (+/-)	Maybe
Environmental quality?			
(+ = impact is beneficial; - = harmful)			
Climate change	X		
 Streams/groundwater quality 	X		
Air quality	X		
 Soils/land quality 	X		
 Fish/wildlife habitat, populations 	X		
 Plant Resources (timber, firewood, berries, etc) 		_	
 Invasive or pest species 	X		
 Natural beauty of landscape or neighborhoods 	X		
Noise or other environmental impacts	X		
Environmental sustainability		+	
Hazardous substances use	X		
Community waste stream		+	
Light pollution at night	X		
Recreational opportunities?			
Public land use and access	X		
Trails/waterways	X		
• Parks	X		
Public assembly/activities	X		
Education/training/knowledge & skill	X		
development?			
Public safety?		+	
Public health?		+	
Medical services?	X		
Emergency response?	X		
Economic performance & sustainability?			
 Employment of residents 	X		
 Short-term (i.e. construction) 		+	
 Long-term (operating and maintenance) 	X		
Cost of living reduction	X		
 Return on investment 	X		
 Visitor opportunities/impressions/stays/ 		+	
purchases			
 Competitive business environment 	X		
 Support for existing businesses 			X
New business opportunities			X
Economic sustainability			X
Attractiveness of City to new		+	
residents/businesses			
City government performance?			
 Infrastructure quality/effectiveness/reach 		+	
(more people)			

Existing services		+	
New services	X		
Cost of City services (+=reduction)		+	
Tax income to City	X		
Transportation?			
• Air	X		
Water	X		
Roads	X		
Communications?			
Internet	X		
• Phone	X		
TV/radio	X		
Other? (type in)			
OSHA compliance		+	
•			
•			

8. How does this project provide benefits or add value in multiple areas? (e.g. benefits both to the environment and business performance.)

Improves employee working conditions, reduces safety hazards for the public and employees, and improves the efficiency of the Disposal & Recycling Center facility as a whole. By correcting sanitary deficiencies and providing a heated warm-up space during winter, the DRC may find it easier to attract potential employees.

- 9. Are other projects related to or dependent on this project?
 - Is this project dependent on other activities or actions?
 - If yes, describe projects, action or activities specifying phases where appropriate.
 No
- 10. Will the project require additional infrastructure, activity, or staffing outside the immediate department or activity? (E.g. will the construction of a new facility require additional roads or road maintenance or more internal City staffing?)

This project requires the construction of a 260 square foot extension to the existing DRC building. The project will not require additional staffing but will a require a greater expenditure of operating funds to operate (heat) and maintain.

11. What regulatory permits will be required and how will they be obtained? Fire Marshall review of building plans – submitted as part of construction project by either the contractor or the Manager/ Operator

12. What are the estimated initial (e.g. construction) and continuing (operational) costs of the project?.

Construction rough programming cost estimate:

10' extension (260 ft²) (reusing south end wall materials)

(
 Metal roof & side panels 	\$1,000
 Framing materials 	\$2,000
 Labor DRC employees 	\$3,000
Rollup door	\$1,000
Miscellaneous	\$1,000
 Freight 	\$1,000
Interior scale house (130 ft ²)	
 Framing materials 	\$2,000
 Insulation 	\$300
 Doors, 	\$300
• Windows	\$400
 Composting toilet 	\$0 (on hand)
Bathroom sink plumbing	\$1,000
 Electrical wiring, bsebrd heater 	\$2,500
 Labor DRC employees 	\$3,000
• Freight	\$500
Miscellaneous	\$1,000
Side entry w/snow shed roof	\$2,500
Subtotal	\$22,500
Contingency	+\$ <u>3,000</u>
Total building programming est:	\$25,500
Consultant design 20%	<u>+\$5,000</u>
Total building addition w/ design	\$30,500

Site work, tree & berm removal, road \$10,000 Eyewash station, heated \$1,300 Total programming est: \$41,300

13. How will the project be funded, initially, and for its operating life?

Funding for construction is requested from State revenue sharing funds and City budget reserve funds. Road construction on site may be fundable by City Road Maintenance funds. Operational costs will become part of the regular operating budget of the DRC.

Part 3. Project Budget

Proposed Budget Line Items

Total	\$41,300	Indirect costs	\$0.00
		Total direct costs	\$1,900.00
Other (list)	\$0.00	Other (list)	\$0.00
Other (list)	\$0.00	Heating	\$1000.00
Other (list)	\$0.00	Repair & maintenance	\$100.00
above			
Contingencies Included	\$0	Insurance	\$0.00
Equipment (eyewash station)	\$1300	Utilities	\$500.00
Waste disposal	\$	Supplies	\$200.00
Construction (building addn)	\$25,500	Contractual	\$0.00
Site work	\$10,000	Equipment	\$0.00
inspection			
Design permitting and	\$5,000	Travel	\$0.00
easements		5	·
Land, structures, ROW,	\$0.00	Training	\$0.00
Project management	\$0.00	Benefits	\$0.00
Administrative	\$0.00	Personnel	\$0.00
Budget estimate		estilliate (allitual)	
Construction project Budget estimate	Cost	Operational budget estimate (annual)	Cost

Updated Latest Estimate* Budget Line Items Date:_____

Construction project Budget estimate	Cost	Operational budget estimate (annual)	Cost
Bauget estimate		commute (amidal)	
Administrative	\$	Personnel	\$
Project management	\$	Benefits	\$
Land, structures, ROW,	\$	Training	\$
easements			
Design permitting and	\$	Travel	\$
inspection			
Site work	\$	Equipment	\$
Demolition and construction	\$	Contractual	\$
Waste disposal	\$	Supplies	\$
Equipment	\$	Utilities	\$
Contingencies	\$	Insurance	\$
Other (list)	\$	Repair & maintenance	\$
Other (list)	\$	Other (list)	\$
Other (list)	\$	Other (list)	\$
		Total direct costs	
		Indirect costs	

* Use this form if there are significant budget changes during development of the project.

Part 4. Jobs and training

____1.5____retain/save

- 3. What training is necessary to prepare local residents for jobs on this project?

 None
- 4. How many local businesses will be affected by this project and how?

 Any business generating waste processed by the DRC will be benefited by this project through improved efficiency in unloading.

Part 5. Record of Project planning and development meetings

Event	Date	Agenda	Minutes	Outcome	Number
(Meeting of		Posted	or record	Rec to	of
committee,		(date)	Attached	Council,	attendees
Council report,			5	requested	
etc.			(yes/no)	action of	
				Council,	
				etc.	
DRC Committee	11/8/10	11/2/10	Yes	Rec to	4
				support	
DRC Committee	12/15/10	12/8/10	Yes	Review &	5
				edit	
DRC Committee	6/29/11	6/24/11	Yes	None	4
DRC Committee	7/6/11	6/29/11	no	Work	3
				session	

CITY OF GUSTAVUS, ALASKA ORDINANCE NO. FY12-02NCO

ADVISORY QUESTION NO. 1

Should the City of Gustavus pursue a VPSO position for our community to enhance public safety as well as to facilitate enforcement of City ordinances?

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GUSTAVUS CITY COUNCIL AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. CLASSIFICATION. This non-code ordinance is of a permanent nature.

SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this ordinance or any application to any person or circumstance is invalid, the remainder of this ordinance and application to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION 3. PURPOSE AND FINDINGS. The purpose of this advisory question is to solicit public opinion regarding the establishment of a VPSO position in our community to enhance public safety as well as to facilitate enforcement of City ordinances.

SECTION 4. ENACTMENT. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED by the Gustavus City Council that the following advisory ballot question be placed on the October 4th, 2011 General Election Ballot and shall read substantially as follows:

ADVISORY QUESTION NO. 1

Sh nce

Jim Mackovjak, Mayor	Attest: Kapryce Manchester CMC, City Clerk
PASSED and APPROVED by the Gu 2011.	stavus City Council this 12th day of August,
DATE INTRODUCED: July 8th, 2010 DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: Augus	
Section 5. EFFECTIVE DATE. This adoption by the Gustavus City Cour	s non-code ordinance becomes effective upon its ncil.
YES	NO NO

Gustavus Disposal & Recycling Center July 2011 Tri-annual Staff Report to the City Council Facility Statistics for the Fiscal Year (July 1st – June 30th) Four Year Comparison

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Waste intake ¹				
Pounds of recyclables	163,532	157,408	145,244	148,815
Pounds of non-recyclable trash	81,508	76,042	72,346	71,593
Total pounds waste delivered	245,040	233,450	217,590	220,408
Cu. yards C/ D waste & ash landfilled	29	32	54	58.5
Operating time				
Number of days open during reporting period	177	160	140	135
Number of customer transactions	3,450	3,230	3,303	3,318
Pounds per day average	1,384	1,459	1,554	1,633
The processing of recyclables ²				
Number of southbound recycle shipments	5	5	3	5
Recyclables baled for export to Seattle <u>in pounds</u>	45,607	45,710	46,288	40,348
<u>in bales</u>	63	55	53	47
Pounds of food waste composted	56,283	56,200	44,184	44,818
Pounds of glass bottles pulverized	36,770	37,100	37,840	41,420
Income & expense metrics ³				
Income	\$80,401.53	\$66,238.91 ⁴	\$66,367.94	See note 3
Expenses	\$80,401.53	\$66,238.91	\$66,367.94	See note 3
Cost per pound average	\$0.33	\$0.29	\$0.31	See note 3

Compiled by PNB July 12, 2011

¹ There is a slight variation in some of the data that was used in the FY08 & FY09 Annual reports (released as the November Staff Report) – I attribute this to differences in how the data was queried from the DRC's database and changes to the database's internal structure that were implemented this January.

² Baled weights do not include recyclables such as lead-acid batteries, TV's, fluorescent lamps etc. (several thousand pounds). The November reports are a better source of the total weight of all materials recycled.

³ Data is not yet available for FY11

⁴ Does not include \$14,920 encumbered for future spending

DRAFT Gustavus Disposal & Recycling Center Facility Improvements Site Diagram July 2011 Staff Report



Diagram illustrates existing balefill/ landfill as the pattern (this is the area inside the existing fence). The outer black line along Boat Harbor Road and State Dock Road is the facility boundary. Diagram also illustrates the proposed improvement to the driveway to allow for one-way drive-through offloading.