



**CITIZENS' RATE REVIEW COMMITTEE  
ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARING / TOWN HALL AGENDA  
THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2016  
6:30 P.M. MEETING  
PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING TRAINING ROOM (401 EAST THIRD STREET)**

**Mission Statement**

*The City of Newberg serves its citizens, promotes safety, and maintains a healthy community.*

**Vision Statement**

*Newberg will cultivate a healthy, safe environment where citizens can work, play and grow in a friendly, dynamic and diverse community valuing partnerships and opportunity.*

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. Approve minutes from the March 24, 2016 meeting.

**IV. INTRODUCTIONS**

**V. PRESENTATION BY STAFF & CONSULTANT**

**VI. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARING**

1. Open Public Comments  
(30 minutes maximum, which may be extended at the Chair's discretion, with an opportunity to speak for no more than 5 minutes per speaker allowed)
2. Close Public Comments

**VII. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND FINAL RECOMMENDATION**

1. Committee discussion of Wastewater rates with motion for recommendation of rates to City Council

**VIII. FINAL STEPS IN PROCESS**

1. City Council Public Hearing : Monday, May 2, 2016

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

*ACCOMMODATION OF PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENTS: In order to accommodate persons with physical impairments, please notify the City Recorder's office of any special physical or language accommodations you may need as far in advance of the meeting as possible and no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please contact the City Recorder at (503) 537-1283. For TTY services please call (503) 554-7793.*

**The Committee accepts comments on agenda items during the meeting. Fill out a form identifying the item you wish to speak on prior to the agenda item beginning and turn it into the Secretary. The Chair reserves the right to change the order of the items on this agenda.**



Ms. Galardi presented the capital improvement costs and funding with the I & I projects included, revenue increases, and the rates and bills. The Council's charge was to add back in the I & I projects and she explained what those projects would be. These projects were also eligible for SDC funding and did not all have to be funded by the rates. There were also existing reserves that could be used. She developed the lowest rate increase that would fund the projects and came up with 4.2%. The 4.2% per year increase would fund the I & I projects and would potentially draw down reserves in the short term but with the higher than projected current revenue for the current year it could end up as good or better than what was projected. For an average residential wastewater customer bill, the increase would be 4.2% or \$2.65 in the first year and \$2.74 in the second year. For commercial and industrial customers it would increase 3% to 5% based on their class and amount of usage. It was an overall 4.2% system-wide revenue increase.

Mr. Morace thought the proposed rates that went to Council were too high already and he would like to keep them where they were.

Ms. Bradford said this was only an increase of .2% and she was in support.

Ms. van Grunsven agreed with Mr. Morace to leave the rates as they were recommended to Council.

Mayor Andrews said the charge from the Council had been to reinstate the I & I projects to avoid kicking the can down the road as had been done in the past.

Chair Rogers said he was not qualified to say how one capital improvement project weighed against another. Staff had been hired to do that. He did not think it was in the Committee's purview to say do the I & I vs. Hess Creek or other projects. The Committee's deliberation weighed a lot of these considerations including kicking the can down the road. The Council felt strongly enough to go beyond the current recommendation and had staff do the work, but he would not feel right going forward with a proposal to increase the rates that came from a minority position on the Committee.

City Engineer Kaaren Hofmann said the one thing about the I & I projects was that they would help the City in the long term so the City would not have to do big trunk line projects. If the I & I projects were put off, the operations and maintenance costs would be more in the future.

Mayor Andrews asked what would happen if the Committee voted no on the increase, and the Council rejected it again. FD Zook said the Council met the Code by referring it back and could move forward with the rates they deemed were sufficient. If the recommendation from the Committee was different from the original recommendation, there would be a public hearing on April 7. If the recommendation stayed the same he would take it back to Council in April.

**MOTION: Morace/van Grunsven** moved to not raise the rates and keep them as originally recommended. Motion passed (3 Yes/ 1 No [Bradford]).

FD Zook said in Budget Law, a motion had to be passed by a majority of the committee, not a majority of a quorum. In this case that would mean four yes votes.

**MOTION: Morace/van Grunsven** moved to reconsider the previous motion vote. Motion carried (4 Yes/ 0 No).

**MOTION: Morace/van Grunsven** moved to keep the wastewater rates at 4% and not change what was originally proposed. Motion carried (4 Yes/ 0 No).

## V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

**VI. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

**VII. NEXT STEPS IN PROCESS**

FD Zook would research to see if a public hearing needed to be held since the recommendation was not changed.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 PM.

**Approved by the Citizen's Rate Review Committee on this 7th day of April, 2016.**

---

*Citizens' Rate Review Committee Recording Secretary*

---

*Citizens' Rate Review Committee Chair*