

**MINUTES  
CITY OF GIG HARBOR  
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, April 13, 2021  
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Due to public health concerns, this meeting was held remotely.

**CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

Public Works Committee Chair Jim Franich called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Public Works Committee Members Present (remotely): Jeni Woock, Bob Himes, and Jim Franich

Staff Present (remotely): City Administrator Bob Larson, Public Works Director Jeff Langhelt, City Engineer Trent Ward, and Executive Assistant Maureen Whitaker (scribe)

Emily Minor from the City Attorney's office was present (remotely) for discussion of Agenda Item #2

Murphy's Landing Marina Representative Raelene Rogers was present (remotely) for discussion of Agenda Item #1

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** March 9, 2021

**MOTION:** Move to approve the March 9, 2021 Public Works Committee Minutes.

Himes / Woock – Motion passed unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS:** none.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. Murphy's Landing Marina Navigation Channel Dredge Draft Agreement**  
Public Works Director Jeff Langhelt presented the draft Agreement and provided the supporting background. Mr. Langhelt explained that the build-up of sediment that naturally flows from both Donkey Creek and the unnamed creek was likely impacted after the City installed the marine outfall pipe in the sea bed adjacent to the outfalls for the two creeks and Murphy's Landing Marina.

Mr. Langhelt further explained that the City and Murphy's Landing Marina have verbally agreed to work collaboratively to rectify this issue through the design, permitting, and construction of a dredging operation. The Agreement provides for the City to perform the design work necessary to dredge the area and to submit

the dredging design for all necessary permitting to the appropriate state and federal agencies and will manage the submission until a permit approval is received. Costs associated with the design work and permit submittal are the responsibility of the City. The City will coordinate with the permitting agencies and Murphy's Landing to transfer the approved permit to Murphy's Landing. The Agreement further provides for Murphy's Landing to complete the permitted dredging work which includes the dredging outlined in the permit, disposal of the material if necessary, or anything else that might be necessary for the dredging project. All costs associated with the dredging project, with the exception of the design and permitting are the responsibility of Murphy's Landing. The Agreement further states the once the City received the required approvals on the permit submittal, the City no longer has any responsibility related to this dredging project or any ongoing sediment flow, accumulation, or dredging on the Murphy's Landing property and Murphy's Landing is solely responsible for the ongoing maintenance, dredging, and control of their property as it pertains to sediment accumulation and dredging and the City is not responsible for such ongoing impacts.

Mr. Langhelm discussed the timeline for the work to be completed as follows:

**Design:** City will complete the design by January 1, 2022.

**Permitting:** City will take reasonable efforts to apply for permits with the understanding that the timeline is out of the City's control. Mr. Langhelm noted that the fish window is February 15 thru July 15, where no dredging work can be performed.

**Dredging:** Murphy's Landing is obligated to do the work within the timeline issued by the permit. The Agreement states that Murphy's Landing's failure to timely commence the dredging project shall not impact or renew the City's responsibilities.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Public Works Committee had very little questions and recommended presenting the Agreement to Murphy's Landing requesting their review and signature. Once reviewed and signed by Murphy's Landing, the Agreement will be presented to City Council for approval.

## **2. Water Franchise Agreements**

Mr. Langhelm stated that it is common for water purveyors to have franchise agreements with the jurisdiction where they are located. He gave a brief summary of the implications of having water purveyors in city limits without a franchise agreement. Emily Minor from the City Attorney's office was present to provide guidance and answer any questions from the Public Works Committee. Both Mr. Langhelm and Ms. Minor outlined the benefits of having a franchise agreement which provides the City and its citizens full protection against damages caused by a water main break, provides a guarantee from the water purveyor to relocate their infrastructure as needed as well as meet the requirements and operating procedures outlined in the Public Works Standards.

Mr. Langhelm said that if there was a water main break there is currently no insurance or anything in place that requires a water purveyor to fix their pipe and the damage that it could cause to the roadway and adjacent property owners, which could potentially become a large question of who is responsible.

Mr. Langhelm stated that he would like to make this presentation today to the Public Works Committee and then reach out to the water purveyors in city limits to start negotiating franchise agreements and then present to City Council for approval. There was a question about how much staff time would be involved. Mr. Langhelm stated that it is mostly City Attorney time. Ms. Minor said that there are lots of examples of franchise agreements out there, so she would not be drafting something new. The one sticking point could be cost recovery. The City could ask for City Attorney costs to be reimbursed. The City does levy a 5% utility tax which is already collected and there could also be a franchise fee. Ms. Minor further stated that there are already a few variants out there.

Councilmember Franich stated that he didn't want to make this overburdensome and turn this into a money-making situation for the City. Councilmember Himes said that we have talked a lot of the advantages to the City but why aren't the water purveyors coming to the City for a franchise agreement. Mr. Langhelm stated that the Public Works Department has received multiple requests within the last two years from water purveyors asking to receive a franchise agreement with the City to operate in the City's right-of-way. Mr. Langhelm further explained that the water purveyors already have a duty to serve their customers and said that Washington Water wants a set of rules to operate by and some certainty of what is expected of them.

Councilmember Woock stated that she was surprised that the City hasn't had franchise agreements with water purveyors before. Mr. Langhelm stated that staff tried to bring this forward 8-10 years ago, but it wasn't supported. Ms. Minor stated that a franchise agreement protects both parties.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Councilmember Franich recommended notifying all water purveyors in city limits that the City is going to do this.

### **3. Pavement Rating System Review**

City Engineer Trent Ward stated that it has been the City's priority to budget for and perform pavement repair and maintenance on an annual basis, and as a result, the City is known for having some of the best roadway pavement conditions in the region. Mr. Ward explained how the roadway pavement condition is collected using the WSDOT StreetWise II – Flexible Pavement Rating System program. He further explained how the data is summarized in a spreadsheet format that is then used to rank all the City roadways by PCI number which is the primary general indicator for when a roadway should receive maintenance and/or repair. He said that often times there are certain other factors included in the decision-making as to when repair and/or maintenance of the roadway is necessary. Mr. Ward added that as a point of reference, a PCI less than 65 is a fundamental criterion that the State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) and other grant agencies that fund pavement preservation use as

the value at which a roadway segment should begin being considered for pavement preservation work such a chip seal or HMA overlay.

Councilmember Himes stated that he analyzed the rough data. He said that 21 are in the 45-65 PCI range, 3 are in the 25-45 PCI range, and 3 are in the 25 or less range. He added that the streets below 45 are short streets or dead-end streets. He asked if the length or rating of the road are accounted for in the data. Mr. Ward stated that the use of the road, whether it is an arterial or collector or a short neighborhood street, and the amount of vehicle trips are accounted for in the algorithm. He further stated that the other significant factor is when City staff physically walks the roads. The Rating System is updated every two years and the same person has been walking and evaluating the roads for several consecutive years.

Councilmember Woock asked what the goal is today. Mr. Langhelm stated that it was a request from Councilmember Franich to place this on the agenda. Councilmember Woock stated that in her opinion, Briarwood is in dire need of road work and asked if the City considers if the roadway is a court or a neighborhood street and how is it decided? Mr. Ward stated that the PCI Rating Matrix is an entry point and a lot of factors are considered besides the PCI Rating Matrix. The City looks at failure modes and if they are getting worse. Other considerations are what are the traffic volumes and what are the overall funding sources? Arterials and collectors are eligible for grant funding, local streets are not. He said that the bottom line and most important is a roadway's degradation and what are the funding sources. Councilmember Woock asked why Hall Street has such a low rating because to her, it looked in good condition. Mr. Ward stated that he would look at it.

Councilmember Himes asked if complaints or the smoothness of the roads get added to the Matrix and is there data to show this. Mr. Langhelm responded that any complaints are tracked in Cartegraph which are usually occasional reports of potholes or loose valve covers.

Councilmember Franich asked what criteria is used when deciding when a roadway needs maintenance. Mr. Ward stated that there are approximately 14-15 criterion such as distress types, alligator cracking, raveling, patches, sags, humps, pavement edge conditions, etc. He said that the algorithm evaluates how long the crack is verses the roadway length. Councilmember Franich stated that overall, he feels that the City has done a pretty good job over the years but added that the PCI for Dorotich seems incorrect and Ross Avenue is rated at 82 and should be a 40. He said that this was a good conversation to have and appreciated it being placed on the agenda. On a side note, Councilmember Franich inquired if anyone had seen the YouTube video that demonstrated a technique to fix potholes. The video showed the road being heated and little white worm-like material was added, heated up, and it smoothed the road out completely. No one present was aware of this technique. Councilmember Franich said that he will try to find this information again.

## **2021 CIP SCHEDULE REVIEW:**

## **Tier 1**

Mr. Langhelm stated that he highlighted in yellow the projects that have changed. He discussed the current staffing issues including the recent resignation of Engineering Technician Amy Londgren who has been Engineer's lead for Private Development. He expressed that private development has regulatory timelines and bringing a consultant on board who is unfamiliar with our processes is not ideal. The CIP Matrix has been updated but without accounting for Amy's departure.

Councilmember Woock stated that Pedestrian Crosswalk Improvements in Gig Harbor North needs to be moved from Tier 2 to Tier 1.

## **Tier 2**

It was suggested to move the Annual Pavement Maintenance from Tier 2 to Tier 1.

A lengthy discussion ensued about the Pedestrian Crosswalk Improvements in Gig Harbor North and achieving substantial completion in time for the start of the school year. Mr. Langhelm stated that the Schedule shows physical completion by September 30, 2021. Councilmember Himes asked what it would take to get to physical completion before school starts. Mr. Langhelm stated that the lights and the crosswalks would be done and wasn't sure what the benefit would be to get the project to physical completion by the start of the school year. Councilmember Himes expressed his concern about the possibility of malfunctioning lights on the RRFBs. Mr. Langhelm stated that he would add an Operational line to the Schedule for the first week in September and said that staff knows how important this is to City Council. Councilmember Himes stated that if something must give, to get back to us immediately, and added that this will be the biggest discussion in the Quarter 1 report.

Councilmember Woock asked about the possibility of installing a roundabout at Mountainview and Vernhardson. Mr. Langhelm stated that traffic calming measures need to be reviewed to determine what measure is most appropriate. He said that it is already in the City's TIP and on the Impact Fees list and would ultimately need to be added to the budget. He summarized that traffic calming options should be presented to the neighborhood with review by an ad hoc committee and/or the Public Works Committee then to City Council for final approval. Councilmember Franich stated that the impacts from development have created a freeway and there are no easy answers when trying to solve this problem. He added that there is a fine line for traffic calming measures with some being good and some bad.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETING:** May 11, 2021

## **ADJOURN**

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 5:00 p.m.

Woock / Himes – Motion passed unanimously.