

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE Meeting No 3 Notes – July 11, 2012

Participants

CAC Attendance: Tom Badrick, Bruce Brown, Dave Gooley, Al Iverson, Rich Martin, Ruth Spetter, Dan Vizzini, Kara Warner

Public Attendance: Charles B. Ormsby (Skip) and Margaret H. Ormsby

Staff in attendance: Jim Brown, Linda Macpherson, David Allred, Dave Green, Michelle Burkhart, Tuong Ngyun, Mike Ciolli, Scott Gibson, Guy Graham, Brant Williams, Steve Berhndt

Linda Macpherson called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm

Charles B. Ormsby (Skip) signed up to make a public comment. Skip introduced himself as Chair of the Birdshill Citizens Planning Organization (CPO) and expressed concern that he has not been appointed to the CAC. He noted that he would be making an objection to City of Portland.

Linda reviewed the agenda and the activities from the last meeting

- Tour – 6 members were on the tour, 5 provided comments
Collected comments were summarized and included in the agenda packets. These comments can help with the process of determining the Goals and Guiding Principles and even some evaluation criteria as the project moves forward.

It was emphasized that the major objective of the meeting was to provide the CAC with the substance they need to suggest Goals and Guiding Principles for the Oversight Committee.

Jim Brown then provided overview of planning process and described integration of CAC into the process

- Vision and Guiding Principles provide a high level road map and vision that is utilized to underlie the basis for planning. VG&P from CBWTP were utilized as a basis for the draft, tweaked for Tryon Creek.
- Vision and Guiding Principles is not an exclusive work product of CAC. but input from CAC, BES and LO will be incorporated into the document.
- Levels of Service product build on the Vision and Guiding Principles and define measurable performance requirements to meet the Vision and Guiding principles.
- Alternative Evaluation Criteria was introduced as a weighted system that will be utilized to make decisions during the planning effort. CAC, BES and LO will have opportunities to provide input into the criteria
- Alternative Evaluation criteria will be initially developed by Project Team and then input solicited from BES, LO and CAC.
- Project Team will preliminarily score alternatives but there will be input from the CAC. Public input will be secured via an Open House.

- Schedule:

July – Vision and Guiding Principles – CAC and Oversight Committee

August – CAC provides input into development of Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Levels of Service

September – CAC reviews draft Alternative Evaluation Criteria

October – Oversight Committee review of Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Levels of Service

November – Project Team begins Brainstorming/Alternative Development

Flow chart suggests key points of input, but does not represent all CAC meetings

- Some discussion by the CAC about the need to 'weight' the alternatives evaluation criteria'. For now, all five elements of the Vision and Guiding Principles are assumed to have equal weight.
- Dan Vizzini suggested that the CAC meets Oct/Nov. for presentation on Flow and Load, Condition Assessment so they are ready to provide input in January on Alternative evaluation. Discussion ensued about how this would occur.

- Dave Green noted that at the selection of the 30-year preferred alternative, cost split between BES and City of Lake Oswego would not be defined. Intent is to promote concurrence about what is the best 30-year, long-term treatment and site alternative that meets the baseline criteria defined by the Vision and Guiding Principles.
- Dan suggested that CAC be involved in the discussions related to cost split/equity between the partners.
- It was noted that cost will be only one component of the evaluation – not just what’s is most cost effective, but what is right.

Linda facilitated discussion on Vision and Guiding Principles

- Ruth questioned what weight the individual V&GP carry? The answer was that there is currently equal weight between the five elements, however, CAC should anticipate a discussion in August about weighting, specific to Alternative Evaluation Criteria She also noted she didn’t see reference to obligations to comply with regulatory requirements? It was noted that this was included under Environmental Stewardship
- She further noted that the education bullet could be more Educational bullet could be bigger part of the project.
- Dan Vizinni commented that the Bulleted list is good. HE suggests revising vision statement to “ . . . producing clean water to promote healthy ecosystems . . . ” and add “providing critical infrastructure for community and economic development”
- Bruce Brown commented that key element in vision statement has to deal with how decisions today affect future generations. “Decisions on how this vision is accomplished will recognize the needs of future generations” Following this comment the detailed language of the vision statement was collectively revised by the CAC.
- Dan suggested the CAC hold off applying weighting of principles as long as possible because they might be seen as competitive attributes. Rather, he thought that all guiding principles should be met in an integrated fashion that optimizes the balance between the principles.
- Dave Gooley suggested keeping it simple and simply indicating that Vision and Guiding Principles will be applied rather than detailed description of how they would be applied.
- Al Iverson was concerned about where the access to the plant fit into the guiding principles? Dan suggests that fits into the implementation.
- Dan consider bulleted list under each element be included as an attachment and develop a statement specific to each.
- Dan also queried what qualities of the treatment plant are we after?
- Bruce: Suggests staff eliminate redundancy (combine similar elements) and translate some of the more specific items to a level of service (where they are a ‘how’).
- Dave Gooley emphasized: ‘Provide value to ratepayers’ is critically important as it allows ratepayers to see attention to cost efficiency – not just value.
- Dan: Comparability to well run peer facilities would rather it is compared to operational performance and protection of the asset. Price has to not be set to the minimum, but so that plant is resilient, and is set to operate at peak performance. Eliminate reference to peer facilities. Add a bullet on affordability.
- Dave Gooley raised caution about utilizing public funds outside BES’s core mission.
- Al: thought it would be wise to add a guiding principle to coordinate with Foothills development to provide buffer and access to the plant. Good Neighbor is a two-way street.

After additional discussion, it was decided that staff would compile comments and send revised draft by end of day Friday. CAC provide feedback by end of day Tuesday. CAC feedback will then be shared with Oversight Committee on July 19. The CAC is invited to the Oversight Committee meeting.

