

Tryon Creek WWTP Oversight Committee 7/19/12 Meeting Notes

ATTENDEES: Linda Macpherson/NWR
Dean Marriott/Portland
Dan Saltzman/Portland
Jack Hoffman/Lake Oswego
David Donaldson/Lake Oswego
Steve Behrndt/Portland
Dave Green/CH2M HILL
Guy Graham/Lake Oswego
Amy Trieu, Commissioner
Saltzman's Office/Portland
Jim Brown/BES
Paul Suto/BES
Brant Williams/Lake Oswego
Scott Gibson/BES
Michelle Burkhart/CH2M HILL
Skip Ormsby/Birdshill CPO
Margaret Ormsby

FROM: Michelle Burkhart/CH2M HILL

DATE: July 23, 2012

Linda Macpherson/NWR called the meeting to order at 10:07 am.

Linda described the purpose of meeting as bringing the Oversight Committee (OC) up to date on project activities and finalize the Vision and Guiding Principles (V & GP) so that the team can move forward with the Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (TCWTP) Facilities Plan. The Vision and Guiding Principles document is an important basis for the planning process.

David Allred/BES described the materials in the Oversight Committee packet.

Jim Brown/BES provided an overview of the project status, including a description of work products, project scope and schedule.

Linda described the CAC process and gave a debrief of the meetings. All CAC materials are posted on BES website to promote transparency to the community. Five members appointed by LO, five by BES.

- First meeting introduced the project and covered basic documents
- Second meeting provided background/history of the facility and Foothills planning and also toured the facility. This provided an understanding of the condition and operation of the plant.
- Third meeting described the CAC interface with the planning process and solicited input on V&GP. CAC asked staff to draft revision based on comments/feedback at that meeting. Staff revised and fed back to CAC for comment. Still a bit of tweaking from CAC, but all agree that this is a good basis for technical work. CAC wanted input from OC to confirm team is on track with V&GP.

Dave Green provided an overview of information specific to the TCWTP that has been provided to the CAC. He also described some of the key planning considerations that drive the planning process.

- Q. Commissioner Saltzman asked for clarification about the 10/10 limit.
- A. This is a phrase to describe the a water quality standard that DEQ has put into place for the Willamette Basin, requiring a discharge of no more than 10 mg/L Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) and 10 mg/L Total Suspended Solids (TSS) during the dry season. DEQ has the ability to implement this as part of any permit renewal, specifically associated with any major plant upgrade or modification. This would be negotiated as part of a permit negotiation during a renewal process. The current permit limit at TCWTP for BOD/TSS is 20 mg/L for each constituent.
- Q. Dean Marriott/BES asked if treatment process would need to be modified if 10/10 limit were implemented.
- A. This 10/10 limit could potentially drive the construction of tertiary filters. The planning process will need to incorporate footprint and room in the hydraulic profile for filters.
- Q. Brant Williams/Lake Oswego asked about CBWTP and if it was subject to the 10/10 standard.
- A. The Columbia Boulevard plant discharges into the Columbia River, which is not subject to the Willamette Basin Standard, and has less stringent requirements. The Columbia discharge permit requires a 30/30 limit
- Q. Mayor Hoffman asked about where the plant discharges.
- A. It discharges into the Willamette River rather than Tryon Creek. Plant effluent is discharged through a diffuser, the first discharge point of which is about 400' from the bank.

Brant provided an update to the Foothills Planning process, including brief discussion of the Vision and Guiding Principles for that plan. Summary items from Brant's presentation provided emphasis on the following key points:

- When the streetcar was eliminated, it drove revisions to the Foothills Framework Plan.
- LO has now developed a draft revised framework plan and planned to bring to Council last week, but that has been rescheduled. Currently planned to be a few weeks out and certainly by the end of September.
- Next steps include addressing floodplain mitigation, zoning changes and design and development standards.
- Brant described original plan and then highlighted revised concept plan. The southern portion of the District has been pulled out for now. Overall development has been scaled down to reduce density. Northern portal location has been revised – moved from State/Terwilliger to State/between D and E avenues. Reduced density and development results in reduced infrastructure

costs. Elimination of streetcar opens up timing of District implementation, allowing for closer alignment with TCWTP improvements.

- Concept plan shows a minimal buffer between TCWTP and Foothills. Identifies potential property that Foothills could purchase over time, or could exchange for property.
- Commissioner Saltzman asked about the width of the buffer shown. Brant indicated that the plan was conceptual. Dave Green and Jim Brown indicated that what is shown on Foothills Plan looks to be in the range of 40-50'.
- Brant summarized the Framework Plan recommendations for TCWTP improvements and implementation of those improvements.
- Once Framework Plan is adopted, approval of draft standards is a 3-4 month process.
- Commissioner Saltzman asked what improvements would be associated with odor control – Staff indicated that the base alternative will assume enclosing headworks and primary clarifiers. FP alternatives analysis would consider alternate options for implementation that aligned with long-term treatment solutions.
- Paul Suto clarified that the Facilities Planning process will have the alternatives evaluation work complete by the end of 2013, including a decision to cover the existing headworks facility or build a new facility. Design and construction of an enclosure around the existing headworks would take about 3-5 years. Construction of a new headworks facility would require even more time.
- Brant pointed out that dates in his 'Next Steps' slides need to be revised, but represent reasonable durations once Council approves the Revised Framework Plan. However, with Streetcar not driving the process, implementation could be slower.
- Dave Green pointed out that consideration of additional property outside the current property boundaries for treatment units is an important part of planning criteria.

Jim Brown provided an overview of the Facilities Planning Process. Jim noted that the:

- Bulk of technical work begins at the end of the presented flow chart.
- Enhancement Plan was specific to existing facility. Concepts will need to be applied to conform to a revised/future plant configurations
- Levels of service describe specific performance measures that the plant will need to meet.
- Alternatives evaluation criteria will include social, environmental and financial criteria.
- Levels of service and alternatives evaluation criteria will be developed with input from CAC and be presented to Oversight committee for endorsement.

- Once levels of service and evaluation criteria are defined, the Project Team (BES and CH2M HILL) will develop alternatives that meet 30-year planning criteria. Baseline alternative will maximize use of existing facilities. All alternatives will reuse some of the facilities (secondary process is a good example of a process unit that is in good condition and has quite a bit of remaining useful life).
- All alternatives would allocate footprint for any units necessary to meet established regulatory levels of service. Space for tertiary facilities is an example. Implementation of those facilities would be a function of BES negotiations with DEQ, but however, space would be identified and allocated for implementation of that process unit.

Linda provided an overview of the Vision and Guiding Principles (V&GP) and indicated that Project Team and CAC are looking for general endorsement from OC and input as desired.

- Linda read the Vision statement and indicated that the statement was developed by BES with input from the CAC, using the CBWTP V & GP as a starting point. Linda described how the Guiding Principles amplify the vision statement and clarifying bullets further provide additional dimension to each guiding principle.
- This document will be utilized as a guide for improvements to and operation of the facility moving forward, beyond the planning process.
- Jim clarified that evaluation criteria and levels of service will be derived from V&GP.
- Linda indicated that comments from one of the CAC members were received late yesterday and will be incorporated based on additional CAC discussion.
- Commissioner Saltzman responded that the document looks fine overall, but doesn't address 'river users'. Linda indicated that CAC brought up this group and there was some discussion that they might be covered through general language. Project team will take that comment back to CAC. Dean commented that the term "neighbors" infer people adjacent to the plant. [David Allred note: river users can see the plant or be affected by the plant and therefore have a stake in the project.]
- Mayor Hoffman believed it is generally fine and thought the Oversight Committee did not need to wordsmith the document.
- David Donaldson indicated he feels the product seems appropriate.
- Linda stated that CAC would finalize based on final CAC member comments. The Project Team will bring Alternative Evaluation Criteria and Levels of Service back to the Oversight Committee in October.
- David Donaldson asked if any Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) discharge to the treatment facility. The Project Team did not have that information immediately available and will provide an answer via email. BES administers the industrial pretreatment program for LO.

- Mayor Hoffman commented on the CAC notes from the August meeting that he understands that the principles are not prioritized and need to work holistically together.
- Linda indicated that if the Oversight Committee wanted to provide feedback/guidance on whether any of these guiding principles should have higher weight that would be valuable to the team.
- Mayor Hoffman asked if the CAC had discussed mechanisms to bring the community along with the process. He is nervous about cost, especially specific to improvements to reduce I/I. Linda indicated that there has not been a CAC discussion specific to bringing public along, however it is planned and has been described to the CAC that open houses will be CAC open houses. Otherwise, robust information is available on the BES website, links on the Lake Oswego website and via articles in Hello LO. The first formal open house is anticipated to be in February 2013, to present the alternatives resulting from the whole-plant alternative analysis. Printed information is available if either Lake Oswego or BES would like to distribute in other fashions (neighborhood meetings, public displays, etc.). The actual facility planning contract does not have resources for additional neighborhood meetings. CAC meetings now include a public comment period and guests from the general public have attended 2 of the 3 meetings. Public notice is being provided and there are articles being written for Hello LO about the project.
- Brant indicated that cost should perhaps be considered to be part of 'Value to Ratepayers' criteria rather than a separate item. Linda believes this will be a point of further discussion with the CAC. Dave Green clarified that costs (capital and life cycle) will be provided for each alternative and the Project Team, CAC and Oversight Committee can utilize that information as a basis for decision making, based on perceived value provided by each alternative. Dean suggested that will lead to a discussion about 'who enjoys the value and who pays for the cost'. Linda suggested a separation between value to ratepayer and value to developers could be a point of discussion.
- Mayor Hoffman asked how decisions would be framed and made about spending on I/I reduction vs. treating those flows at the plant. Jim Brown indicated that there could be a preferred alternative for each I/I removal scenario. The preferred solution could be different for each city.
- Mayor Hoffman asked how environmental stewardship would factor into that - Jim Brown thought plant footprint, energy use represented examples of how environmental stewardship might be weighed specific to that decision. Paul Suto indicated the right solution could be a middle ground balancing I/I reduction and plant improvements.
- Mayor Hoffman asked where in the process Dean's question about who pays for value would be addressed. Jim Brown and Dave Green indicated that the goal

would be to identify a solution that meets the established minimum levels of service for the 30-year plan regardless of who pays for what. The Project Team (informed by the CAC and Oversight Committee) will need to determine what is required for any wastewater facility in a neighborhood. The team will then develop technical solutions, footprint, good neighbor solutions, etc to meet those levels of service. As the planning effort moves into implementation of the improvements and capital planning, that information begins to provide a basis for the discussion. Financial planning for each agency is not included in planning process, but would be developed by each City internally based on recommended plan.

- Mayor Hoffman asked if the CAC had any discussion about the language in the VG&P “reliably meeting permit requirements” specific to exceeding rather than meeting requirements. Linda indicated that the CAC discussed this extensively. Steve Behrndt indicated that in order to reliably meet permit requirements, the plant is effectively required to exceed them most of the time. He gave performance of CBWTP as an example – typically facility operates well below their permit limits, which effectively become the worst case operating scenario.
- Mayor Hoffman asked if there was any discussion amongst the CAC about creating a model for the industry rather than just adequate facilities? Linda indicated that there has not been a discussion along these lines. Dave Green described the goal of planning as developing alternatives that equally meet the established levels of service to allow for fair comparison; this does not preclude enhancements above min. levels of service down the road. Steve Behrndt indicated that the Enhancement Plan explored a range of solutions from state-of-the-art to more cost effective solutions that could be considered as part of this planning process.

Linda thanked the Oversight Committee for their input and guidance and asked for public comment. There was no public comment. The meeting was adjourned 11:42 am.

Meeting presentation materials are attached.