

Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan CAC Meeting No. 4 - Summary Notes – August 8, 2012

Participants:

Kara Warner, Ruth Spetter, Dan Vizzini, Mary Beth Coffey, Dave Gooley, Rich Martin, Bruce Brown

Staff in attendance:

Jim Brown, Linda Macpherson, David Allred, Dave Green, Michelle Burkhart, Tuong Nguyen, Mike Ciolli, Scott Gibson, Paul Suto, Guy Graham, Brant Williams, Steve Berhndt, Mike Faha

Public Attendance: Charles B. Ormsby (Skip) and Margaret H. Ormsby, Don McHarness, Molly Harberger/The Oregonian

1. Welcome and Meeting Objective Overview

Linda began the meeting at 4:05 with a review of the meeting objective and agenda. She noted that the overarching objective is to review the Vision and Guiding Principles (V&GP) subsequent to Oversight Committee (OC) meeting and to review the work of the 2008 enhancement plan followed by the regulatory framework.

2. Review OC input/comments

The OC Meeting Notes were distributed along with the revised V&GP. Linda discussed the process to utilize the V&GP as an initial direction noting that it can be a living document with changes made at a later date should the CAC believe this is needed given new information. She suggested accepting the input from OC and transitioning the guiding principles portion of the document to evaluation criteria through the addition of words such as 'minimizes' to provide a yardstick to measure the degree to which alternatives address the vision.

Dan Vizzini asked about the possibility of a shorter, more succinct list that will be utilized for evaluation criteria? Linda noted that staff will use the V&GP as a core document and pull evaluation criteria from that language evolving the guiding principles into criteria. This alone will shorten the document.

Linda received input that notes were overly technical with too much engineering jargon. Some acronyms were not defined. Staff will work to improve future presentations and meeting notes.

Dave Green/CH2M HILL reviewed overall process diagram to review the current status of where we are at in the facilities planning process.

3. Review Enhancement Plan

Dave Green reviewed the Enhancement Plan effort, process and findings/ recommendations. Presentation materials are attached.

Ruth Spetter asked if odors were identified during the odor survey of the plant. Dave indicated that some odors were associated with the plant, but largest observed odor source was a conveyance drop box on Foothills Drive.

The CAC inquired about phasing investments to keep pace with re-development. Dave responded that one of the enhancement plan findings/recommendations recognized that as development occurs, odor control improvements can be triggered to that development to provide increasing levels of mitigation.

Bruce Brown wondered if there might be correlation between odor and size/capacity of the facility. Dave responded that this depends more on what treatment processes are employed as well as size of collection system, topography, weather conditions, etc. Flow conservation could actually exacerbate odors due to lower flows/higher residence time in collection system.

Mike Faha/Greenworks discussed process, concepts and recommendations for visual mitigation. Many concepts were considered and identified, but formal recommendations were not made. Intent was to identify creative concepts/approaches that could be applied to the existing site facilities (or alternative site layouts).

Ruth Spetter asked whether the green walls shown would create a maintenance issue due the growing material on concrete. Mike Faha said the impact depends on the technology utilized. Regardless of technology, there is a significant maintenance and access impact.

Kara Warner asked for a description of the multi-use building concept? Mike described a shared facility (BES operations staff and community) where a space might be available for community use.

Ruth Spetter asked for some example facilities? Mike Faha – Marine Park Water Resources Education Center, BES lab and others. Dave noted this is a place where creative funding would be required as this could be concluded by some to be outside the core mission of BES though education objectives are related to the mission of water quality. The question to be discussed is whether this an element that the community might value? Should the site be programmed to accommodate such a facility?

Dan noted the significant change of grade between Tryon Creek corridor and Plant; sightlines from river (east) are uphill; sightlines exist from Tryon Creek to the north – plant is visible.

Dave presented the recommendations from the Enhancement Plan.

Dave Gooley commented that, in Portland, there are some pump stations that are disguised as homes. He asked whether such a treatment would be feasible here. Dave Green replied that it is possible and is done in some jurisdictions. Design standards from LO could drive how the facilities look. It is more difficult to provide that specific type of mitigation with an existing facility.

Mary Beth Coffey asked if it is possible to access the creek from the TCWTP property? Steve Behrntd responded that it is theoretically possible, but it is very steep, even from lowest point in the plant.

Bruce stated that plant visually looks like a plant and there is not a huge need to make it look like something it isn't. Dave indicated that this is important feedback as different approaches can be utilized to match the goals/interests of the community.

Dan expressed appreciation for the enhancement plan work especially since the work is fairly current, was a good attempt at engaging stakeholders (vetted with public). His only concern now is that we are adding new demands on the facility (growth, regulatory). Dave Green said the team will utilize this work to define levels of service that will serve as the basis for alternative evaluation (specific to baseline mitigation) – and then apply those concepts to the alternatives.

Dan Vizzini stated that some of the goals identified in the Enhancement Plant are not core to the mission of utilities. However, improvements in Facilities Plan could be leveraged to meet those goals. For example, trails could be incorporated, using parks monies, etc. to implement improvements. Dave Green agreed drawing attention to the key word - -'complementary' uses.

4. Review Regulatory Framework

Michelle Burkhart presented the regulatory framework considerations. Kara asked if DEQ was re-classifying the Tryon Creek plant as a Class 1 facility. Michelle said not as of yet though it is prudent to consider this possibility.

Bruce asked about whether reuse water fell under the Class 1 vs Class 2 reliability criteria. Michelle indicated that water quality requirements specific to reclaimed water are governed by different guidelines and are not addressed by reliability criteria.

Dan V asked if the plant has the ability to store peak flows? Tuong: yes, up to 4 hours of flow can be stored and then re-routed for full secondary treatment.

Dan asked about the Temperature Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) would impact the timing, enforcement at the plant. Michelle described the recent info from DEQ indicating that all permit renewals are on hold while DEQ negotiates with a third party to resolve a lawsuit about the temperature TMDL.

Dave Gooley and Dan Vizzini asked for clarification on Inflow and Infiltration (I\I issues) and blending of treated with partially treated effluent, as well as temperature.

Dan also asked about the tradeoffs between dilution and head loss thru the outfall. Michelle responded that the high level of dilution provides good mixing in the summer when river flows are low, but the high head loss creates hydraulic constraints in the winter when flows are high.

Kara asked which constituents are affected\aided by the diffuser in the river. Ammonia, metals, etc.

Dan commented that the toxics issues have come up in the last 3-4 legislative sessions and they will continue to come up. Kara and Dan commented that regulations on microconstituents may not be far off. Michelle indicated that this issue may need to be managed upstream of the treatment plant because the effectiveness of removal through the treatment plant is limited.

Bruce asked about the possibility and economics of reducing I\I rather than building more treatment capacity. Dave explained that this collection system is not a CSO system and reducing I\I is expensive and difficult with these systems, chasing pipe leaks all the way up to the house. Michelle indicated there are opportunities to look at those tradeoffs (I\I reduction vs treatment capacity) and the Facilities Plan work has time built into the process to look at those tradeoffs.

5. Discuss Evaluation Criteria

Linda queried the CAC to see if how the process will unfold/come together is becoming clearer.

The CAC indicated that the more substantive info (like that presented at CAC Meeting #4) had value in setting the stage for the alternatives.

Dan – interested in pieces to come (land use and flows and load) and he asked if there a terminal limit/carrying capacity (build out capacity) of the site? What is the relationship between that and land use? Anticipates that this will be a question at open houses and will need to be clearly answered. Dave Green explained that to a degree the facilities planning effort will do this, laying out how to transition the plant from today's demands/technologies to future demands/technologies.

6. Upcoming meetings

Three committee members indicated that they will not be able to attend the September meeting. David/Linda will confirm attendance and determine if meeting needs to be rescheduled.

Note: Based on this feedback the September 12th meeting at the Portland Building will be held on September 13th.

7. Opportunity for Public Comment

No public comment.