

## Kickoff Meeting - Tryon Creek WWTP Oversight Committee (OC) Summary Notes

ATTENDEES: Linda Macpherson/NWR  
Dean Marriott/Portland OC  
Dan Saltzman/Portland OC  
Jack Hoffman/Lake Oswego OC  
David Donaldson/Lake Oswego OC  
Steve Behrndt/Portland  
Dave Green/CH2M HILL

Guy Graham/Lake Oswego  
Matthew Grumm/Portland  
Jim Brown/BES  
Brant Williams/Lake Oswego  
Matt Brown/Williams/Dame & White  
Scott Gibson/BES

FROM: Michelle Burkhart

DATE: September 23, 2011

Meeting initiated at 1:05.

### Introduction

Subsequent to welcome and introductions, Linda reviewed meeting purpose and goals as well as anticipated outcomes for the process and agenda for the meeting. Linda noted that the agenda was framed to provide the attendees a better or background understanding of the context for the collaboration ahead as well as provide an opportunity for open-ended ideas and aspirations for the OC to think about. Next steps will determine how these ideas will be approached.

### Context Setting

Jim Brown reviewed the purpose and drivers for the Facility Plan project, as well as significant issues to be addressed/reconciled as part of the project. He reviewed the enhancement planning concepts and outlined the steps involved in the Facility Planning effort.

A key decision point for both agencies will be a determination of the most cost effective approach to manage I/I - either to make improvements within the collection system to eliminate/reduce I/I or to make improvements at the treatment facility to treat the flow. The Facility Plan will provide costs for treatment based on various degrees of I/I removal to facilitate that decision.

Matt Brown reviewed the steps and schedule of the Foothills District Framework Plan as well as some key details of the Plan. One of the key elements for the Framework Plan included a floodplain analysis to fill the area within the District to eliminate flooding concerns. Another key element is mitigation of the TCWTP to ensure it is a good and viable

District neighbor. There is interest in defining Eco-District opportunities related to reclaimed water use and/or energy.

It is understood that the plant is a conditional use based on the 2002 Zoning Ordinance; there was some question about whether the plant was at one time a permitted use. This zoning history will be confirmed and communicated to the group. Building within the District would occur in 2015 at the earliest.

Scott Gibson provided a summary of the current agreement between Lake Oswego and Portland as well as a brief history of the formal agreements since the inception of the partnership. The agreement does not have a mechanism to provide treatment capacity to address wet weather (I/I) flows. Currently, Lake Oswego flows represent approximately 2/3 of the flow to the plant. Capital cost split is 50/50 and has been implemented as such. The agreement term is 50 years, through 1/23/33. The agreement can be amended by the parties at any time.

## Discussion/Shared Vision ideas and concepts:

Dean Marriott

- Continue to provide cost effective wastewater treatment.
- Continue to be a good neighbor; the City of Portland's commitment to Lake Oswego is evidenced by the transfer of land to create Foothills Park and dedication of an easement for a trail as well as a commitment to the implementation of odor control in a fashion that facilitates success of Foothills District

Commissioner Saltzman

- Concerned that the City of Portland ratepayers aren't viewed as subsidizing improvements that only benefit LO.
- Desire to accommodate LO's vision in a way that respects Portland ratepayers.

Mayor Hoffman

- Cost effective treatment that benefits both LO and Portland ratepayers
- WWTP comply with federal regulations
- Interest in addressing rainwater at the source, rather than paying to treat it at the plant
- Sustainable facility consistent with vision of Foothills District
- Foothills District is viewed as a regional benefit – Portland and Lake Oswego have both made commitments to promote density and economic development within the UGB; linking the region's urban centers is a component of this commitment and to cooperative transportation planning
- Lake Oswego understands the issues related to costs – LO is in similar position with regards to rate impacts on LO's water plan (in Tigard)

- Would like more information on how other facilities addressed cost split associated with good neighbor attributes?

Alex McIntyre

- Develop a successful transit-oriented neighborhood that connects Lake Oswego and Portland together

Guy Graham

- Future stakeholders can say “they got it right”; model for other agencies – destination as a community asset; place of pride

Brant Williams

- Maximize opportunity associated with parallel planning efforts to provide best services such as water reuse, energy, etc.

Dean Marriott

- Maximize recovery of resource assets associated with the plant (reclaimed water, energy)

Discussion: Definition of cost split for improvements will be an item of discussion – both parties want to avoid their ratepayers feeling like their rates are funding improvements that benefit others. Framing the information about the project for both Portland and Lake Oswego ratepayers is important – the project must not be viewed as a benefit for Lake Oswego developers and the plant must not be viewed as a bad neighbor. There are synergistic goals that need to be brought forward.

Ownership model should be an item of discussion in addition to cost split; ownership might provide more perceived certainty/control on one’s own destiny for Lake Oswego as the property is in their City boundary. Regardless of ownership, the parties are committed to work together to achieve good neighbor mitigation in a manner that can facilitate timely implementation of the Foothills Plan.

It is recognized that the Enhancement Plan defined odor control as a function of “wastewater treatment” rather than good neighbor mitigation.

It is recognized that the schedule of improvements should be defined as a function of the planning effort – triggered to development activities.

Current BES CIP includes some of these improvements, but they are not funded within the next 5 years.

Property boundaries – can they be re-defined? Are the property exchanges acceptable? It was generally agreed that this would be evaluated as a part of Facility Planning.

Ratepayers distant from the plant will be concerned about paying for projects that benefit immediate WWTP neighbors whether they are residents of Lake Oswego or Portland. Election politics can be particularly problematic unless there is agreement between parties that mitigates polarizing responses that so frequently occurs during the election season.

Urban Renewal opportunities of Foothills investments, etc. offer opportunity for payment for plant improvements outside of rates for both municipalities. Funding availability will be a challenge due to timing of Foothills development and plant enhancements.

Need future discussion on:

1. Cost sharing
2. Timing of improvements
3. I/I impacts and facilities plan
4. Strawman Goals and Guiding Principles – to communicate the intent of the two cities to other stakeholders and as a part of departure for discussion

## Next Steps

---

Linda Macpherson noted the discussion was helpful to understand the background and the political and development dynamics at play. There is actually little conflict between the parties – everyone wants to do what is best for the region and the ratepayers. The process ahead must be about the possible approaches that will build a level of stakeholder agreement.

Linda suggested that the OC meetings need to occur more frequently at the beginning of the process to set it up for success. Everyone wanted to participate should their schedules allow but a next meeting will be set up to include at least Dean Marriott and Alex McIntyre, with appropriate staff support. This meeting will be set up by Jim Brown/BES.