

Summary Meeting Notes

Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 13, 2013
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Portland Building

CAC MEETING NO. 7

CAC in attendance: Bruce Brown, Mary Beth Coffey, Dave Gooley, Al Iverson, Rich Martin, Dan Vizzini, Kara Warner, Dave Gooley

Staff in attendance: Jim Brown, David Allred, Dave Green, Linda Macpherson, Steve Behrndt, Guy Graham, Tuong Nguyn, Mike Ciolli, Paul Suto, Scott Gibson, Amin Wahab, Michelle Burkhart

Public in attendance: Charles “Skip” Ormsby

1. Welcome and Overview of Meeting Objective

Linda began the meeting at 4:03 p.m. by reviewing the agenda. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to explain work the project team has been doing that will be of use in future meetings for the selection process. Even though the CAC has not met since October 11, 2012, the project team has explored whole plant option alternatives, based on the CAC’s guidance. Linda reviewed a schedule graphic that shows where we are at in the process.

2. Update on December Workshops and Alternatives Work to Date

Dave Green described the overall process whereby the project team developed process ideas and alternatives, which evolved from planning criteria, levels of service, and evaluation criteria. Dave emphasized that the workshop focused only on wastewater issues. Julian Sandino, a CH2M HILL Senior Technologist, was invited to share the types of technologies and solutions used by other utilities that have many of the same challenges. National and international knowledge and inputs are being brought to the project to ensure that the latest thinking is available to Tryon Creek facilities planning.

Dave handed out a summary matrix that captures the results of the planning criteria work, specific to each unit process.

Michelle Burkhart then described common themes and assumptions that apply to all concepts. She also noted the wastewater focus but noted that the team needed to show linkages. As the team looked at the evolution of technologies, it was emphasized that facilities planning is not “either/or” thinking but “both/and” thinking. The PowerPoint presentation illustrated how the options were prepared and the standard approaches for each alternative.

Dan Vizzini asked about the relationship between river level, back pressure on the outfall, and flow through the outfall. Michelle Burkhart discussed how those relate to capacity.

Bruce Brown asked about solids digestion and energy production considerations. Dave Green noted that the infrastructure is already in place at the Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant to produce energy from solids, so in that sense energy already is being produced from the solids – just not in Lake Oswego. It was noted that the partial digestion alternative gives an opportunity for onsite energy and gas utilization solutions. There was a brief discussion about barging solids, but people quickly noted that it would not be possible to get a barge into the Columbia Boulevard WWTP.

The CAC wanted to explore how process solutions related to the process units. Michelle Burkhart noted how some “what if” scenarios were used in the workshop process. What if we move the headworks to allow gravity flow and avoid pumping, thus minimizing energy consumption? She noted that for every piece of equipment onsite there are associated costs. If you reduce the number of process units, cost savings are possible. Eliminating primary treatment or solids processing on site were both examples.

Bruce Brown noted that cities have not done a holistic job of looking at the link between fresh water and wastewater. He asked if we could boldly explore reuse. Michelle responded that reuse is considered in all options when the time is right. She also noted that although a lot of technical work has gone into the four alternative site plans, much more refinement is needed.

Al Iverson asked about the feasibility of eliminating primary treatment. CH2M HILL staff responded that treatment plants in Albany, Oak Lodge, and elsewhere had implemented those changes with high-performing influent screening.

Dan Vizziini inquired about the risk of new technologies and the consequences of that risk. Jim Brown responded that one important level of service used was that all process units must have proven and predictable performance. In short, the Facilities Plan will not propose any new or unproven technologies.

Alternative 2 generated some discussion about the natural area adjacent to the plant. The regulated areas will be shown on the site plans for each alternative, in March. Jim Brown noted that BES is also considering a seismic retrofit of the existing interceptor in the natural area. Microtunneling is an option for replacing this interceptor, and that would be an advantage in the natural area.

Rich Martin asked if a new headworks at Tryon Creek would be similar in size to the new headworks at Oak Lodge. CH2M HILL staff indicated that the Tryon Creek headworks would be slightly larger but generally comparable to the facility at Oak Lodge.

There was also some discussion about micro-hydro possibilities.

One of the downsides of eliminating primary treatment is that you have less digester gas for energy. An advantage is that it cleans up the site visually and provides flexibility for a buffer between the plant and adjacent properties. Bruce noted that the energy is available from the warm effluent itself, and that heat could still be available for adjacent development.

In reviewing Alternative 3, Rich Martin asked if, given the age of the concrete, the primary clarifiers could be repurposed. Michelle responded in the affirmative.

Bruce wondered about new structures versus existing structures. He noted that if we think outside the box, covering the facilities would allow integrating some other uses, structures, or aesthetics. In the discussion that ensued, people commented that some opportunities (i.e., sports facilities such as tennis courts) would raise safety concerns with visitors coming into the space of an operating facility. For example, it would be possible to co-locate facilities and structures such as parking lots. Moving the headworks as shown in Alternative 2 would allow some facilities to be co-located, such as a different option for the administration building and potential public functions.

Michelle also mentioned that there is nothing to preclude small footprint technology solutions.

The next step will be to explore landscaping options and interacting with Foothills development. Kara Warner asked if there are names for the alternatives. These issues will be discussed more thoroughly at the March CAC meeting. Cost information will be provided at the April meeting.

Dave Green described next steps for the project team – i.e., the technical work that is being completed.

3. Review the Project Schedule

Linda described the upcoming work for the CAC:

- CAC meeting #8 (March 13th): Present site plan information associated with the four alternatives and how they relate to public concerns
- CAC meeting #9 (early April): Present cost information associated with each alternative and prepare for the open house
- Open house in mid-April
- CAC meeting #10 (late April): Take information from the open house and begin to evaluate and rank alternatives

Dan suggested the West End building as a good location for the open house.

4. Update on Oversight Committee

Staff will brief the Oversight Committee in mid-March. At that time the Oversight Committee will be made up of Dean Marriot and Steve Behrndt because bureau assignments will not be made until May. Guy Graham noted that new City Council Member Skip O’Neill and new interim City Manager Tom

Coffee will be briefed on the project. They will be provided with the information developed for the CAC. Guy received packets of information to take to them.

Dan indicated that the new Lake Oswego City Council has rescinded the Tax Increment Financing for the Foothills Plan, but the zoning changes that were enacted have not been changed. Input is needed from Lake Oswego Oversight Committee members on direction related to Foothills. The CAC needs to understand the impact of that decision on our planning process.

Dan also suggested that Lake Oswego staff provide a heads up to the community through its newsletter , and Linda commented that it would be good for that update to refer to the website where all project materials are included. Dan asked for some additional materials.

5. Opportunity for Public Comment

Charles "Skip" Ormsby signed up to provide comments but declined the opportunity at the end of the meeting.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 pm.