

Summary Meeting Notes

Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan **CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

March 13, 2013

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Lake Oswego Pointe Condominiums, Riverside Room

CAC MEETING NO. 8

CAC in attendance: Mary Beth Coffey, Dave Gooley, Al Iverson, Rich Martin, Dan Vizzini, Kara Warner, Ruth Spetter, Tom Badrick

Staff in attendance: Jim Brown, David Allred, Steve Behrndt, Guy Graham, Tuong Nguyn, Brant Williams, Paul Suto

Consulting team in attendance: Dave Green/CH2M HILL, Linda Macpherson/New Water ReSources, Mike Faha/Greenworks, Michelle Burkhart/CH2M HILL, Tim Strand/Greenworks

Public officials in attendance: Skip O’Neill/Lake Oswego City Councilor

Welcome and Overview of Meeting Objective

Linda began the meeting at 4:05 pm. Linda reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives. The team has recognized that the alternatives include some “mix and match” components on which the CAC will be able to provide valued input.

Review of Process to Date and the Four Treatment Alternatives

Dave Green provided an overview of the process, with a specific emphasis on the technical work since December. Dave referred to four alternative solution sets that Michelle Burkhart described at the February meeting. Based on brainstorming, senior advisors’ input, unit process ideas from Lake Oswego, and BES input and initial screening work, the team identified four whole plant alternatives that framed up some initial decision points. The team continues to work on refining alternatives based on technical development and cost evaluation. These four alternatives all met the tactical levels of services and conformed in varying degrees to the goals and guiding principles/evaluation criteria. The team is currently exploring some key decisions on certain elements - the more detailed layout and costing work has shown that certain treatment elements do not make sense at Tryon Creek. These findings will be

reviewed at the next meeting. Dave briefly reviewed the four alternatives. Ruth Spetter asked whether some of these treatment functions would be replaced at the Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant for any of the functions eliminated at Tryon Creek. Dave responded that these were identified and have been accounted for.

Dave cautioned against getting too invested in the differences between Alternatives A, B,C, and D, noting that the elements can be mixed and matched to form a hybrid solution.

Review of the Enhancement Plan Concepts

Mike Faha provided a brief review of the findings and concepts presented in the enhancement plan. This plan was the result of a public process that occurred 5 years ago and focused on enhancement of the existing Tryon Creek facility. Mike noted that the process was extensive with the citizen members who were appointed as a sounding board. The process was very intentional, including odor control and looking at the strong natural resource element of Tryon Creek. The architect looked into colors, building faces and roof forms because it was realized that, in the future, people could be engaging views of the plant from above (and from the river). Mike showed illustrative sketches and images. Dan Vizzini asked if an alternative to green walls might be trellis works with plant materials. Mike agreed that trellis work could be an alternative.

Review Site/Edge Alternatives

Mike Faha described the basis for the site plan that the project team is using. This includes FEMA 100-year and 1996 floodplain maps as well as the sensitive lands and Willamette River Greenway overlays. This also includes the Foothills District Framework Plan. He explained that, although the plan is not specifically moving forward now, it does represent the best information available to the project team for use. The Tryon Creek Facility Plan is a 30-year plan, and it is assumed that by the end of the planning horizon, the surrounding neighborhood will develop in a fashion generally consistent with what is envisioned in the Foothills District plan. Lake Oswego City Council has adopted Comp Plan changes that change the district land use to mixed use. The consulting staff have incorporated the Foothills District Framework Plan footprint on some of the base map drawings.

Ruth Spetter asked how likely the plan would be to come to fruition. Brant Williams said it was the adopted plan and although urban renewal financing was overturned, new term development is not likely but the land use footprint was adopted by City Council. Dave Green noted that since the City intends that this will happen in the duration of the Facilities Plan, it is prudent to consider it now.

Mike Faha turned the discussion to Tim Strand to further describe the four landscape edge alternatives.

Tim described the edge treatment concepts associated with the four process alternatives. However, he emphasized that the edge treatment concepts are transferrable to various alternatives. No one edge treatment is exclusive to any one alternative layout and one alternative might have two or more different edge treatments.

Dan Vizzini asked whether it was possible to move some of the facilities in Alternative B to provide additional buffer along the south. This alternative is designed to provide buffer and connectivity to the Tryon Creek natural area.

Kara Warner asked about the status of the Foothills building shown on BES property in the site maps. Is this an optional building? The team responded that the Foothills District does not consider the building to be optional; however, the Foothills District Framework Plan showed it on BES property and the purchase of that property has not been negotiated with BES.

Ruth Spetter queried about any geotechnical work been done in this area, and whether there is concern about foundation stability (similar to Sellwood Bridge work). Dave responded that there has not been any investigation as part of the Facilities Plan; however, solid basalt rock is very close to the surface in this vicinity, and any structures would likely be founded directly to rock.

Kara, noting that there is property outside of plant boundaries for Alternative B, asked about the feasibility of acquiring self-storage property. The goal of facilities planning is to define whether use of the property provides value in implementing the 30-year plan. The property owner is aware of the facility plan option, and there would be a possibility of condemnation. The issue at play is value. This option opens up more buffer and separation.

Tim then showed images reflecting the quality of the different buffer option. He showed sketches and precedent images.

Dan asked about Alternative D, where it seemed odd to have the security fence outside the water feature. Tim noted that the fencing boundary shown is consistent with what was identified in the Enhancement Plan. BES could choose to provide a physical barrier in lieu of a security fence, and move the secure boundary further into the facility. However, BES would need to be comfortable that it could reclaim the land if needed for future treatment units. Steve Behrndt said that the CAC should not feel constrained by where the fence is located but there needs to be some visual signal to stay on the path.

Dave Gooley asked about the difference in maintenance costs between the edge treatments. It was noted that in terms of landscape edge alone, Alternative B is cheaper than Alternative C, which is cheaper than Alternative D.

Ruth Spetter asked how the water features function. Tim noted that these features would likely not have standing water in them year round, but might be seasonal. This would need to be determined as part of a design.

Dan noted that the layout of the roads/blocks in the Foothills District Framework Plan does not seem to take into account the substantial grade change in the areas (west to east). As you move west, adjacent properties look down on the plant. For them, visual mitigation is not an edge issue, but rather views within the plant. Brant Williams noted that the buildings can be up to 90 feet but are currently anticipated to be 50 to 60 feet.

Dave Gooley noted that internal visual mitigation is as important as edge treatment. Dave Green noted that, for those looking down, all the alternatives are comparable, although some alternatives simply have more structures on the site, below the development. Dave Gooley asked about the differential costs of roof treatments Michelle Burkhart explained that equal cost is being applied to all alternatives. However, as we move forward toward a recommended alternative, more detail can be added.

Dan Vizzini agreed but noted that massing to allow uniform roof treatments has a great deal of potential from both street level and above

Kara Warner asked about the floodplain impact differences. Michelle Burkhart said that facilities located in the floodplain are less critical for plant performance. Flood mitigation issues exist for all four alternatives. The Foothills development likewise requires fill. Alternative B and D require cut and fill. Dave Green noted that the most important thing is for the plant to be resilient during and after a storm event. If it is knocked down, it has to bounce back quickly and maintain its biology. Tuong Nguyn noted that chances to reduce odor are more troublesome when the odor facilities are close to the edge. Dave Green also noted that the closer to the edge, the more likely any maintenance work would have to be done from the public right-of-way.

Ruth Spetter asked about the wind direction and where odor-generating facilities are located. Tuong said that north is better because of the prevailing winds. Biofilers can withstand flooding more easily.

Preparing for April 10 Meeting

Linda Macpherson distributed two worksheets and requested that CAC members complete them by the end of the month. David Allred will be the point of contact, and CAC members can either scan and email or mail their completed worksheets to David.

Next Meetings

- March 20-21 –Workshop with BES and Lake Oswego to Rank Alternatives
- April 10 – CAC Meeting #9 – Initial Ranking of Alternatives
- Possible Oversight Committee meeting?
- April 24 –Prep for Open House (early) and then Open House
- May 8 – CAC Meeting #10 – Review Open House Results and Confirm Alternative Rankings
- Sometime in May –Meet with Oversight Committee
- June –October – Develop Recommended Alternative and Draft Facilities Plan Report
- October –Meetings to review Draft Report

Kara Warner asked if the meeting to prepare for the open house might be held right before the Open House. Staff believes that can occur. There was then discussion about the best location for the Open House. The CAC believed that the Riverside Room at the Lake Oswego Pointe Condominiums would be preferred, Mary Beth Coffey said she would check on availability. (After the meeting it was confirmed that the room would be available for this purpose as long as parking is managed and we encourage the use of street parking or parking at Foothills Park.)

Next Meeting:

April 10, 2013, at the Portland Building