

Summary Meeting Notes

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

April 10, 2013

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Bureau of Environmental Services/City of Portland

CAC MEETING NO. 9

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

Staff in attendance: Jim Brown, David Allred, Steve Behrndt, Tuong Nguyen, Brant Williams, Paul Suto, Scott Gibson

Consulting team in attendance: Dave Green/CH2M HILL, Linda Macpherson/New Water ReSources, Michelle Burkhart/CH2M HILL

Public in attendance: Charles Ormsby and Margaret Ormsby

Welcome and Overview of Meeting Objective

Linda Macpherson started the meeting at 4:03 pm.

Linda reviewed the agenda, which included several items necessary to prepare for the upcoming Open House. The objective of the meeting is to provide CAC a strong understanding of the four alternatives, key site differences, and costing work. The CAC should also be aware of BES/Lake Oswego staff rankings prior to making its own evaluation of the alternatives and edge treatments. Staff collected the Edge Connections and Other non-process Attributes Preferences survey from CAC members that had been distributed via email prior to the meeting.

Discussion of Possible Fifth Alternative – Relocation of TCWTP

Dave Green noted that there had been a question from two Lake Oswego councilors about the feasibility of a fifth alternative: moving the plant up the hill to open up the current plant facility property to development or alternate uses. Project staff reviewed the concept with Lake Oswego City Councilor Skip O’Neill, City Manager Tom Coffey and Brant Williams/City of Lake Oswego. After discussion of the fifth alternative, a decision was made to not incorporate this concept into the Facilities Plan. Ruth Spetter

asked whether they had discussed geologic issues at the site and reiterated that these should be incorporated into the evaluation and costing work.

Dave Gooley inquired from what perspective Lake Oswego would rank the alternatives. Dave Green responded that Lake Oswego has been involved in the process and pays a portion of the capital cost and operational costs. Steve Behrndt offered that Lake Oswego might have some differences in opinion from the BES on the subjects of property use and adjacent properties. Both communities seem sensitive to costs and rates.

Review of the Four Refined Treatment Plant Alternatives

Dave Green summarized the process since December, development of alternatives, and the recent alternatives costing work to provide a background for CAC decision making.

Michelle Burkhart described the work to refine the alternatives and present them as comparable solutions so the CAC can focus on key questions. She added that the consulting team has generally applied the largest footprint technology so the site has space, but it recognizes that in the future there might be different, smaller footprint solutions.

Dan Vizzini talked about the opposing pressures to expand and contract the facility footprint on the site. Some stakeholders from Lake Oswego might want to limit the ultimate size and capacity of the treatment plant.

Kara Warner asked about recycled water use for the new Foothills development. All four alternatives provide the opportunity to produce reclaimed water, but the drivers for reuse do not currently exist in Lake Oswego. It was acknowledged that water supply concerns within Lake Oswego might be one driver. Dan noted that the plant could sell purple pipe water to Foothills Development and Foothills Park. He wondered if the plan proactively set up the plant for reuse. Michelle Burkhart replied that this would be a good suggestion for the CAC to make.

Michelle then walked through each of the four alternatives.

Kara asked whether the property purchase was the cause of higher near-term costs for Alternative B. CH2M HILL responded that the property purchase was just one of the near-term cost elements for Alternative B.

The question arose as to whether power generation at Tryon Creek might be of value to Lake Oswego or the Foothills development. Kara expressed her concern about truck hauling and carbon footprint. She thought it would be useful to have a comparison. There was discussion about transporting solids to Columbia Boulevard to take advantage of the renewable energy facilities there. Lake Oswego might be able to share in those benefits. BES believes that the revenue from CBWTP cogeneration helps to reduce O&M costs for TCWTP for both BES and Lake Oswego ratepayers.

It was noted that all alternatives have Hwy 43 access on the west entrance.

Ruth Spetter asked if the drawing Michelle showed were different than those shown before. Michelle responded that only the process units were shown on the drawings presented to the CAC. The administration building was previously shown on the hill in Alternative B. The administration building could actually be sited in various locations, including the existing location.

Dave Gooley noted that illustrating the processes to make the alternatives comparable in the way Michelle did was very helpful.

Dan Vizzini asked whether the change in truck hauling created a structure with odor control. It was noted that the plan does include odor control.

Review Cost of the Four Treatment Plant Alternatives

Dave Green reviewed the cost graphs, noting that the capital costs are amazingly very similar in each case. The costs through 2040 (in today's dollars) include staff costs (engineering and legal). Michelle explained the uncertainties of the Class 5 cost estimate. (Class 5 are preliminary level financial estimates) Dan observed that the first three portions of each vertical bar graph are roughly equal. The blue and red bars show the percent of newness of the facility plan alternative. Al Iverson wondered if ultraviolet disinfection costs might decrease in the future and whether the dynamics of energy and chemicals might change. Dave Green responded that UV is not a very good fit from a technology perspective, due to the peak flows seen at TCWTP.

Ruth asked about the bankside outfall and whether this is what the plant has now. She also wondered about the environmental impact of the outfall. Michelle explained that it is not what the plant has. The bankside outfall will go through a significant regulatory and permitting process with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The alternative to the bankside outfall would be to build a pump station that would only be used a few times a year, whereas the bankside outfall would require little maintenance and also be more reliable.

Foothills Development would trigger enhanced odor control.

Dave Green asked if there are other ideas from the CAC about the alternatives. Dan wondered if Lake Oswego might consider making the plant not expandable. In order to determine the highest and best use of the property requires knowledge of what possibilities exist in the future. Leaving area at the site for future regulatory issues/drivers was deemed important. Dave noted that the issues at the plant do not derive from growth pressures but from regulatory and wet weather flow drivers.

Kara wondered if all the buildings stand outside of the flood plain. Michelle noted that all facilities would be flood-proofed and costs were included to address that.

A horizontal bar chart presented suggests that there would be no investment in existing facilities during the first 10 years, which was not necessarily accurate.

Dave Gooley wondered if any of the alternatives would prevent future expansion. Dave Green and Michelle responded that all alternatives accommodate expansion. Dan Vizzini asked if all the

alternatives anticipate the Foothills Development grid. Dave verified that they do. Dan also asked to what extent staging could be done to minimize the bond requirements.

Scott Gibson explained that BES would finance the investment. BES has a larger rate base so the impacts on rates in Portland are lower. Since the current agreement between BES and Lake Oswego has BES financing, Lake Oswego would be billed on improvements based on a depreciation schedule. The payback approach in the IGA dampens the rate impacts to Lake Oswego.

CAC Ranking of the Four Treatment Plant Alternatives

Linda explained that there is not enough time to rank the four alternatives and the non-treatment-related enhancement options. The alternatives will be presented at the Open House without ranking. The CAC decided that they preferred to hear the general concerns from the citizens. Linda distributed a schematic of the proposed open house. The CAC said that there should not be a presentation as it minimizes conversation. Getting the attendees at the Open House to state their concerns would be the most important.

Review of Feedback from BES/Lake Oswego Rankings

Paul Suto described the BES ranking process. Staff were split in their ranking, with strong preferences for both Alternatives B and C.

Elevated piping was discussed. Jim Brown said that elevated piping poses a risk and would probably be dealt with in all alternatives.

Steve Behrndt noted that being a good neighbor is going to be a challenge which makes alternative B attractive as all the other options are close to neighbors. Treatment plants do generate odors even if strong odor mitigation is in place. There was a discussion about resiliency and how a new plant could be returned on line more rapidly if it were to be damaged. A new plant would be more robust.

Al asked about the number of feet of elevated pipe. It was noted that there are 1200 feet of elevated pipe.

Public Comment

Skip Ormsby noted his concern about the process and the fact that he is not a member of the CAC. He said growth and the associated risks are a big concern. The Birds Hill Neighborhood Association does not want increased density and flag lots. He is also concerned about raw sewage lines breaking. Dave Green explained that the planning work provides for facilities to treat all the flow coming to the plant – it does not contemplate any raw sewage overflow from the Tryon Creek plant.

Getting Ready for the Open House

The CAC noted how important it is to get community views about the key issues and key risks. They noted that some generalized information on rate impact should be included.

Dan asked, separate from goals and guiding principles, what risks does the staff see that should possibly drive an alternative selection. He suggested that a list of key risks be prepared for next CAC meeting.

Steve Behrndt talked about resiliency and long-term ability to respond to a catastrophic event. Some alternatives may allow design to address those long-term concerns. The CAC thought this was important information to include in the Open House.

Information needed for Next CAC Meeting:

Dave Gooley – additional information on gas management and review of technical components

Tom Badrick – some understanding of rate impacts

Rich Martin – a short presentation on the resiliency of a plant without primaries

Ruth Spetter – why is there such a difference in truck traffic between alternatives

Dan Vizzini, Ruth Spetter, and Dave Gooley would be pleased to review the materials for the Open House. If the CAC has any additional questions, they should email David Allred.

It was agreed that the CAC members would come to the Open House early, arriving at 4:30 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm.

Upcoming Meetings:

Open House: 5 – 7 pm April 24 in the Riverside Room at the Lake Oswego Pointe Condominiums (CAC to arrive at 4:30)

CAC Meeting No 10: 4 – 6 pm, May 8, location TBD.