

Summary Meeting Notes

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

May 22, 2013

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Riverside Room, Lake Oswego Point Condominiums, Lake Oswego

CAC MEETING NO. 10

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

Staff in attendance: David Allred, Steve Behrnt, Guy Graham, Brant Williams, Paul Suto, Scott Gibson, Mike Ciolli

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

Lake Oswego City Council Members in attendance: Councilor Jeff Gudman and Councilor Skip O’Neill

Welcome and Overview of Meeting Objective

Linda began the meeting at 4:10 pm

Linda distributed the agenda and comments from the Open House along with the same Workbook and Feedback form previously distributed at the Open House (hole punched for CAC Notebooks).

Linda reviewed the agenda noting that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss staff and Open House feedback, and then solicit feedback from the CAC. It was noted that BES has not completed their evaluation of alternatives and wanted to get input from the CAC to help inform this evaluation.

Staff Feedback on Alternatives

Paul Suto reviewed the work and concerns, noting that BES staff is interested in feedback from the CAC to help inform BES’s second round of scoring. BES has been looking into technical aspects of some of the components of the alternatives – particular the alternatives that would not include primary clarifiers.

BES staff has taken some site visits (Oak Lodge, Wilsonville, Forest Grove) and conducted phone interviews with Miami and Louisville to understand aspects of a no-primary configuration. Staff thinks a no primary option could work but it would require additional contingencies in the planning and phasing process and require more work to refine the no primary alternatives. Paul discussed observations:

- Primary clarifiers provide buffering of influent flows and loads from secondary process. This provides a wide spot in the line.
- BES staff is very familiar with primary treatment processes. New learning curve would be associated with a 'no primary clarifier' option
- BES staff may want to enhance robustness of secondary process without primary clarifiers
- Benefit of not providing primary clarifiers is increased site buffer and simplified operation.
- Reduced number of components increases reliance on those components that remain.
- Concerns are related to management of peak instantaneous flows, but also management of daily load variations.
- BES has looked further at replacement of the influent gravity sewer (key component of Alternative B) – BES had previously understood and it had been conveyed to CAC that this elevated gravity sewer represented a significant risk. BES now understands this risk is more easily mitigated (This new info is related to recent work by BES, separate from the Facilities Plan project). Also Paul noted that the cost to retrofit that elevated gravity sewer is not as significant as first thought. Scott Gibson described that Tryon Creek work for Alternative B assumed ~2,000 linear feet of replacement for the Tryon Creek interceptor, to allow for gravity flow. So, a new influent pump station would be the least cost solution for BES flows. Since new influent pump station for BES flows would be needed for the higher elevation headworks, it diminished the gravity appeal benefit of Alternative B. Also, the alternative raises a question about timing of replacement of Foothills interceptor and how that might coordinate with construction of Headworks.
- Relocation of truck traffic up to Highway 43 (as shown in Alternative B) is viewed as a benefit.
- Mike Ciolli raised a concern related to the wide range of flows during storm surges. He likes the buffer that primary clarifiers would provide.
- Rich Martin asked if thickening facility would be larger with no primary solution. Yes, a 'no primary' option requires an additional gravity belt thickener as compared to the options with primary clarifiers.
- Alternative B stretches out treatment plant campus over a larger land area, providing additional buffer, but increasing the distance for operational rounds.

- Energy footprint is more advantageous for the options with primary clarifiers, due to increased aeration requirements to stabilize solids in non-primary options.
- Bruce asked about the value of using the biogas – it will provide benefit at Columbia Boulevard and could be used at Malarky Roofing or utilized to produce energy. The value of the biogas was calculated for each alternative, but that value was not specifically added to the O&M costs as a savings.
- Odor mitigation was a driver for some of the other treatment plants to eliminate their primary clarifiers. Odor mitigation for options with primary clarifiers would require a robust odor control system. There is still some potential for errant odor emissions due to taking facilities offline for service/cleaning.
- Steve Behrndt asked if any of the alternatives would require a lower O&M cost (labor, materials, energy, chemicals). Which option gives you the best chance of keeping the overall cost lower because everyone shares in the operating cost? Which alternative is more operable and helps the plant be a good neighbor? Paul noted that capital costs are relatively the same. In operating costs, overall not much difference, power cost is higher with Alternative B, but hauling costs are lower with B.
- Steve: What are key benefits associated with B that are attractive to CAC/Community? The attributes discussed were buffer, truck traffic redirected to 43. Steve noted that the buffer as a driver needs to be evaluated against the risks Paul mentioned.
- Steve commented that the complexity of learning to operate a new facility will take some number of months, but BES operations can do this. This should not be a decision factor for the 30-year plan.
- Operating costs are based on planning level estimates – BES may choose to operate the secondary process more conservatively, which could result in increased power cost as compared to planning level estimates.
- BES is planning to rerank the alternatives based on feedback from CAC and Open House.

Lake Oswego:

- Brant Williams noted that while Lake Oswego does not build or operate wastewater treatment plants, but much of the discussion within Lake Oswego has been around Alternative B and its positive good neighbor benefits, particularly the buffer and streamlined footprint.
- Lake Oswego hasn't yet had the time to take into account recent process feedback from BES related to primary clarifiers.
- Alternatives with buffer and a more streamlined /better visual site plan offer benefit to nearby community and to the Foothills District.

- Brant noted that those alternatives that reduced operational costs, limited truck traffic through the neighborhoods, and allowed for cleaner operations were most preferred.
- Brant asked: How does each alternative work for the community?
- It was asked what impact would taking the lower storage unit property off due to the tax rolls in Lake Oswego. Brant responded that Lake Oswego has never considered this property as prime redevelopment property (as part of Foothills Plan). Lake Oswego could be interested in 'land swap' related to more desirable property in the southeast corner of the TCWTP site.

Dan Vizzini observed that relocation of plant entrance/truck access to 43 is possible on Alternative C should the Foothills road system develop in the fashion shown. Could move the administration building up the hill in Alternative C and consider a land swap as part of that alternative as well.

Dan also had questions about resilience and adaptability. Which of these plans is most flexible in its operation to deal with those risks and/or adapt to changing conditions? Paul responded that under extreme power outage scenario, gravity flow configuration offers advantage in B, but less treatment (limited or no aeration capacity). Steve said flexibility would need to be incorporated as part of any of the alternatives. Under earthquake scenario – increased number of structures increases likelihood that some of the facilities will not be significantly damaged. Steve also noted that a plan that provides a high level of odor control and noise mitigation is important. Adaptability – having a site that accommodates future facilities for increased regulatory requirement. Kara asked about how much time it would take to recover if there were a washout.

Dave Gooley asked at what point to you need to make a decision that leads you down a path? Dave Green responded that with Headworks project, need to decide where to construct and at what elevation. In part, "gravity flow" drives this location, but there are other advantages as well. This Headworks project is likely in 5-10 year time frame (construction) with predesign and design happening relatively soon. The Facilities Plan could be a planning guide – identify path forward that would require further work to confirm feasibility, costs are what is expected, etc.

Dan asked about technological changes: How do you design the plant to take on new technologies as they become available? Is there anything in the literature or conference that suggests significant changes in wastewater technology? Paul responded that some discussion about incentivizing agencies to pursue newer technologies to move industry forward. Dan then wonder if there is a tipping point where local use of sludge is more viable in the local area than hauling to CBWTP (and then to eastern Oregon)? Yes, in CA where the costs to manage and dispose of sludge are becoming more significant, there is some movement to find more local solutions.

Kara asked about recovery time if the secondary process is washed out during a storm event. Paul said 2- 4 weeks.

CAC Discusses Alternatives – Likes and Dislikes

Linda again noted there will be more work from technical team to rerank the alternatives based on new information. What are the attributes that the CAC observes that drive their opinions on the Alternatives? It was decided that each CAC member would define the attributes that were the most important to them.

Mary Beth – ‘truck hauling makes me nervous’; odor control is on the top of community’s list; likes Alternative B because of increased buffer, trucks come in and out at 43.

Bruce - can see advantages to B and C. He likes the gravity aspect of Alternative B but it now seems not as beneficial as he was originally hoping. The spread out aspect of B allows more incorporation of natural landscape (not a ‘fortress of sewage’). For Alternative C Bruce likes the dispersed risk associated with primary treatment (more types of treatment), like the compactness of C, opportunity to leverage tanks into multi-use (build on top of tanks). Likes the connection to Tryon Creek. Leaning more towards Alternative C.

Kara – likes Alternative B due to partial gravity flow, if acquiring property is realistic. Likes operational costs of Alternative A. Leaning towards Alternative A but Alternative B is compelling as well.

Dave Gooley – Noted that all 4 alternatives have same site area except Alternative B is slightly larger (likes opportunity associated with additional site); Dave acknowledged that he doesn’t know enough about process configuration to offer opinion. Alternative B gives you options that other don’t have due to more available site. Dave likes moving trucks out of Foothills neighborhood and up to Hwy 43. Gives larger buffers. Gravity flow is attractive. Would pick Alternative B, and thinks decisions about process need to be further developed.

Rich – leaning towards Alternative B for trucking on Hwy 43, centralization of odorous components, elimination of odor issues (and associated cost) associated with primaries.

Al – like that Alternative B has access to Hwy 43. Robustness of primary clarifiers is good – operational concerns increase risks.

Tom – prefer Alternative B due to good neighbor components – truck traffic on Hwy 43 and increased buffer, reduced odor control. Confident that operations can operate revised configurations.

Dan – easiest path would be to stick with the known – Alternative A. Pursuit of access to 43 should be part of whichever solution is selected – safety and good neighbor benefits are paramount. He has serious concerns about property acquisition (big risk for Alternative B); land swap may address this issue. Would like a hybrid plan, expand to west, put off headworks question. Go to Alternative B, but add more tanks to mitigate storm flows. Even though Alternative C is much more implementable than B he is leaning towards modified Alternative B.

Linda – Staff will be looking at how to incorporate the input they heard from the CAC and from community into a preferred solution. She invited all CAC members to provide any additional comments to David Allred via email.

Next meeting has not yet been scheduled – BES will reach out to CAC to define schedule.

It was asked when the CAC wants to see evolution of alternatives? It was decided that the alternative should be brought back to the CAC certainly before the Open House and whenever staff and consulting team need input. Also it was noted that the CAC has not finalized opinions on edge treatment which will be a topic to review/discuss as a part of the remaining meetings.

Opportunity for Public Comment

There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 PM.