

Summary Meeting Notes

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

July 10, 2013 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Riverside Room, Lake Oswego Point Condominiums, Lake Oswego

CAC MEETING NO. 11

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

Staff in attendance: David Allred, Becky Tillson, Guy Graham, Brant Williams, Paul Suto, Scott Gibson,
Mike Ciolli, Tyong Nguyen, Eugene Lampi, Jim Brown

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

Welcome:

Linda introduced and welcomed Becky Tillson, BES Community Relations, and announced David Allred's retirement. CAC members wished David well. Linda reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

BES/Lake Oswego Staff Preferred Alternative Solution:

Dave reviewed the process to date as well as summarized the feedback on alternatives from the last CAC meeting, Open House and BES/Lake Oswego meeting. Dave noted that the general preference expressed included attributes from Alternatives B & C. Dave surveyed the CAC to determine if any of the members had received a different impression. The CAC members affirmed that this was their impression as well. One comment was that emphasis on future flexibility was also a key message.

Dave then provided an overview of BES/Lake Oswego input and also asked BES if the views were accurate. BES affirmed that this was a good summary of their concerns and feedback.

Development of Preferred Alternative:

Michelle described the attributes of the preferred alternative as attributes of Alternative B and C were melded together. She noted that the team began to look at the alternatives as not an either or, but a both. As this occurred new possibilities were revealed. She referred to the process flow diagrams. Flow through the plant would be by gravity (through the new headworks, new primary clarifiers, aeration

basins and disinfection facilities) for all flows except high flow events. During these events, flows in excess of 22 mgd would be routed to the three existing clarifiers and subsequently pumped to the aeration basins. The vast majority of the time all flow would be by gravity as only 6 wet weather events would be anticipated per year.

Bruce inquired about the decision not to take all peak flows through the new primary clarifiers, by gravity. Michelle noted that to do so would not allow for reuse of the three original primary clarifiers, and would significantly increase the project cost.

Rich wondered if the existing clarifiers (wet weather) would need to be covered for odor control. The potential for odor generation from the wet weather clarifiers would be significantly reduced since they would not be utilized during warm weather. The costs and plan assume those clarifiers would still be covered within the planning horizon, but would be provided as the second phase of odor control (rather than the first).

Kara: Does BES still need to pump their raw sewage up to the new headworks? Michelle answered that this was the case.

Bruce questioned if over time BES and Lake Oswego were to reduce their stormwater flows entering the system, could it then reduce or eliminate the use of the wet weather clarifiers? Michelle indicated that it could reduce the frequency of use, and the total volume of flow that would be routed in that fashion, and subsequently pumped to the aeration basins.

Mary Beth asked about the number of biosolids trucks would exit the plant through the neighborhood. It was affirmed that there could be up to 7 – 8 trucks per weekday at the end of the planning period. Michelle explained that the best solution was thought to be one that allowed circular solids load-out on the site and ultimately would allow trucks to either use Highway 43 or through existing ingress and egress. Access to Highway 43 could be coupled with development of a northern entrance as part of the Foothills Development, or BES could enter into an arrangement with the self-storage property to access 43 in the near term. The current hauling operation (hauling at night, 5 days/week) is assumed, with no truck traffic on the weekend.

Questions and Observation:

Once there is concurrence on the approach, there will be additional refinements to the preferred alternative, including site work, consideration of Foothills street grid etc. Costs will be better defined.

How are you phasing out onsite digestion if you will continue to have primary clarifiers? In the preferred alternative, primary sludge will be hauled to Columbia Boulevard. Onsite digestion will be phased out only once solids handling improvements are in place to minimize the total amount of solid hauled.

Jim Brown made the point that Alt B and C were originally ranked the highest by staff, and at the meeting on May 31st, the team (both Lake Oswego and BES) provided feedback on what alternative is preferred by each attendee, and why.

Bruce asked why is there a difference in hauling cost between Alt A and the Preferred Alt? This is related to the significant reduction in solids accomplished through onsite digestion. Michelle indicated that one of the findings of the technical work is that solids handling has a significant impact on trucking and annual costs. Follow-on development of the preferred alternative will focus on minimizing the amount of solids hauled, likely through co-thickening technologies to reduce the amount of water hauled.

Al questioned what type of thickening is being assumed? Michelle said they would thicken with gravity belt thickeners or other technology to co-thicken primary and waste activated sludge. Kara asked if there is room for different technologies in thickening facility shown on the map. Michelle confirmed that the facilities have been laid out to accommodate largest footprint technology.

Michelle presented the gas production as an opportunity benefit – there are costs associated with capturing that benefit. Paul commented about the Annual Gas Value – does it include the heat value of the gas, as well as the electric value? How is that calculated? The graph presented included kW/day, which reflects only the electricity offset, and doesn't capture the value of the heat generated with a cogeneration system.

There was discussion about resiliency under extreme events. It was mentioned that this was the most resilient alternative. With a small generator powering the BES Influent Pump Station, most if not all flow would receive secondary treatment. Under an extreme regional power outage scenario, all flow could receive preliminary and primary treatment plus disinfection.

There was discussion about the location of the administration building. It was noted that it could possibly be combined with a community space, or environmental education center. There are several options. It might be a public/private partnership or a long-term lease arrangement. The admin space and any education facility might be located up near the new headworks or it might be located down near Foothills Park and the existing Admin Bldg.

It was agreed that the previous evaluation work and ranking had been used to bring the work to this point.

Linda surveyed the group to obtain feedback on preferred alternative:

- Bruce: likes solution
- Kara: likes solution. Does configuration preclude a community/environmental education center up on the hill? This is not precluded – there will be additional site development as this effort and subsequent predesign efforts move forward. Important to define whether this is a feature the community would value. It could also provide benefit at the existing entrance location.
- Rich: likes constructing dry weather clarifiers and headworks at same location.
- Al: likes primary and gravity

- Dave: likes idea of acquiring additional property and maximizing flexibility; stayed true to guiding principles and evaluation criteria – reflects good planning
- Mary Beth: agrees with others, one concern is increased truck traffic – wants to reiterate value of access to 43.
- Dan: likes elegance in compromise solution; what is more impactful for environment – energy cost of pumping on site or transportation costs of moving sludge offsite?

Scott made the point that one of the sacrifices given up is the simplicity associated with eliminating a unit process (primary clarification).

Dan asked if this configuration makes it possible for the plant to withstand extreme event – increased resiliency? Dave indicated that BES would add generator for the influent pump station and would still provide treatment for all flows under an extreme event.

Bruce asked about the overall context that occurs once a preferred alternative is selected. It was noted that numbers will be developed and become part of a CIP (numbers will be more set in stone). He noted then it is important to include costs now for features/options that we want to be part of the plan – like reuse.

There was interest/concurrence from Bruce, Kara, Mary Beth, Dan to incorporate reuse opportunities now. Dave Gooley mentioned that there is a need to identify what reuse will cost for inclusion in BES Capital plan to be implemented if/when it makes sense.

Next Steps

Upcoming Presentation to Oversight Committee. Would like as many CAC member to attend as possible, perhaps even assist in presentation about their work in the next month.

Overall, there was consensus from the CAC supporting the preferred alternative, and an interest in being involved when the preferred alternative is presented to the Oversight Committee.

There will be no meeting in August as the team will be developing the preferred alternative further.

Subsequent CAC meetings to provide review and feedback on preferred alternative development, architectural treatment, enhancements and edge treatments.

The next meeting is planned for September 11, 2013. It will be at the Portland Building.

There were no public members in attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm