

To: Portland Utility Board (PUB)  
From: Melissa Merrell, PUB Analyst  
Re: Discussion Guide for Water Treatment Meeting Cultivated from Member Submitted Comments  
On: July 17, 2017 Updated July 25, 2017

---

I've catalogued your responses into the following items for tomorrow's conversation. This is a starting point to see where there is consensus among the board members.

#### Discussion Item #1: Process Timeline for Council Input

If PUB is to be of value to the City Council, we must be included in the process much sooner and have access to quicker and better information. Complex issues such as the Biogas Project, Water Quality/Cypto issues, and the Hydro Deal have all come to PUB within a couple of months at best of going to the Council for action, often it seems as a fait accompli. Given that we are a Board of volunteers and typically meet once a month, that is not enough time to do any adequate analysis of the information. At times, we have not received the requested information until the day of our meetings, again making it difficult at best to provide meaningful feedback.

#### Discussion Item #2: Availability of Analysis Prior to Major Decision Points

Given the complexity and budgetary impact of these types of projects, citizens expect a more robust presentation of analysis that includes rate impact analysis, risk analysis, cost benefit analysis, an equity assessment, etc. at the beginning of consideration.

#### Discussion Item #3: More Time for City Process from OHA

This is a complex and very expensive decision and the City should not be forced into a rushed process. Clearly the City must address the regulatory environment but the City needs more time to gather the appropriate information and adequately evaluate the various options. The City should request, and PUB should support, additional time from OHA so the City can make the best decision for the citizens of Portland.

- No infectious crypto was found
- No public health emergency; less disease this year
- PWB acting on assumed responses; others have pushed back (Boston & NY)
- Joint letter from PUB and CUB supporting more time

- Financial uncertainty for the cost estimate for the filtration option

Revisit reasons for more time: PUB Memo from Mike Weedall (Draft Language Requesting Time Extension from OHA for Water Treatment Method for Compliance, July 22, 2017) and PUB Memo from Melissa (Values and Time Request Discussion Guide Cultivated from Member Submitted Comments, July 22, 2017).

#### Discussion Item #4 Public Engagement

Regardless of the chosen treatment option, there needs to be more frequent and more complete public engagement process outside of the PUB.

#### Discussion Item #5 Watershed Protection

If council decides to build a filtration plant, there will theoretically no longer be a need for such strong environmental protections in the Bull Run Watershed. The current City Council and Water Bureau leadership have expressed commitment to retaining these protections, but there is uncertainty with future leadership. The City Council and the Water Bureau should take steps to memorialize these protections permanently and pledge to lobby our Federal Delegation to ensure that the U.S. Forest Service's management of its land in the watershed is aligned with these values.

#### Discussion Item #6 Ongoing Monitoring and Engagement

During construction of chosen treatment option, there should be PUB and Community engagement to oversee the expenditures and changes.

#### Discussion Item #7 Pros and Cons of four options: No Treatment, UV, Filtration, UV Plus ((UV First; Filtration Later)

Discussion Item #8 At this time, should PUB take a position on type of treatment? If not, are there guiding values or principles we think the Council should use in weighing the various options?

Discussion Item #9 What values should guide Council's decision on a treatment option? See PUB Memo from Melissa (Values and Time Request Discussion Guide Cultivated from Member Submitted Comments, on July 22, 2017).