

To: Portland Utility Board (PUB)  
From: Melissa Merrell, PUB Analyst  
Re: Values and Time Request Discussion Guide Cultivated from Member Submitted Comments  
On: July 22, 2017

---

I've catalogued your responses regarding the request for more time from OHA and what values should guide Council's decision on the water treatment question before them.

Request for more time from OHA:

In addition to the memo submitted by Mike Weedall, members also submitted these reasons for or opportunities that would result from more time if granted from OHA:

1. More time would allow for community engagement and education to provide customers more information to support a treatment option. Such information could include:
  - What are the active chemicals or other additives that would be used for either treatment option? How might these chemicals react with current treatment additives like chlorine, sodium hydroxide, and ammonia? What are the potential negative impacts to human and environmental health?
  - How would programs like low income-eligible bill discount program be effected by the rate increases that are projected for either scenario? Could eligibility levels be adjusted to address affordability concerns?
  - What is the carbon footprint of the different treatment scenarios? In addition to understanding the differences in emission levels, what are the energy needs for the different options?
  - How does the cost of the different treatment facilities fit into the Water Bureau's current Capital Improvement Plan in regards to timing and cost?
2. More time would allow for a more thoughtful presentation of the filtration option and its benefits and ideally more tuned costs. While filtration is the standard treatment option for most water providers, it is also used due to the water source (locally filtration is used for municipalities pulling water from the Clackamas and Willamette as their primary source). These sources are exposed to human contaminants and agricultural run-off. Neither is present in the bull run. More time would allow the bureau to more thoroughly evaluate these conditions and determine whether UV or filtration is the optimal long term option and where the optimal location is for either solution.
3. More time would allow the bureau to clarify the question of how either treatment fits the bureau's resiliency plan. If system resiliency is one of the desired benefits, filtration may be the

best option, but might be better served in another location. Why put filtration in a location which provides no diversification of water supply?

Values that Should Guide Council:

1. Safety of the citizens and protection of public health
2. Regulatory compliance
3. Long term reliability and supply resiliency
4. Long term benefits relative to cost
5. Reasonable cost to the consumers
6. Rate predictability