

## Portland Utility Board

August 16, 2018 11:30am – 1:30pm  
Portland City Hall Pettygrove Room  
Meeting #50

### **Attendees:**

*PUB Members:* Ana Brophy, ex officio  
Allan Warman  
Colleen Johnson  
Dory Robinson  
Heidi Bullock  
Mike Weedall  
Robert Martineau  
Vera Zaharova, ex-officio

### *Absent:*

\* Dan Peterson  
\* Van Le, ex officio  
\* Scott Robinson  
\* Ted Labbe  
\* Lee Moore  
\* Micah Meskel

\*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

*Staff:* Dawn Uchiyama (Deputy Director, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Megan Callahan (Communications Director, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
David Peters (Principal Engineer, Portland Water Bureau)  
Todd Lofgren (Senior Policy Advisor, Commissioner Fish)  
Jeff Winner (Capital Improvement Program Planning Supervisor, Portland Water Bureau)  
Elizabeth Pape (Senior Management Auditor, Portland Auditor's Office)  
Tony Andresen (Communications Director, Portland Water Bureau)  
Tim Crail (Chief of Staff, Commissioner Fritz)  
Cristina Nieves (Policy Advisor, Commissioner Fritz)  
Jamie Dunphy (Senior Staff Representative, Commissioner Fish)

Melissa Merrell (Principal Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Shannon Fairchild (Senior Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Yung Ouyang (Senior Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Alexandra Martin (Executive Assistant, City Budget Office)

*Public:* Mary Forst, Confluence Center for Training and Mediation

**I. Call to Order**

Allan called the meeting to order. He reminded everyone that the meeting was of community volunteers tasked to advise City Council on items related to the Water Bureau and the Bureau of Environmental Services. He gave an overview of the [agenda](#).

He described the three topics on the agenda: the Auditor's Report on stormwater management, the board discussion about filtration, and a second facilitated conversation with Mary Forst.

**II. Prior Meeting Minutes**

Colleen asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the August 7 meeting. Melissa reviewed some changes that had been submitted since circulation. Melissa noted there were track changes are included in the packet she provided.

There were no other changes. The [minutes](#) were accepted as revised.

**III. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**IV. Disclosure of Communications**

Allan spent time with BES discussing sewer issues and had miscellaneous billing conversations with other bureaus.

Robert met with commissioners, bureau directors, and bureau staff about labor subjects, and gave general information on his service on the Utility Board.

Heidi attended a community meeting with BES staff present about the Portland Harbor Super Fund site.

Tim Crail, Chief of Staff to Commissioner Fritz, introduced himself. He noted that Commissioner Fritz is now assigned to the Water Bureau. He introduced his colleague Cristina Nieves, Policy Advisor to Commissioner Fritz. Cristina explained they will be working on Water Bureau matters.

**V. Audit Report: Private Stormwater Management: Bob Mackay, Senior Management Auditor, and Elizabeth Pape, Senior Management Auditor, Portland Auditor's Office.**

Elizabeth provided members with an overview of the [audit](#).

She explained that the City Auditor is an elected official without a vote. The Auditor oversees the oversight functions of the City government, including the council clerk, archives, the ombudsman, and the Audit Services Division.

The Auditor's Office provides performance audits to ensure bureaus are functioning according to the bureaus goals and stated practices. Examples of topics of reports provided by the Auditor include police training, the art council, and short-term rental policy.

The Auditor's Report outlined today is an audit of the Bureau of Environmental Services stormwater management on private property.

Elizabeth explained that stormwater is water that runs off during wet weather. This water enters the sewer system and the City relies on property owners to help manage stormwater.

Private stormwater management helps prevent sewer system overflow. In the combined system, wastewater and stormwater flows into the same pipes. Treatment facilities can manage all the water and discharge the water to water ways unpolluted. However, heavy rain periods can cause overflow and pollution in the water system.

Private property owners can manage the water that collects on their property and prevent it from overflowing to natural waterways.

There are ways to manage water collection on site. Elizabeth referenced page four of her meeting materials. The examples of stormwater management cited on page four include:

- Ecoroofs which collect rainwater to reduce runoff and allow water to evaporate;
- Drywells which collect runoff below ground and allow it to disperse into the ground;
- Planters which collect runoff above ground, filter it, and disperse it into the ground;
- Swales which collect runoff at the ground level, filter it, and disperse it into the ground

Elizabeth explained that the audit report considered the permit requirement for new development which was outlined in a stormwater management manual adopted in 1999.

She referenced a chart on page four and highlighted the increase in total acres of managed land since 1999.

She described the Clean River Rewards Program which provides discounts to rate payers managing stormwater on site. There is a rate paid for general stormwater and a rate portion for water generated on site. If property owners register stormwater structures with the city there will be a discount on their bill.

Due to this program the total acres of managed land increased from about 100 to 4000.

The report considered the issue that with incomplete information on private stormwater management there was a risk of overspending.

The report found that data used to track the managed land was not adequate for the variable designs of stormwater facilities. Stormwater facilities require knowledge of the privately-owned sites as well. Individual structures feed into the design of larger facilities. If private systems did not exist, the public facilities would have to be larger.

Information for stormwater facilities is located in multiple places in the city. One is TRACS, which the City uses to track building and development permits. There is not ongoing monitoring of these structures; once structures were built and permits cleared out BES staff did not inspect facilities to be sure they were still functioning. Information was also stored in a custom-built Access database that is used by the maintenance inspection program (MIP) in the Pollution Prevention group. These are both used to track requirements related to the stormwater management manual. Cayenta is the city's billing system. Information about properties receiving Clean River Rewards is located in this system.

The report noted a need for oversight over the data systems. The process of transferring data from the two databases is manual; there is no automation between them.

The rewards program relied on reporting from a geographic information system. One issue the report observes is that not all addresses are formatted consistently so when using the geographic information system, a lot of addresses did not correspond and were not reported.

Elizabeth described another issue. Properties in the Clean River Rewards Program were not shared with planners.

In sum, there were issues with data management.

Additionally, there was no regular inspection program for the private structures. 6% of properties were inspected on a regular basis; only some had the initial inspection. Single family residences were unlikely to be inspected. Commercial and multifamily properties were more likely to be inspected.

Overall 78% of properties were never inspected.

Because there were few inspections, people could claim they had a stormwater management system, but it was not checked.

There is a risk of overspending if benefits of private facilities are not accounted for in project planning.

The bureau uses field researchers to canvas neighborhoods looking for facilities manually. The bureau brought cases where the budget was reduced due to these efforts.

Private stormwater management facilities do have a significant impact on the total amount of managed stormwater.

The report indicates that if data management was improved, the bureau could rely on data systems and decrease reliance on staff to canvas sites.

Elizabeth referenced the recommendations of the report on page twelve. The bureau should develop a single information system and a risk-based program for structures not currently in the inspection program.

The program evaluation determined the bureau needs to evaluate maximizing efficiency by combining the two programs.

The auditors asked the bureau if they had assessed combining the two systems, but the bureau indicated they were unable to quantify the result of combining the systems at the city level.

There is also no information on the cost to the private sector.

The report looked at indicators to demonstrate how the system could be effective. They considered how changes in stormwater management impacted the volume of stormwater managed. Removing the requirement for permitting single family property storm structures would reduce areas that would trigger regulations. They could raise the threshold to reduce the number of permits. This would reduce the acreage of land required to be managed.

The report considered if the Clean River Rewards Program's goal of rate fairness was met. This was a stated reason to adopt the program. The auditors found that 86% of properties that had permitted stormwater systems were not participating in the rewards program.

Elizabeth referred to a chart about single family household bills discounted by the program. In the chart, red shows people who are managing stormwater but not enrolled in the rewards program. They appear to be worse off with the program because they are subsidizing the rate of people who are participating and paying extra because they are not enrolled.

The report found that outreach has a strong effect on participation in the program. After the first year, the bureau rolled back outreach and now does outreach with bill inserts and small mentions; there is not much outreach now. More than 50% of participants enrolled almost ten years ago in the program's first year. Approximately 15,000 ratepayers enrolled in the first year and about 1,500 enrolled each year since.

The bureau accepted the recommendations of the report. The bureau agreed to use the results of the evaluation to ensure the achievement of results.

Elizabeth asked if there were any questions.

Allan asked when the bureau will complete the recommendations.

Elizabeth said the auditor's office did not receive a timeline but will follow up in one year.

Michael Jordan said he agrees with the recommendations and has talked to PUB about resources to update data management. He said hopefully the bureau will have made progress on data management in the next year.

Mike added that beginning this fall there would be a comprehensive evaluation of rate structure.

He said that the bureau does not currently have the resources to monitor all the structures and the overwhelming number of structures not monitored are single family. He suggested the bureau could use a statistical sampling for inspections.

Mike said a program assessment is to be finished in 2020 and a rate evaluation ordinance will be brought to council in spring 2021.

Colleen asked about the process to sign up for single family structures and to clarify if the structures are permitted.

Elizabeth said the structures are not permitted.

Ana asked if rewards and permitting are integrated.

Elizabeth said that business services offices focused on billing. The permit program is spread throughout bureau and Development Services.

Ana asked about monitoring requirements and Elizabeth said that was handled by the bureau.

Mike W. asked Elizabeth to go over information on how they did their analysis.

Elizabeth said they used an estimate of how many properties were eligible. For example, they compared properties participating in the downspout program.

One issue is records are kept by property because there is not a unique identifier for the structures. They compared this to properties identified with accounts participating in rewards program.

Ana observed using a bigger area may be costing tax payers more money.

Elizabeth said they found the bureau sends staff to manually inspect some of the structures and this is not costing more money but could be done more efficiently.

Colleen cited the report's statement that stormwater management is required for private property developments that are 500-square-foot or larger. She noted that this is one of the lowest thresholds in the nation. Colleen asked why an increase is not recommended. Elizabeth said the bureau and auditor's office doesn't have the data to make a recommendation.

Mike J. directed Colleen to the charts on page nine that show work load versus managed area. Workload percentage is based on the number of permits. Most permits applied for are single family structures and little time is spent reviewing these permits. Multifamily and industrial sites are reviewed more in-depth. The bureau reviewed 9% of the total pervious area and seeks to manage the total volume for overall water quality. The bureau also uses information from experts at watershed services.

Colleen commented that the participation rate is low. She said it is similar to the low participation rate in the low-income assistance program. Colleen said it may be a structural issue within the city and elaborated that the city seems to be unable to connect people to programs that effect affordability and water quality.

Elizabeth said she sees problems when you must opt-in to a program. She said something to explore may be automatically making permitted structures eligible for clean water rewards. If the structures are regularly inspected there should be a way to automatically enroll. When data systems line up it may be possible to automatically enroll property owners.

Mike J. said the bureau needs an interface between the billing and permitting systems. He explained that billing data is managed by the Water Bureau, permits are managed by BDS and Revenue has a function, too.

Mike W. said it's possible to go beyond getting a return on money spent and there is an optimum spot in enrollment. He said he agrees with Colleen and the bureau should look at other demands as the situation progresses. He explained that looking at the demand side, 30% is a good participation rate with an opt-in system. He has learned that from looking at PGE. Depending on the program the saturation can occur at 40%.

Mike J. said the goal in the upcoming rate review is to find an optimum level in the returns.

Robert noted that the barriers apply in every program and they could be the same reasons for the perceived low participation rate. There will be issues, whether the program is going away or structures are degrading or there has not been enough attention to funding and having the program work. He asked if these are barriers or other factors. He asked if barriers will be evaluated.

Mike J. emphasized Mike W.'s point that there is an optimum enrollment level for the administration of programs. He deferred to Elizabeth on the causality and echoed that they cannot determine cause and effect.

Elizabeth said there is not data on the barriers and the auditor's office would like to see data on it. She went on to say there may be disproportionate impacts in vulnerable communities. She noted the high participation rate when members enrolled in the first year.

Robert observed that outreach has diminished and is no longer strong focus.

Elizabeth said one of the reasons they were not doing outreach is the Bureau thought the program was going away and that is documented.

Ana asked if the community would be involved during the rate evaluation process. Mike J. said at the front end the community will be engaged to determine values and expectations. Technical work with consultants begins this fall and there will be heavy involvement with council at the adopted phase.

Mike W. mentioned the problem of doing evaluations in house versus out of house. He asked if the evaluations would take place in house. Mike J. said the evaluations would be done by a third party.

Melissa asked about other audit work happening in the fall. Elizabeth said they were still auditing bureaus. Private Stormwater Management was the first report completed. Restoration and Green Streets is wrapping up this fall.

#### VI. **Filtration Board Discussion**

Allan recapped the filtration issue. At the August 7 PUB meeting, PWB provided an overview of the outreach activities and their alternative analysis for four components of the filtration project: procurement method, location, capacity, and treatment technology. PWB presented this information in a work session to City Council on August 14. Related ordinances will be part of the Council agenda on August 22 and there will be an opportunity for public comment at the time if PUB chooses to provide input. Melissa compiled comments and feedback from last session into a [discussion document](#).

Allan asked if members have any other observations or suggestions they'd like to add. Allan said PUB has an opportunity to provide these observations and suggestions to City Council next week with a formal letter, chair comments during public comment, or both. He said the board wouldn't meet again before then so if we chose a formal letter communication we'll follow a process similar to May when we sent a letter to the Mayor about commissioner assignments – members would agree on the substance of the letter today and vote to authorize Melissa to work with the chairs to put it in writing.

Dory asked how the letter worked in the past. Melissa explained that there would be a discussion to agree about the content and tone, and she would work with the chairs on the details. There would not be tracked changes and wordsmithing with the full board but they would be able to review the letter to confirm it reflects the agreed upon content before the letter is sent.

Mike motioned to send a letter. Colleen seconded.

Dory asked if the other option is testimony. Colleen has said they have also both sent a letter and gone to the council meeting.

Allan referred to cryptosporidium, saying that it appeared the favored option would be UV treatment but the board was concerned that UV was not robust enough to address other potential issues. The board recommended the city take more time to consider options. The follow up recommendation to go from UV treatment to filtration was backed by the board's comments.

Robert said this is not mandated in our bylaws and he supports any of the options. He noted both Colleen and Allan have spoken to council and he was confident they could speak in council or send letter or do both. He had comments about the content of the message to council.

Allan suggested a vote for the motion to send a letter. Colleen suggests voting on the letter and then deciding if they would also like a message spoken to council and that motion could happen separately. Robert amended his comment, saying he wanted to have co-chairs attend if they were invited to speak.

Colleen and Allan agreed with Robert.

The Board voted, all aye, no opposed, and no abstaining.

Allan invited Robert to comment on the content.

Robert attended the council work session where PWB presented the filtration preferred options and was impressed with Commissioner Fish. Fish had explained the Community Benefits Agreement needed executive oversight and review from the beginning to the end of two projects: filtration and the facility work at BES's treatment plants.

Rob said the mayor didn't oppose this idea and encouraged Fish's comments during the session.



Robert explained the Community Benefit Agreements which are in place for large construction projects. The program is designed to benefit some businesses: women-owned, minority, and emerging businesses. The program gives attention to businesses that have been historically underserved by contracting processes and businesses that may have the skill but not the funding. The Community Benefit Agreement levels the playing field in regards to equity and gives more people the opportunity to participate.

In the past, often the City has hired very large company and relied on subcontractors to provide diversity. That had resulted in some cases in historically disadvantaged groups ending up with clean-up tasks and the goal is to move underserved populations into skilled trade jobs.

Robert said using a Community Benefit Agreement is mainly to increase the participation of those historically underserved. The Agreement is untested but the standard of accepting the lowest bid is not in conflict. Robert cited Michael Jordan's comment that \$100-150 million in work will take place in the Columbia Treatment Plant. Robert supports Nick Fish's position that the community benefit program has executive level review and would like that included in the letter.

Ana asked what procurement's role in the process is and if the Community Benefit Agreement and procurement are related. She continued, saying if procurement is working with bureaus on the Community Benefit Agreement, what is the role of PUB. The bureaus are following rules, have a list, and are being directed. The PUB can ask for oversight but bureaus may already be asking for that as well.

Colleen clarified the role of PUB, saying they can include in the letter support for Commissioner Fish's comments.

Robert said that because of the newness of the Community Benefit Agreement, Commissioner Fish wants a higher-level review. For example, CAO Tom Rinehart could provide oversight on how the program is working as adopted. It is based on the scope and size of the project.

Community Benefit Agreement model is recently adopted and untested. Addressing it acknowledges PUB's connection to council and that PUB is engaged.

Allan reiterated what Robert said and supported it being included in the letter. Heidi said she agreed there should be a letter and that the letter should include Rob's addition.

Mike W. asked for more information. He agreed the support of Commissioner Fish's comments should be included in the letter but also wanted more content.

Allan referred Mike to the presentation.

Melissa said this is existing official city policy. She said the PUB may discuss CBA in a future agenda.

Dory said she agrees with Robert and made a motion to vote on getting a letter prepared by Melissa.

Colleen clarified the letter should add a statement saying PUB supports executive level oversight of CBA in this particular project.

Robert wanted more discussion on the four questions of filtration: procurement method, location, capacity, and treatment technology.

Colleen said she thinks the bureau did a thorough job and would like to provide a supportive recommendation to council.

Melissa said the preferred contracting method is coming to council and there are no action items at council at this time on the other components. The Board would have another opportunity in the future to respond to other council items.

Robert said he is comfortable with CM/GC.

Melissa suggested the members could use the discussion document she submitted as the core of the letter and add Colleen's comment on the Water Bureau's thorough process and Robert's addition that PUB supports Commissioner Fish's comments on executive oversight of the CBA.

Colleen said they had a motion to send the letter. She seconded the motion.

Colleen asked if there was public comment.

Community member Lorie McFarlane commented. She began by referencing last summer's cryptotoxin incident in January 2017. She asked when the public learns about cryptotoxin in the water. She said there is urgency to remove the toxins and urgency to control corrosion. She said there is a question of if corrosion control methods would prevent lead in the water. There is a separate treatment facility in the development schedule. She said there is a new twist on filtration and that dealing with lead with corrosion control methods is mentioned often in public presentations. She asked what the Water Bureau is doing to prevent lead exposure now and for the next nine years before filtration is completed. She mentioned a friend whose child has developmental disabilities. Another friend who is pregnant had excessive lead levels. She said the public doesn't know if the water provided is treated with optimal corrosion control. Expectant mothers and those with children who rely on tap water are the most vulnerable populations. She urged the City to adopt a free filters program for the most vulnerable until they meet the filtration goals. She cited lessons learned in other cities. She said looking at blood lead levels in kids already exposed is using the children in research inappropriately. The City should look at water levels of heavy metals. She emphasized that pregnant women and children deserve better care.

Colleen motioned to submit the letter to City Council prior to August 22<sup>nd</sup> and she and Allan will be present at the meeting to speak in the public comment portion of the meeting.

All aye, no abstaining.

Melissa said she would send the draft of the letter by Friday morning.

Robert added that he would also like to see a presentation on the Community Benefit Agreement. He went on to say that PUB should be informed on other equity components in the City such as the Office of Equity and Human Rights equity trainings.

Robert suggested OEHR attend a PUB meeting to provide discussion on equity and that the PUB should have more broad discussion on equity aspects of board service.

Rob motioned to have Melissa put together meeting on equity issues.

No public comment.

All aye.

VII. **Board Development, Mary Forst, Confluence Center for Mediation and Training**

Colleen re-introduced Mary Forst and explained that the facilitator is here to discuss board dynamics.

Mary said a good starting place was discussing the board's purpose. She framed the discussion, saying the board was revisiting its purpose after three years of work and after the founding documents were written. She asked the members to consider what the purpose means to them and to talk about their disagreements and listen for areas of commonality. Ideas Mary asked members to consider were how they work together, including effectiveness and barriers.

The group discussion began. Mary prompted the Board to state their understanding of the group's purpose.

Colleen said she looked at the Blue-Ribbon Commission Report. PUB was established based on the recommendation in the report. Colleen said she was comparing the existing by-laws to the Blue Ribbon Committee Report. The committee used the word oversight over 60 times in the 25-page document. The main purpose of the committee is to provide citizen oversight and accountability. The Board is the voice of the community, an advocate for citizens, tasked with asking critical questions, analyzing bureau decisions, and the policies they bring forward.

Allan said in addition to financial review, the PUB must balance the needs of community members with bureau needs. Mike W. said he includes balancing the city's needs with bureau requirements to ensure the long-term capabilities of the system. Mary asked what the group would be doing to support that goal. Allan said they would look at financial requests and what the bureaus are offering, and keep the goal of delivering high-quality water, balanced with needs of the community.

Mary echoed and emphasized the phrase "the needs of the community."

Allan spoke about balancing the need to provide high-quality water and quality treatment with assets available for the future and need to protect the infrastructure.

Heidi agreed with and built on what Allan said. She said there was a need to listen to customers and understand customers' needs. The PUB should balance the legal mandates of the bureaus and the mandates of serving customers. To balance those mandates the PUB must be among

community members and ask questions. They must be present and curious at PUB meetings so they can be knowledgeable about the bureaus.

Ana said the PUB needs to be aware of the needs of the community so that information can be communicated to bureaus. The PUB members must bring their expertise. One function of the PUB is to have difficult conversations and be real.

Dory said the PUB should stay current, share when there are blind spots, educate themselves, and bring people in to fill in gaps so the PUB is not antiquated and can be nimble. They need to listen to be sure they can hear.

Ana said she hears Allan and others talking about citizens, but she uses the word community. Some community-members are not citizens or property owners. Colleen said this was also an important goal for Commissioner Amanda Fritz.

Dory asked if PUB can change their language to not use the word citizen.

Robert suggested using the word customers.

Melissa added the board cannot change city ordinance language, but she has been adopting communications to use the words community and community member. The Board can adopt that language in their communications.

Robert said the majority of the issues in the discussion are in the ten stated values and asked how they should prioritize the values. The values are the expectations and are not negotiable. The PUB needs to talk about affordability, equity, system reliability, and consider what the priorities are. Every value should be revisited and the PUB should consider how they approach the value. If one priority is disproportionately favored, the ten values are at risk. The PUB's efforts will not be successful if they have a singular focus. He said some items should not be in the ten values.

Allan supports Robert's ideas. He said if the bureaus were communicating more effectively in the past the PUB may not exist. Allan compared Portland's communications to communication in Denver's water bureau, saying Denver's communication was more effective. Allan added he did not see an educational purpose of the PUB, that was a function of the bureaus and not the board.

Mary asked if Allan was suggesting additional purposes to ask Council to add to the PUB.

Allan said he wants bureaus to communicate better.

Melissa said education is not a specified component or purpose of the PUB. She added there may be some educational scope in communicating with other groups. But there is no educational role stated in the ordinance. Providing comment to the Council on the bureau's communications to the public could fit within its oversight role.

Mary said asked clarifying questions: Is education entirely outside of the PUB's purpose? Has the PUB educated the community? Should education be included in the statement of purpose?

Robert said the Board has not worked to narrow their focus and he rejected a move to do so. Engagement with bureaus is the most important aspect; board members are meant to be present in communicatory role but not as advocates.

Allan said he went to five neighborhood meetings to represent the PUB. At the meetings, people were repeatedly suggested the bureaus should talk to the community more proactively and should not approach the community after a decision has already been made.

Ana echoed Allan's comments, saying a purpose of the PUB would be to suggest to bureaus to communicate more effectively and proactively with the community.

Colleen distinguished between the PUB's purpose and how they carry out the purpose. How the PUB carries out the purpose is about public engagement and is how they do what they should be doing. She agreed with Robert that part of the tension when having budget discussions is about the ten values under which one can justify anything. When looking at the budget and having ten values there is not much guidance. She mentioned narrowing the values and considering naming the top three or four values. This would answer the question of the purpose of the PUB and get to the "what" not "how."

Mary asked if Colleen to expand. She asked how bureaus are presenting information and if the PUB can consider this in terms of accountability and purpose. Mary observed they may be seeing the disconnect in oversight that led to the need for the PUB in the first place.

Dory said she agrees with Colleen and there was a potential to embody the PUB's values. Dory said she sees that happening in the next couple of years. She said community engagement is central and the PUB should be more visible in-person and online and should lead by example. Dory asked if goals and priorities are to ask good questions about how the bureaus are engaging the community. She said many people have worked in organizations where someone sends a survey with good questions but the survey may not reach the right audience or the questions may be too vague. She mentioned the survey the bureau sent about Bull Run, saying people will blindly answer unless they know a lot about what the watershed does. She said it was a question of engaging the right people. Dory said she and Ana went to an equity training and said organizations can pour money into wrong solutions and can continue getting the same results.

Mary asked if members had anything else to add in terms of the purpose of the group.

Allan said he would send the questions to Ted, Mike, Scott, and Lee to see what they think. He said he would like to expand on the critical questions to bureaus.

Mary observed that PUB receives reports from a lot of people and not just the bureaus.

Allan said a subportion of accountability is asking critical question of bureaus.

Robert said the purpose of the bureau is to deliver high quality water and sewer service. Mary asked how Robert would state the role of the Board in supporting the Bureau's delivery of high quality water and sewer service.

Robert said resiliency, regulatory compliance, and applying the stated values. The PUB's input is based around all ten values. The water and sewer service delivery is a critical function of the bureau and is not a purpose of the PUB; rather it is a value and focus.

Colleen said she agrees with Robert and says it speaks to the purpose is the values. She said there is a tension between affordability and issues of treatment, quality of water. She said the city could pour tons of money into projects and incrementally increase the quality of the water and increase the cost. The purpose of the PUB is, thorough oversight and accountability, finding the place where rates are affordable and water quality is high.

Robert said they were in agreement.

Dory said the bureaus need to prioritize making high quality water available.

Rob reflected the constituents desire for high-quality water. He said Portlanders have a significant amount of people who enjoy drinking the tap water and living in a place where that's possible.

Allan said the purpose of the board is to make recommendations to council to make high-quality water affordable. The Board must find a way to support cost effective decisions as well.

Robert said it's not comfortable to be in community discussions saying people can't have high-quality water because people don't want to pay for it. People also do not want degraded quality.

Mary said now the Board is prioritizing values.

Heidi said Robert is saying this is about not just rates but about clean, safe water. She wondered if the choice of meeting locations may be a reason they are not hearing more about rates. She also said the engagement may be happening in a vacuum. The job of PUB is to find out how important affordability is.

Colleen asked if it was possible to ask Mary to come back and help PUB with a value matrix.

Robert said he agreed Mary should come back a that PUB should operate at the highest level possible.

Robert left at 1:15 PM.

Colleen asked if the consensus was to have to have Mary come back.

Allan said in the past rates had risen more than 10%. The function of the Board is to search through the budget and find areas of give and take and have conversations with both bureau directors.

Dory mentioned Lorie, the community member who gave public comment. The community member brought up corrosion control and she has spoken in past. The Water Bureau has communicated about those issues.

Colleen said the information was on a communication called, "[Seven Things to Know About the Bull Run Project](#)." This communication mentions the difference between filtration and corrosion control. This issue is also related to the audit report. Portland doesn't do a good job getting information to the community. This has been a repeated theme in other areas.

Mary commented that in her discussion with Rob, he said the bureaus have difficulty assigning budget to public outreach and messaging.

Ana said it was a question of staffing. She said there will not be enough people to work in these programs and the City relies on volunteers to go out to communities and bring awareness.

Allan mentioned at his experience in Denver. Their water bureau had ads on television. The water was separate, and the community loved the water bureau. The survey result showed consistently high ratings. They improved the public perception after they were the focus of negative comments. Allan would like to see PWB and BES work together and do proactive communication.

#### VIII. Board Meeting Agendas

Colleen previewed the upcoming agenda for the next board meeting.

September 4, 2018

Location: World Trade Center Training Room

4pm Board Meeting

Agenda: Stormwater Fees, City Budget Process, Capital Update, BMP Preview, City Plans, 101

Last winter the issue of Stormwater fees came to the forefront after an Administrative Review Committee about the allocation of offsite stormwater fees and overwater impervious structures. PUB tried a few options to schedule a briefing on the item but held off once the bureau canceled the subsequent council consideration as they realized they needed to do more work. Melissa circulated a memo from Director Jordan to Commissioner Fish about a proposed solution last month. PUB has asked the bureau to brief PUB and answer member questions at the September 4 meeting.

Melissa explained there would be other details covered at the September 4 meeting, including the capital updates and the Budget Monitoring Process (BMP), which is an exercise bureau go through when doing budget adjustments. Dawn and Gabe will also be presenting an introduction to Citywide plans and how they affect bureaus once they are adopted. Claudio Campuzano, City Budget Office Interim Director, is to provide a preview of changes to the city budget process.

Colleen mentioned that Dory was working with Melissa to schedule meeting in Lents and Foster Flood Plain. There is a scheduled tour of the Bull Run Watershed on November 8.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 PM.

--DRAFT--