

Portland Utility Board

October 2, 2018 4pm -6pm
Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant
5001 N Columbia Blvd, Portland, OR 97203

Meeting #53

Attendees:

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

Absent:

* Lee Moore
* Van Le, ex officio
* Dan Peterson
Scott Robinson

*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

Staff: Dawn Uchiyama (Deputy Director, Bureau of Environmental Services)
Steve Behrndt (Wastewater Operations Group Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services)
Paul Suto (Principal Engineer, Bureau of Environmental Services)
Jonas Biery (Business Services Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services)
Cristina Neves (Representative, Commissioner Fritz's Office)
Jamie Dunphy (Representative, Commissioner Fish's Office)
Melissa Merrell (Principal Analyst, City Budget Office)
Shannon Fairchild (Senior Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)
Alexandra Martin (Executive Assistant, City Budget Office)

Public: Mary Forst, Confluence Center for Mediation and Training

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 for the benefit and on behalf of the community of Portland.

He gave an overview of the [agenda](#) which included a continuation of the board development discussion and a briefing on the facility plants for BES' treatment plants.

Allan noted the sign-up sheet for public comment.

II. Prior Meeting Minutes

Allan asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the September 20 meeting. There were no changes and the [minutes](#) were accepted as submitted.

III. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

IV. Disclosure of Communications

Ted has regular communication with bureaus, including BES, related to non-profit volunteer or work for Depave.

Rob has regular communication with commissioners, bureau directors, and bureau staff about labor subjects.

Allan and Colleen met with both Commissioners Fish and Commissioner Fritz since the last board meeting.

They talked about the purpose of the PUB and what value the board brings to City discourse.

Commissioner Fish said he thought it was most valuable for PUB to continue doing the things it has been doing:

- o Scrubbing budget requests to see if they make sense
- o Questioning whether requests for new staff seem appropriate in the sense of why now and the scope of program work
- o Advocating for certain policy issues

Commissioner Fritz said she appreciates the work and expertise of PUB, she has read their correspondence, and she hopes to come to a future board meeting.

Commissioner Fritz's priorities are sustainable systems and advancing equity goals. She is very interested in filtration. She talked specifically about a Town Hall on November 8. Allan and Colleen offered to be partners in that work. Melissa noted this is the same day as the field visit to Bull Run. Heidi asked if the meeting was in the evening. Cristina from Commissioner Fritz's office said the meeting would be held at IRCO at 6pm.

Micah told the other PUB members that he was asked to speak at a meeting of the Portland Harbor Community Coalition and took information about the Low Income Assistance Programs.

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

Colleen introduced Mary and said she would work through issues and values identified.

Mary reiterated that she would help the Board have a discussion about values, following up on their last conversation about purpose.

Mary asked members why they wanted to have the discussion and how they think it will help do their work.

Colleen said PUB has ten values that they identified in the last budget process. Those values are meant to be lenses through which they look at budget policy issues. She thought it would be valuable to have a prioritization of values. All the values are important but there are so many that they don't serve as helpful filters for making recommendations. Almost anything that could be put forward in the budget could be advocated for with one or more of the values.

Mary asked if Colleen saw the values as important but not helpful in making decisions.

Colleen said it would help making budget recommendations if they could identify three top priorities. This would help them have a consensus when forced; some values could take precedence.

Mary rephrased Colleen's comment: there are too many values to help make choices if all values are equally important.

Ted said it depends on what they are talking about. For some issues, only some of the values will come into play. Not every decision will require balancing all ten values. Ted said it depends on context.

Allan suggested an activity where members put colored dots to see the group's priorities.

Ted said that may help but it depends on what they are talking about. He said doing an overarching prioritization doesn't seem helpful.

Allan asked if the values are related to the purpose. Mary asked what he thinks. Allan said yes, they are related. PUB uses the values to focus on issues and to give recommendations to Council.

Allan said at the last meeting someone said the purpose is what and the values are the how.

Mary said Ted is saying that for any given topic the values will whittle themselves down to three or four.

Rob agrees with Ted and said there wasn't value in prioritizing. He said they will not be able to rank them and that speaks to why they are on PUB. There is a rightful prioritization of diverse voices on board. He would not like to rank the values and thinks it is better to assess choices on

a case by case basis. He is willing to participate if it serves the board to prioritize the values but it will be difficult and will not serve the purpose of PUB.

Ted asked Colleen if she was interested in ranking the values mainly in the context of annual budget decisions.

Colleen said yes, it is related to making budget decisions. She said the budget discussion last year would have been more focused with more consensus if there was a sense of what the board as a whole views as most important. She said it might be that everyone would have a different set of four but they could participate in an activity to see which rise to the top.

Mary restated what Colleen said, Colleen would like to focus on prioritizing values in the budget context.

Heidi agreed with Ted, and said it is contextual, and if they use ranked values and have the same lenses they will lose what PUB is here for which is issue spotting and learning about different perspectives on issues.

Mary said she hears an acknowledgment of the tension in the values and the different points of view of PUB and that that's valuable. Some members would see ranking the values as damaging rather than serving the purpose.

Mary suggested members talk about the budget and what several values are most important.

Mike said he understands where others are coming from about why ranking may be difficult and unnecessary.

Dory said it would be helpful to have strong definitions tied to values. She thought affordability and equity were married and in the same family. But in a previous meeting a board member had described how they see equity with a racial lens. Affordability applies to all community members in Portland. Having working definitions for each value and what they mean to the group would help them have a clearer understanding.

Rob also questioned the talking about the values when they are generally outcomes. Some are non-negotiable. For example, public health and meeting regulatory requirements are not negotiable. It is not an option for the bureaus, they must comply. PUB and the bureaus cannot weigh delivering mandatory outcomes when considering program decisions. It doesn't matter if PUB values regulatory compliance or if it is included as one of our values. It is an outcome that must occur.

Mary asked if some values, such as regulatory compliance and public health, were given requirements and don't belong on the list of values. Rob said yes, if bureaus are not delivering on those requirements they must figure out how to do so.

Allan said the values like regulatory compliance and public health aren't black and white. He cited the Water Bureau's negotiations with OHA. Related to the Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant, some operations are within regulatory areas and some are

negotiable areas. PUB and the bureaus must consider each issue. Another example is determining timeframes and extent of regulatory efforts.

Ted agreed with Allan. BES has made decisions in certain areas to get programs up to speed to get in better negotiating position. They need to consider how much they are willing to invest to get resources.

Dory asked if that is something PUB has control over. Council and bureaus come to PUB for input but isn't this for them to decide. She said she was trying to understand how much weight PUB's recommendations holds.

Mary asked Dory if she was asking that because it would affect the values?

Dory said yes and explained that some of the values are embedded in the mission of all bureaus. She said she didn't know if PUB shares responsibility.

Allan commented that PUB is here for the benefit of community members and are their surrogate voice. Their role is to discuss issues, gather data, and make recommendations to council. We use our values to say we made certain decisions because they are under a value that we hold highly. From a budget point of view, some values are more important than others.

Dory asked how they would want to emphasize and measure the difference of having decisions pass through the board compared to the bureaus.

Mary wanted to run down the list of values and work on definitions, focusing on budget in the context of prioritizing values. This would enable to discussion, though it may not resolve the questions.

Dory said they could start with regulatory compliance. She noted at the City level, there may not be regulations. She thinks of compliance at the state level.

Mary said they could start with affordability. She asked the group how they define affordability.

Mike it was difficult to elicit definitions in a group context, though it was a good idea. He said a more efficient way to work on definitions would be to have couple of people put together definitions to have something to react to.

Mary said she heard Dory say it would be helpful to hear people's thoughts in the spirit of discussion and finding discrepancies. She said this may not be important once you talk about the values.

Ted said that having a process similar to how they assessed decision packages could be helpful. They could have a discussion, go home, rank and reflect on packages, and come back together to continue the discussion. He valued having a meeting before the final meeting where they all can hear about which values they associate with the decisions. He thinks it will be helpful to move towards having more conversation about values within the budget process. It was good to read ahead and share how they are thinking and then separately rank them.

Mary asked how they would improve this. Ted said they could think ahead more and discuss more before individually ranking them.

Mike said his comment was focused on the way the group will spend time.

Ted agreed it was not useful use of time.

Dory said she agreed and was hoping for a better understanding. Dory said she would like to know more about what her peers are thinking. She doubted they would be able to get through ten values but they could have the dynamic Ted spoke about. She wanted to know more about what their involvement in the budget process looks like.

Colleen said the BMP is a precursor to what will happen when they get to the annual budget process. There are new phrases, decision packages will likely be gone and instead there will be program offers and they don't know exactly what that means yet. Tensions exist between program offers and the fact that they can't afford everything. There are limited resources and PUB and the bureaus must make choices. In the past they have spent time making the choice to support adding FTEs and or recommending packages. The choices are determined by the values they have. Having a prioritization of values makes easier to make those choices. If one is going to choose between a and b, having an understanding of the value to the group as a whole would be good.

Dory said she went to an emerging manager training. There was a list of behaviors and attributes the City values in a good leader. The training had everyone rank the values by placing check marks next to the values to tally and rank. Dory suggested doing this activity. It would be fast to add their check marks and instead of having to talk about each one they would simply note what gets the most checks. That would help with prioritization. She agrees with Ted that a natural filter emerges from each issue.

Allan said he would like to move the conversation forward and noted they have 35 minutes. He said his lens was coming from an advisory board that has community benefit at the focus. They need to work to be sure people have access to services of the two bureaus. They should look at the efficiency of operations and the value. They also need to consider public health and watershed health. Assistance to low-income customers is about programs and ensuring programs are effectively serving all citizens. He noted the use of language about who PUB serves. He thinks of the people PUB benefits as residents. For watershed, he thinks of Bull Run which is gravity-fed. There are also other infrastructure areas, such as combined sewer overflow and treatment plants. When they have conversations about program offers and how to determine best choices with limited dollars to be sure systems run efficiently. The bureaus should continue to repair and ensure facilities function. Compliance is an issue that may offer a range of choices based on timing. Some may see equity and affordability as separated by a bright line but he sees them as related. For service resiliency, PUB should think of how they focus on future event with catastrophic impacts to the city and plan to react well. They should ask for better engagement between the PWB and BES; the bureaus should communicate much better than they have in the past.

Dory said there were a lot of differences in her definitions. The last one is transparency and public engagement. PUB's responsibility is to be transparent and raise visibility in the

community. That is extra layer of what PUB should do and not just what the bureaus should do. There is also an element of advocacy that the board serves and that is part of transparency. Their role is advocacy for all residents in Portland, for their access to affordable rates in utility bills, efficiency of operations. She has a broader definition than Rob. Dory said Ted mentioned public health while Rob's definition was broader.

Allan said his intent was to be broad as well. He agrees with comments on public engagement and said Commissioner Fritz will bring power to the opportunity.

Dory wanted to see how everyone was thinking and see if members were aligned around the same goals.

Mary asked others to chime in. Other people want to know what others are thinking about in terms of values.

Heidi said she views public health as separate and different than watershed health; she said they should not necessarily link them. There may be occasions where they might need to opt for public health above watershed health. That stands out. Heidi clarified she wasn't saying that watershed health shouldn't be on the list but that they shouldn't be thought of together. She noted accessibility applies in many different ways and that isn't not on the list. She was curious if access to resources is different than affordability. She said a person may have access but that doesn't mean it's affordable. She wanted to know where access fits. She associates it with affordability but it may apply elsewhere.

Mary said Allan had mentioned affordability and that all customers have access. Affordability should not be a bar to access.

Colleen said one way of thinking is the role of access in affordability, equity, and assistance to low-income residents. She said she imagines looking at Venn diagram; they cross over. Affordability has to do with rates and in looking at those rates PUB needs to consider income, the rate of growth of those utility rates, and keep that in relation to rate of growth of wages, incomes, inflation so they have a sense of how rates are growing in general compared to rates in the general economy. When looking at the rate of growth of the utility rates they need to ensure that there is program assistance for people who struggle with being able to afford rates. That's the low-income piece. They need to look at how those rates are distributed across various demographics.

Mary restated Colleen's comment; if rates are increasing faster than other measures in society PUB may be interested in maximizing programs to support people. She asked for other thoughts about how the other values go together.

Ana said looking at the values, from public health to system resiliency, some are requirements for the bureaus and some are part of the strategic plan. They are already goals for the bureaus. Affordability is affected by income in this context and not removal of barriers to service delivery. She would like the board to rank values in context of the public. They also need to consider what the bureaus are trying to achieve, the goals of the bureaus, and their strategic plan. PUB is evaluating the programs and giving advice to the community, commissioners, and the mayor and we need to consider the goals of the bureaus and what to help them with.

Mary said it sounds like some members are not sure how the equity concept applies.

Vera said access to services is related to equity.

Micah said access and removal of barriers are related to equity. He highlighted the difference between equity and equality. Equity requires looking to the past and inequalities that have existed and how to right wrongs. Equality means treating everyone the same while equity addresses how to strategically focus efforts and packages to address needs.

Mary asked how this is specifically related to water and sewer services.

Allan noted Commissioner Fritz will bring a significant amount of interest in the equity side. He also noted significant developments in the water bureau and that equity is a strong focus. He said the PUB should expect to see more.

Dory said what helps her when comparing equality and equity was a very helpful visual aid. Three people of different heights are looking over a fence gate. Equality would give each person the same box to stand on; some still would not be able to see over the gate. Equity means making sure everyone can see over the gate, however many boxes are required. She was reminded of race in particular with that analogy. But the analogy includes other disenfranchised groups, including speakers of languages other than English. This is related to outreach goals to help others understand the issues. PUB members can help bureaus prioritize language barriers and outreach to disenfranchised communities. She noted a connection between equity goals and her lived experience.

Allan said this comes back to access. And echoed the notion that one size doesn't fit all. PUB is looking for what they can do to help the City make the right decisions.

Mary said it's not just about affordability and access, it is also about transparency and PUB engagement.

Dory said there should be buy-in or completeness. She has reservations about doing this work while some PUB members are not here.

Ted said part of process was to get on same page; he was thinking about examples of different interpretations of affordability, which definitely changed after discussions with Mike. New understandings are the product of ongoing conversations. Mike's point on how assistance to low-income community members is not perfect, there are barriers to find out about programs. Affordability should apply to all residents and customers, there should be a special look at people falling through the cracks who are not able to have low-income assistance. It is an ongoing process get to what the values mean.

Mary said she heard Ted say it is useful to define the values and he wants to make it more part of a process. She asked members to say more about how to build it into a process.

Rob said it is always budget season in Portland. In the Board there is a bias or tendency to manage FTEs over programs. He asked what it will look like when they are asked to say yes or no

to programs which will state this is the deliverable and this is the cost. In the past, the letters of recommendation to Council required exhaustive deliberation. They went through around 40 FTEs. They discussed every FTE and there was a motion to approve everything. This process distilled the Board to management level decision-making about staffing. He felt this was not essential to bureaus or to PUB's mission and values. He wondered how values will affect how we make decisions on program offers. He think the problem of focusing on staffing will solve itself with the way CBO are changing the budget process.

Colleen said she hopes the new budget process will make this easier. She hopes a simple yes or no will suffice. But they need to look at the issues from multiple perspectives. This discussion is important because there are limited resources and some choices will have to be made. If there are 22 program offers, they are not doing their job if they say yes to all of them without review, questions, and scrutiny. All programs are worth while. PUB needs to weigh the cost and benefit of each of the 22 programs and try to decide hwo they will define their recommendation to Council.

Mary said a question is what role your discussion on PUB's values has brought to decision making and how can you incorporate values in making those choices.

Robert said what he is hearing is there is not enough to go around and we must cut. There will be cuts because there must be cuts, even if programs should exist. He thinks its ok to rubber stamp everything if all are valuable.

Colleen said PUB has never advocated cutting programs, people, or budgets. They have debated the rate of increase for utility rates, how quickly FTEs are onboarded, whether or not three or one FTE should be hired. There is a big difference between slowing the rate of increase and actually cutting. No one has advocated cutting. Terminality is different and carries the emotion that they are tying to cut jobs or programs or harm institutions. That is not a fair way to put it.

Robert agrees that they are not talking about people losing jobs or programs like sustainability going away. They sometimes propose unworkable solutions. He noted the Executive Director position Gabe holds. The Board recommended having the same person do two complex jobs, GPS mapping and being an administrative assistant.

[Melissa was asked for clarification after the meeting. PWB's FY 2017-18 request included 5 FTE including one for records management and one for administrative support for the deputy director position. The positions requested were management analyst and an administrative assistance; neither were technical or GISmapping in nature. At the same time, the bureau was carrying about 20 vacancies.

From the March 7, 2017 Notes:

PUB concurs with the City Budget Office recommendations for Water (which did not recommend the records management positons) with the additional consideration that the records management request should be considered within the scope of the Deputy Director's office to signal the importance of Bureau-wide records management and that it could be considered as part of the role of the administrative support for the deputy to minimize the ongoing rate impact of additional staff costs.

Eight members voted to support the statement and one voted to oppose.]

Ted agreed with Rob. The Mayor and Commissioners-in-charge keep the rate of increase to 4-5%, PUB can make recommendations within that framework, but also imagine a world where they see beyond that. They are just an advisory body; they make recommendations to the Mayor and commissioners. They can be independent of the guidance. If they feel a need at either of the two bureaus and there is a mandate to limit the rate of increase, it is not outside of the realm of possibility to diminish the increases that PUB says to the Mayor start exploring new sources of revenue for these two bureaus. They are just an advisory body and their word is not the end.

Mary asked if they are advocating for more creativity.

Ted said yes and for more independence.

Dory asked when do they get to evaluate the budget. Colleen said December and January. Melissa will send PUB the schedule of when things are coming out.

Dory said she had a comment about regulatory compliance and environmental stewardship. She expects bureaus will do their due diligence. She doubt something will be missing and noted the background for that value is stronger in bureaus than at PUB.

Mary asked for comments on what PUB is taking from the discussion.

Micah said vocalizing is important to dig deeper in explaining themselves and their positions.

Dory said staying connected to the same values is important as is bringing something unique to the table.

Mary said Colleen and Allan expressed a desire about how values can apply in program offers in a more robust way.

Robert said he learned he doesn't need to have the same definition of the values and differences in values will bring strength to the board.

Mike said most of the time, PUB is respectful about different thoughts, different backgrounds. A couple of times he has seen tension and that's natural and expected on a Board.

Allan said it was time to wrap up due to time.

VI. BES Treatment Plant Facility Plans Paul Suto, Principal Engineer, Bureau of Environmental Services

Paul said he had two slide decks to go through, one for Columbia Boulevard and one for Tryon.

He said it may be more detail than what PUB needs but the goal is giving them background.

He said the Columbia plant is in a mid-cycle update. The work is done on a five-year permit cycle with DEQ. PUB was able to see a little bit of the plant at the tour. He referred to his [slides](#) and said they can see size in the map. On average, it is the largest treatment plant in the state. He noted some property is reserved for future need. Before when they had rain it was enough to cause overflow. That was 20 plus years ago. There was on average 96 calendar days of overflow. Now there are three to five events per year. It is a 95% reduction.

Allan asked if it was still within regulation. Paul said yes. In 1994, BES laid out the cornerstone of the reduction, connecting downspouts and created a plan for both the Columbia Slough and the Willamette River. The slough is smaller and has more water quality issues. It is almost 100% controlled. The Willamette would be about 95% controlled for about \$50 million of investment in the CSO tunnels. (This is half the cost of getting to almost 100% control.)

Micah asked him to talk about the decision to go one level down, about the green infrastructure, and the overall cost. Paul said adding more green infrastructure reduced Inflow and Infiltration that typically increases flow to the treatment plants with stormwater.

Allan asked what percentage of green infrastructure has reduced.

Ted observed that regulators agreed to the lower investment because of the agreement to invest in green infrastructure.

Paul showed a graphic of the increased flow directly to CBWTP after CSO projects were on line. He said in 2006 they finished the westside, in 2012 they finished the eastside. A lot of improvements were related to captured CSO moved at the plant.

In 1995 they added two digesters on the west side. They didn't know how many they needed; the idea was they needed as much as they can fit. That is not a good way to regulatory needs.

He noted the road with multiple tunnels and clarifiers. In the 2016 update, they took a step back and decided to focus on the core campus and add more clarifiers and look at the water quality.

He said the plant operations are complex. He explained the flow on an average day. During dry weather the plant receives about 70 mgd (million gallon per day) and can reach more than 200 MGD during wet weather. Paul showed illustrations of plant operations in both scenarios.

He then talked about the alternatives that were considered to meet DEQ permit requirements for secondary treatment. Alternatives include baseline, looking at west properties, and adding clarifiers. There are two alternatives on the main campus with slight differences.

This is an overview and they are doing process improvement at the plant. Scoring criteria was used. This involves resiliency and reliability about current assets and future assets. They didn't score the existing plant in the rankings.

Colleen asked what is on the vertical axis, the total points. Paul said it's the total points based on criteria in the key. The second table shows score and NPV.

C is low scoring option, with lower cost and higher risk. It turned out to be not constructible, they would have to add additional wet weather clarifiers and this was not built into the cost.

They ended up with a road map of improvements that include clearing the current composter area, adding 2 proposed clarifiers, improving tunnels, addressing reliability needs, improving biosolids processing, and work on the aeration basins. They focused on programs with DEQ and created a list of projects. The number was provided this year. It includes rehabbing the basins and clarifiers, upgrading buildings, work screening upgraders, upgrades to facilities buildings. They created an implementation plan. There is an annual base reinvestment considering the lagoons and the number of projects. The end product is a reinvented process.

He referred to an image of the tunnels. He said the piping is part of biological process and there is electrical equipment down there. They need to move that out of underground area. It should be above ground since it is a safety hazard for employees and there is a risk of an outage.

There are more minor upgrades like boilers for heating. They need to be sized correctly. They are oversized now. They are planning a better solution for biosolids, replacing aging equipment and making seismic upgrades.

There is a roadmap for development with DEQ and the EPA to meet the 2024 deadline. In the existing MOA there are some facilities to relocate on site. The plans go through the engineering teams. They have until December 2024. He referred to the overall schedule.

He asked for questions.

Allan asked about the biosolids projects impact on other projects. Paul asked if he meant the interim biosolids projects. Allan said yes.

Paul said the request for the biosolids interim projects will buy time until other improvements are in place. They will be getting modernized equipment and a wider range of capacity They can manage it so they can have annual net zero accumulation.

Allan referenced the external contract for the biosolids lagoon. Paul said they are hiring a contractor to dredge the lagoon and with mobile equipment they are processing in parallel.

Allan said to ship the biosolids to east Oregon. Paul said yes.

He started the presentation on Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. Tryon is 1/10 size of Columbia Boulevard. The have not done much. It is operating efficiently but it dated.

Paul asked if PUB has taken a tour of Tryon. Melissa said they have not.

Paul said there have not been major upgrades since the early 2000s. The last expansion was 1996.

The City of Portland owns the facility, flow from Lake Oswego comprises 2/3 of the dry weather flow. Portland owns and operates and Lake Oswego uses complex accounting to pay Portland back. The overall population served is 50,000.

Paul referred to the map and pointed out the Willamette and Highway 43.

There is an existing project to modify existing primary clarifiers, create new solids handling and load out areas, work on border control, expanding the aeration base when there is a nutrient need, and secondary clarifiers.

Paul went through the timeline for improvements. He said the third clarifier is further out, he noted the detailed roadmap and visual to show when the planning efforts will develop. He said they have tried to be good neighbors. The idea is to expand the plant and reduce reliance on pumping.

Allan asked is there was any chance Lake Oswego would repurpose the land. Paul asked if Allan meant if the treatment plant were no longer there. Lake Oswego is currently exploring a small footprint plant option in the area, based on other developmental opportunities in land there.

Allan asked if they will know something in the next two years. Paul said they are now working on an IGA. They need to develop the concept more. They are only at the concept stage and they need more cost certainty.

Allan asked what the time frame for Tryon is. Paul said the original schedule was five years and they are two years in. They will likely get the most important pieces in place in three to four years. It is an aged plant, and needs reliability improvements. It will be 15-20 years for the full roadmap of improvements.

Once headworks is completed, then disinfection and aeration improvements will happen. The timeframe for all the work is 15-20 years.

Micah asked how big the greenway buffer is. Paul pointed out the greenway on the map. Steve noted it is at least 100 feet. Paul said it acts as a natural resources buffer. Steve said the City partnered with Metro to purchase land to leave as green space.

Micah asked about the plan to purchase land. Paul said they are asking that this area be expanded to meet nutrient program performance. Steve noted the buffer is desired when facilities are close to residential and commercial development.

Micah said this is part of the South Reach.

Rob asked about repurposing the Lake Oswego plant and said they must find a place to put 2/3 of the cake. They need to find out where the City of Portland wants to put it. He referred to the map. Rob asked if Lake Oswego is considering an independent facility. Paul said it's a P3 arrangement which could include BES operating and maintaining the facility.

Allan asked how much of the planned work would continue before there was a clear decision from Lake Oswego. Paul said part of the conversation was how far to go before the project is on pause.

Colleen asked what the history is and how did Portland come to own this treatment plant when it serves mostly Lake Oswego and is in Lake Oswego city limits. Paul said back when the plant was built in 1964 the flow was 50/50 . Portland changed that scenario when waste was sent to Columbia.

Steve noted the geography of the region. This is the bottom of the basin.

Colleen noted this is not owned jointly, even though it served 50/50 at first. Paul confirmed the City of Portland owns the land and the neighboring land. Steve said Portland sold land where Foothill Park is now but still owns other land.

Ted said Lake Oswego has a history of going on its own. They used to be a Water customer and are still trying to get a permit. They took Tigard away with consequences for the longterm financial wellbeing of the City. Ted wondered if Lake Oswego plans to go on their own with waste treatment. He asked if this been elevated to the level of electives. He said they are putting rate payers on the hook for something with huge financial consequences if they decide have their own plant.

Jamie said this has been discussed with Commissioner Fish and the Lake Oswego City Manager.

Ted asked if the City has spoken to DEQ and regulators at the state. Paul said a meeting is coming up with just Lake Oswego and the City of Portland. It was reschedule for a couple of weeks from the October 2 meeting. Paul noted he was concerned as well.

Colleen said, following up on what Ted said, is the future discussion being elevated to electeds. Is this a policy issue that PUB can weigh in on. She asked if they were being told about the plans with no option to voice concerns.

Paul said he thinks, yes PUB can weigh in on. He said they don't know the exact cost impacts. He heard it will cost less from planners but doesn't believe it will cost less. They are revisiting some numbers.

Colleen said they need to consider this under the umbrella of being concerned about the Portland rate payer.

Paul referred to the map and pointed out the circular clarifiers. He noted the influent pump station needs upgrades. They need to work on electrical reliability. Backup electricity is needed, as is backup power, and a water line.

Allan asked if they have generators. Paul said yes. Tryon Creek interceptor is there. They are trying to get a tunnel in and to get a southern line in. They considered eliminating the effluent pump station to go with gravity and use less energy. There is a constructability issue and risk to changing.

Allan asked where this waste goes. He noted a portion of the biosolds are trucked to the Columbia Plant.

Paul said this all goes to the Willamette. It is all self-contained.

- VII. Upcoming Board Meeting Agendas
Colleen previewed the upcoming agenda for the next board meeting.

October 18, 2018
Location: PSU

Agenda: PWB Strategic Business Plan Update, CBO BMP Reviews and Recommendations,
Board Discussion

Upcoming meetings:

November 8 – Bull Run Watershed Onsite Tour – ALL DAY.

January 1 is the first Tuesday in January. Melissa has only heard from a few members on the preference for an alternate meeting date.

Thursday, January 3 from 11am -1:30pm or 4- 6:30pm or
Tuesday, January 8 from 11am -1:30pm or 4- 6:30pm.

Several members said the evening times on January 8 wouldn't work for them.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.