

TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY
POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE
ROCK CREEK WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY
3/18/04 6:30 – 8:30 P.M.

Draft Meeting Summary

Attendance:

Policy Steering Committee:

Kirk Andrews, Banks City Councilor
Jim Doane, Tualatin Valley Water District
Commissioner
Mark Eves, Lake Oswego Corporation
John Godsey, City of Hillsboro Utility
Commissioner (new committee
member, replaces Shirley Huffman
from City of Hillsboro)
Herb Hirst, City of North Plains Councilor
Brian Moore, Tigard City Councilor
Forrest Soth, City of Beaverton Councilor
Lee Weislogel, Sherwood City Councilor

Clean Water Services:

Jeanna Cernazanu, Public Involvement
Coordinator
Bill Gaffi, General Manager
Tom VanderPlaat, Water Resources
Program Manager

Partner and Agency Staff:

Rob Foster, City of Forest Grove
Kevin Hanway, City of Hillsboro
Dave Nelson, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
David Winship, City of Beaverton
Todd Heidgerken, Tualatin Valley Water
District

Consultant Staff:

Dan Heagerty, David Evans and Associates
Kristina McKenzie, David Evans and
Associates
Kristen Kibler, Jeanne Lawson Associates

Public Attendance:

See sign-in sheet

Welcome, Introductions

Brian Moore

Tom Brian was unable to attend the meeting. Brian Moore, Vice-Chair of the committee, led the agenda and called the meeting to order. New member, John Godsey, was introduced. He replaces Shirley Huffman on the committee. Committee members introduced themselves.

Approve Minutes of 9/25/03 and 12/10/03

Brian Moore

Past meeting minutes had not yet been approved. There was a motion and a second motion to approve minutes from 9/25/03. They were unanimously approved. There was a motion and a second motion to approve minutes from 12/10/03. The minutes were approved by everyone except Forrest Soth, who abstained from the decision because he had not attended the 12/10/03 meeting.

Update on Congressional Authorization/Funding Tom VanderPlaat

Tom VanderPlaat briefly explained that authorization for funding has not yet happened. There is some indication that Congress will authorize half of the funds in May and then the other half later. Provided at the meeting was a copy of a letter sent to Tom Brian from the Bureau of Reclamation regarding funding. Tom VanderPlaat encouraged anyone visiting Washington D.C. to deliver a packet of information about the project to congressional delegates. Clean Water Services had these information packets available. Commissioner Rogers recently visited Washington D.C. to request the funding. Tualatin Valley Water District will be going soon. Tom VanderPlaat said the project is a priority for Oregon delegates—Smith, Wyden, and Wu.

- Q:** If the partners front the money, can they get reimbursed by the federal government in the appropriations process?
- A:** Tom VanderPlaat responded by saying they would like to get credit or reimbursement for past investments, but it depends on how the legislation is written. The partners have already contributed a significant share.

Summary of Comments on Feasibility Study Executive Report

Jeanna Cernazanu reminded the group that at the last meeting they had extended an official public comment period prior to acceptance of the Feasibility Study Executive Report. A postcard was also sent out to the mailing list to advertise the comment period and almost 300 stakeholders received a copy of the Executive Summary. It is also posted on the website. At this time, she presented a summary document of all comments that had been submitted. This included 14 public comments and all of the comments received at the last meeting. Tom VanderPlaat gave a PowerPoint presentation covering the common issues from the public comments. A handout of the presentation was provided. The following are comments/questions that were asked during the presentation regarding the public issues (The presentation of some of the issues did not prompt any questions or comment by the PSC. This is not a full list of the issues that were presented. See presentation handout for complete list of the issues presented and the responses):

Issue: Dredging

- Q:** Regarding the issue of dredging, someone asked how much sediment had been deposited in Hagg Lake since the existing dam was built?
- A:** Tom VanderPlaat responded saying that a sediment survey was completed when the feasibility study began. An aerial survey was done and the Bureau of Reclamation took soundings in the lake area to determine how much sediment had come into the lake area over the last 25 years. About 500 acre feet of active storage has been lost due to siltation. This is within the normal range of what was anticipated when the dam was built.
- Q:** Tom VanderPlaat said in order to get 8,000 acre feet of water storage, you would have to remove 14 million yards of soil. A question was asked about whether the acre feet and yards measurements were the same in volume.
- A:** Tom VanderPlaat said the numbers were the same and that he would try to find a way to illustrate that large volume. He said he had contacted the Corps of Engineers and they

told him the cost for dredging based on 8,000 acre feet of water storage is anywhere from \$16,000 to \$32,000 per acre foot. For the volume needed to dredge Hagg Lake, the cost would be \$138-277 million dollars. The Corps did not think it was feasible to remove the quantity estimated to dredge Hagg Lake. For the Columbia River, dredging is more feasible because the excavated materials can be barged. This estimate is a per unit/per yard cost, which includes trucking. It would take approximately 270,000 truck trips to remove the fill.

Q: Does the material have value? Would it have nutrients in the soil that would allow it to be sold?

A: Yes, it may be possible to get some return on the excavated soil if it was dewatered and someone was willing to buy it. We did not conduct a detailed cost analysis. The possibility of selling it was not factored in the cost.

Issue: Information on the water demand side including conservation, reuse, and ASR.

Comment: When talking about ASR, we have to remember that the water is injected comes from somewhere first and it is already part of the supply.

Issue: Potential impacts to Western Pond Turtle and other species in the study area

Q: Is there a serious issue with the Western Pond Turtle?

A: Dan Heagerty explained that the Western Pond Turtle is designated as a “species of concern” and not listed as endangered or threatened by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Habitat is the issue and will be looked at during the Environmental Impact Statement process.

Comment: Mark Eves said Lake Oswego has many turtles. He suspects they may be Western Pond Turtles.

Tom VanderPlaat said some of the issues brought up by the public cannot be answered or resolved at this time and more information will be gathered during the EIS. He stressed that Clean Water Services wants to provide as much known information as possible to neighbors and property owners, and staff are available to meet with people one-on-one. He said he knew it was hard for neighbors to have this much uncertainty in their lives. He said neighbors should talk to himself or Jeanna Cernazanu about any specific aspects or resources on their property that they value. He offered to visit properties and look at these resources.

Clean Water Services will continue to make the effort to document all the public issues and concerns. Jeanna Cernazanu explained that the Policy Steering Committee receives all the public comments, including those from the past scoping process, the petition that was circulated to Hagg Lake neighbors, the web survey, and comments that were prompted from newsletters, meetings, and other activities.

Public Comment

Brian Moore announced that the PSC would be hearing public comments prior to making a decision on the Feasibility Study Executive Report. He reminded the public that many issues could not be responded to at this time and would later be addressed during the Environmental Impact Study process. The following are summaries of the public comments heard:

Doris Beman, Property Owner

She and her husband live above the dam. She understands that the PSC has nothing to do with the urban growth policies, but she feels Washington County is being overbuilt. She referred to a letter that was submitted to the PSC about the growth. Doris Beman said she agreed with the points in this letter. She also commented on all the incentives she sees to move people into Washington County apartment complexes. She hoped the PSC would consider what this growth is requiring of the water supply.

Doris Beman said she has heard second-hand that Stimson does not want to get involved politically in this discussion, but they will not allow a new dam to be built on their property. She also reminded the PSC that the Stimson Dam option would cut the Beman's property in half and require a lot of road building and bridges.

PSC Action on Recommendations from Executive Summary

Tom VanderPlaat quickly covered the findings of the recommendations from the Executive Summary (see PowerPoint presentation handout.) Brian Moore opened up the discussion on the findings and recommendations.

There was some discussion about conservation. Forrest Soth said the Regional Water Supply Consortium is emphasizing conservation. He said conservation will be a continued effort and the effects might not be seen for some time, i.e. low-flow toilets and water conserving showerheads. He understands that new construction is required by law to use these. He is curious about how much retro-fitting has been done and how much is left to do.

Jeanna Cernazanu referred to an article (provided at the meeting) that compares statewide water usage and conservation data from 10 years ago and today (see Oregonian article dated Monday, March 15th, 2004). Lee Weislogel reminded everyone that each water provider needs to continue to provide conservation outreach. He asked Clean Water Services staff if they saw anything in the public comments that would not normally be covered in an EIS that should be addressed. Tom VanderPlaat responded by saying that the feasibility study was a broad analysis of the alternatives and that an EIS will be much more specific. He said an EIS will inform the decision and include the natural resource agencies and the public, who will, in the end, be paying for the project. During the EIS, the alternatives will be looked at again in detail. There was discussion about who will make the final decision. Tom Vanderplaat said that ultimately Congress will make the decision for the Bureau of Reclamation since it is a federal facility. The Partners will have influence on the decision.

A member of the public audience requested clarification on the statistics presented in the Oregonian article. The article read that irrigation uses 30 gallons per every 1 gallon of private

household water. Tom VanderPlaat said that is the case statewide, but not in Washington County; farming in the eastern part of the state, where it is dry and arid, requires much more irrigation than the Washington County nurseries and agriculture. The statistics in the article cover the whole state. In this area, Tom VanderPlaat says the average crop uses 1 acre foot of water, 12 inches depth of water per acre of land.

Larry Beman, a member of the public audience, asked why the 20 foot dam raise was still an option since he remembered Tom VanderPlaat saying the 20 foot dam raise only provided enough for today's supply standard. Tom VanderPlaat explained that the 20 foot raise would provide approximately 24,000 acre feet—supply for 25 years. The 40 foot raise provides approximately 40,000 acre feet—supply for 50 years. Brian Moore added that the EIS will give us more detail. Larry Beman asked why Clean Water Services does not take the 20 foot raise off the table now since it does not provide adequate supply. Tom VanderPlaat said he was not ready to make that decision, based on the information, at this time. A member of the public reminded everyone that the 20 and 40 foot numbers were just benchmarks for study purposes and that the final dam could, for example, be 37 feet.

Brian Moore asked the committee whether they agreed with moving the recommendations from the Executive Report to the next phase. There was PSC consensus that these finding and recommendations could be carried on to the next phase, the EIS.

Next Phase and NEPA Process

Dan Heagerty

Tom VanderPlaat said they would now be moving from the planning level to an implementation level of study. He introduced Dan Heagerty, a consultant from David Evans and Associates, who is on contract by the partners of the study to manage the EIS process.

Dan Heagerty introduced himself and gave some background on himself. He has been working on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes since the law was passed in the 1970s. The EIS is a requirement of NEPA. Dan Heagerty gave a quick explanation of the EIS (see presentation handout), which is essentially a disclosure document that provides a complex picture of a problem and compares various alternatives for solving it. He added that construction permits cannot be issued without the EIS document, if it is required.

Dan Heagerty said that the PSC would soon begin to discuss the guiding principles that would be followed as they do this work. He described the EIS process where thorough information would be gathered for each of the alternatives and analyzed. Then the document itself, the EIS, would be developed and undergo a strict public review timeline where the public comments would be submitted. For this project, as many as 500 copies of the Draft EIS (DEIS) might be mailed out for public review. The Final EIS (FEIS) includes responses to comments and has a 30 day review period. The Bureau of Reclamation would then prepare a Record of Decision (ROD). Once the ROD is in hand, the partners can start permitting. They will likely start writing the permits and preparing bid documents sooner to be ready for issue of the ROD.

There was a question about the Bureau of Reclamation not agreeing with the EIS and how that would affect any permitting process that has already been started. Dan Heagerty said they will

be working closely with the stakeholders, both public and agency, to avoid preparing an EIS that is unacceptable. The DEIS and FEIS do not usually differ much because the major issues are often resolved prior to the DEIS. He looked forward to working with the group.

Discussion of Guiding Principles for DEIS

Jeanna Cernazanu

During the EIS, the staff and partners will be using the same evaluation criteria from the feasibility study. Jeanna Cernazanu distributed the Evaluation Criteria that was used during the scoping process for the feasibility study. The PSC will be asked to identify other factors or “guiding principles” that are important to consider, as well as the evaluation criteria. Jeanna Cernazanu presented some draft guiding principles (see PowerPoint presentation handout). Jim Doane asked if the PSC would be determining how reliable the supply needs to be. Jeanna Cernazanu said the PSC would have to look at those policy issues.

There was a suggestion that the project could seek homeland security grants/funding.

The PSC was asked if they had comments or questions about the draft guiding principles that were presented. The following were comments from the PSC and the public audience:

- It is important to place a premium on conservation. We do not want to provide additional supply that is not used.
- Maximize the current resources
- Need to look at future of Washington County for jobs and industry and what that means for water supply. If industry is brought in, we might need to press for conservation.
- If we provide more water to supply the growth, we will get more impervious surfaces
- Need to talk about ways to prevent future flooding
- Government also needs to participate in conservation efforts (public comment)
- Logging is having an effect in the Scoggins Valley on the water feeding into the lake. This needs to be addressed. (public comment)
- Any activities, like the logging, in the watershed are of concern to the water users
- Forestry permits could be looked at—Forestry Practices Act, under authority of another agency
- There is erosion into Sain Creek from logging (public comment)
- Pollution from boats in Hagg Lake

The PSC was asked to provide any suggestions for the guiding principles to Jeanna Cernazanu or Tom VanderPlaat. They would bring all the comments and suggestions for the Draft Guiding Principles to the next PSC meeting.

Next Steps

The next meeting would mark a complete transition from Feasibility Study to Environmental Impact Statement. Notice for the next meeting, which most likely will be held in June, would be sent via email to the PSC.

Beth Irwin, a member of the public audience, said she had read on the website that the Stimson Dam option had been ruled out. Tom VanderPlaat explained that the Stimson Dam was originally eliminated, but based on the information had been collected, the Bureau of Reclamation requested that this options be studied in more detail. There was some concern about the information on the website being an accurate picture of what was being carried forward into the EIS process.

Meeting Adjourned

Materials provided at the meeting

- Agenda for 3/18/04
- PSC Draft Meeting summary from 12/10/03
- Tualatin Basin Water Supply Feasibility Study—Public Comments on Executive Summary 12/10/03-1/515/04
- Letter dated 2/10/04 to Tom Brian from Bureau of Reclamation regarding congressional authorization and funding status
- Tualatin Basin Water Supply Feasibility Study—Additional Sources Options Review dated 3/16/04
- Water Supply Feasibility Study Evaluation Criteria
- Revised PSC Roster dated February 2004
- Oregonian article dated 3/15/04
- Handout of the PowerPoint presentation given on 3/18/04 (26 total slides)