

**TUALATIN BASIN WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY
POLICY STEERING COMMITTEE
ROCK CREEK WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY
9/29/05 6:30-8:30 P.M.**

Draft Meeting Summary

Attendance:

Policy Steering Committee:

Tom Brian, Clean Water Services Chair
Jim Doane, TVWD Commissioner
Mark Eves, Lake Oswego Corporation
Rod Fuiten, City of Forest Grove
John Godsey, City of Hillsboro Utility
Commissioner
Herb Hirst, City of North Plains Councilor
Dick Schmidt, TVWD Commissioner
Forrest Soth, City of Beaverton Councilor
Tom Woodruff, City of Tigard Councilor

Amanda Garcia-Snell, Jeanne Lawson
Associates

Clean Water Services:

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

Partner and Agency Staff:

Jeff Bauman, City of Wilsonville
Rob Dixon, City of Sherwood
Rob Foster, City of Forest Grove
Todd Heidgerken, TVWD
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin
Dave Nelson, Bureau of Reclamation
David Winship, City of Beaverton
Stewart Rounds, USGS
Derek Robbins, City of Forest Grove

Public Attendance:

Dave Anderson
Larry and Doris Beman
Greg Edwards
Eric Glover
John Kelley
Jeff Lindgren
Wallie Otto
Marna Stickle
Susan Stutz
Bob Watkins
Brian Wegener, Tualatin River Keepers
Alex Williams

Consultant Staff:

Dan Heagerty, David Evans & Associates

Welcome, Introductions

Tom Brian

Tom Brian called the meeting to order, and asked the committee and guests to introduce themselves.

Review 2/17/05 Meeting Minutes

Tom Brian

The minutes were approved with an abstention from Jim Doane who did not attend the previous meeting.

Comment from Greg Edwards, Property Owner

Chair Brian noted that the committee would hear public comment from one individual at this time who needed to leave the meeting early.

Greg read a statement that follows:

I am a Hagg Lake property owner that holds the signatures of 90 residents that gave me their proxies to act in their behalf in matters of dam increase. I was very surprised and happy to hear of a second alternative to what we felt was a poor choice in the 40 ft. proposal. We are very interested in a proposed 25 ft. raise and an expansion of the existing treatment plant at Wilsonville. It makes perfect sense as most of the pipeline is already in place. We feel that this would be a suitable compromise for all concerned. As you may recall that we were pretty steadfast hanging up on the 20 ft. increase and we knew that no one would lose their homes at a 20 ft. increase. After looking at the map, a 25 ft. increase would still not create a loss of homes providing that the road is placed in the right spot. We are still concerned about the proposed placement of the roadway around Tanner Creek, and the take line. All of the affected property owners have a right and a need to know. We don't believe that, "that's where the engineers put it" is the only answer. The Tanner Creek residents are willing to meet as a group with CWS at the park headquarters to talk about other alternatives. Thank you for this opportunity.

Response from Tom VanderPlaat:

Tom informed Mr. Edwards, that new information on the road relocation and the new topography survey and the proposed recreation facilities will be presented at the meeting tonight. He will share maps with the new information with the neighbors as soon as the maps can be made.

Follow-up from 2/17/05 PSC meeting

Tom Vanderplaat

- The Water Managers Group (WMG) Meetings are not considered to be public meetings. However, CWS has developed a list of interested parties who are invited to the Water Managers meetings.
- TVID's response concerning the irrigation exchange pipeline from the Willamette was distributed in the meeting packet. It reaffirms that the TVID is not interested in pursuing that alternative.
- The consultants reviewed the feasibility of a hydroelectric system to generate power as part of this project. The operating criteria was 150cfs or 100cfs for flow and 140 ft. of head on the turbine which was located near the water treatment plant to get the necessary head. The average annual megawatt production would be about 3500 megawatt hours. The estimated cost is \$3.5 to \$4.2 million dollars using a Francis type turbine. According to the present worth, it would generate \$ 50,000 per year but would cost \$200,000 per year. It does not pay off in the 30 year range. Mark Eves commented that a turbine was just installed on Lake

Oswego that can produce as low as 4cfs, costs about \$120,000, and it is virtually maintenance free. He suggested looking at a lower volume than 150cfs.. He has found that the cost benefit is quite favorable. He will share that data with CWS.

EIS Process and Schedule

Dan Heagerty

The current schedule is to have a draft EIS ready for public review in April 2006. A critical path has been developed with this schedule. One of the key pieces is hydrological modeling which will drive water quality evaluations which will drive fish impact evaluations. The draft EIS would include a 60 day or longer public review. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the partners will decide whether to have both public hearings and public meetings. Public hearings are very formal and may limit opportunities for dialogue. Public meetings will be planned throughout the basin. After that, all public comment received will be used to prepare a final EIS. If additional studies need to be conducted, that will drive the timing for the final EIS. The final EIS will go to the public and all agencies for a 45 day review and then the Bureau of Reclamation will prepare a record of decision on the alternative that they choose. This could happen at the end of 2006 but it will depend on the outcome of the public review.

Q: What is the review period for the Bureau of Reclamation? When could we likely expect a decision by the Bureau of Reclamation?

A: The decision would occur after the final EIS. After a 45 day review period, there is a notice of Record of Decision. There is usually a 15 day period of notice but it could be a 30 day period. Then a decision would be made.

Proposed Second Alternative for the EIS

Tom VanderPlaat

Tom began by explaining that the Partnership has been in existence for about 5 years. Five cities, TVWD, and CWS are currently involved in the partnership. The project is seeking a total of 50,000 AF to meet the 2050 demand. Thirty percent of that is for environmental needs and 35,000 AF is for municipal water supply. The planning process included regional water supply studies, the Tualatin Basin Integrated Water Resource Management Strategy, the Water Supply Feasibility Study and now we are in the EIS process.

The major source options that came out of the Feasibility Study are:

- Scoggins Dam raise – 20' (24,500AF)
- Scoggins Dam raise – 40' (52,500 AF)
- Irrigation Exchange Pipeline from the Willamette River (25,000 AF)
- Stimson Dam raise 40'

Tom reminded the PSC that one of the biggest issues was whether a larger reservoir could be filled reliably. Considering that the watershed does not produce enough water to fill a 40' raised dam reliably, it was necessary to look at the pump back option. This could be accomplished by taking water from the Tualatin River, near Forest Grove, and pumping it back to fill the reservoir on a more reliable basis. He also reviewed other options that were discussed at the 02/17/05 meeting and removed from further detail study. These included Stimson Dam, Scoggins Dam, and Irrigation Exchange Pipeline from the Willamette. At that time the PSC moved to direct CWS to look at the 40' raise of Scoggins Dam with the raw water pipeline pump back.

The proposed action was submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation. They responded with concerns about a single alternative EIS and recommend that the WMG and the Project Technical Team look for a second alternative to include with the 40' raise/ pump back alternative and the no action alternative [This letter is included in packet]. With this recommendation CWS, the WMG, and the project team worked to determine a second alternative.

Technical staff developed the multiple source option which includes a 25' raise of Scoggins Dam and the raw water pipeline pump back in combination with expansion of the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant. This alternative meets the purpose and need of 50,000 AF. The dam raise is a bit higher than the 20' raise because communities that would be served by the Willamette would not remove enough demand for the 20' raise to provide the remaining supply.

Tom then addressed why use of Willamette River water for a municipal supply recently became a viable option. He explained that new information has been available after the Willamette River water treatment plant was developed in Wilsonville. A lot of the necessary information has already been generated from the Wilsonville plant. The impacts may need to be updated but the transmission pipeline has been studied. There is existing information that can be utilized in the EIS process. This helps with the schedule and the budget, which is why CWS is requesting that the PSC move this alternative into the EIS process.

Tom also explained that an EIS does not make decisions. It will assess, compare and disclose what the impacts are but the decision comes towards the end of the process. The decision as to what water source communities will use for their drinking water supply is still in the hands of the communities. The EIS does not force communities to move to the Willamette water for their water supply.

Tom discussed the project schedule which is:

- Water Supply Feasibility Study (2001-04)
- Planning Report/ EIS and permitting (2004-06 [Draft EIS –April 2006])
- Congressional Authorization (2006-2009)
- Design and Construction (2010-??)

Q: When we were discussing the 20' raise, it was predicated on an irrigation line from Newberg. Now the discussion is referring to a finished water product for municipal and industrial (M & I). If only one of the two entities that are interested, Sherwood and Tigard, chooses to participate, then this pipeline becomes even more important. TVWD having the interest in the treatment plant would have to come to an accommodation with that community.

A: Yes

Q: The 40' alternative is the alternative that was agreed upon in Feb. meeting. For the Multiple Source Option, there are four communities of user groups, Tigard, Sherwood, Tualatin, and TVWD. Will the EIS calculate the necessary changes to the raise of Scoggins Dam if not all communities choose to participate?

A: The draft EIS will frame the brackets from a minimum to a maximum. If we tried to cover all of the iterations in the EIS it would become an extremely complicated document. Based on

the votes and the public comment we will try to work out the details between the draft and the final EIS. Then, if we lost some of the communities, we could work on how to reconfigure a preferred alternative. A preferred alternative shows a project can effectively be built to meet the partners' purposes and needs.

- Q:** So is the assumption, for the study, that all four communities will vote yes for the Willamette, in which case a 25' raise meets the remaining demand? After that, as we learn more about the communities, the EIS can be tweaked and supplement as necessary?
- A:** Yes. It is also important to know that those local communities, councils and commissions are going to have to sign on the dotted line for some kind of contractual requirement as far as what the design and long range relationships are going to be.
- Q:** If the Multiple Source Option is selected as the best alternative by the BOR, and the expansion of the Willamette treatment plant for exclusive M & I use is not funded by the BOR, whereas a dam raise could be funded by the federal government, BOR could make a decision based on which alternative costs them less. From a Forest Grove perspective, we are going to get the raw water pipeline in either scenario. Am I right in thinking that the size of the pipe is 96" and we are not talking about changing the capacity of it?
- A:** With the 25% raise, we would pump back less. There is a pretty significant cost relative to that pump station and we may have some opportunities to save cost relative to the pump back. You are not filling as big of a reservoir as the 40' raise, so it is not necessary to pump back as much water and there may be a little cost savings there.
- Q:** Which part of the county would expansion of the Willamette treatment plant serve?
- A:** It is a pipeline that goes from the Willamette treatment plant in Wilsonville north to Tigard, through parts of Tigard, Sherwood, Tualatin and parts of the TVWD would be in that as well.
- Q:** We don't have to make a decision as to what the preference is between these two options, we just have to say this is a reasonable second option to go ahead with the study. In terms of the Willamette, we are going to know in a month and a half about Sherwood. We probably won't know about Tigard or Tualatin before a decision has to be made. It does not sound like you have to have that level of information to make a decision, you just have to make some assumptions and have that be part of the study.
- A:** Yes, that is my understanding.
- Q:** An alternative to the Willamette is conservation and purchase water from Portland. Could you comment on why or why not that is a good idea
- A:** Part of the reason that we have not included the Bull Run system in the EIS process is because the partners, that I am aware of, don't have any control or the ability to have Portland make any improvements such as a third dam in the Bull Run. We can't conserve our way out of the half a million people that are coming to the area.
- Q:** Before, were we talking about bringing raw water through a pipeline to TVID's pump station. Why does it make more sense for us to pipe in clean water than to pipe in raw water and use our facilities to clean it here?

A: The irrigation district did not want to be involved. It would also be a farther distance for the pipe line to travel to JWC treatment plant. The Willamette plant has additional steps in the treatment process that the JWC plant does not have. The Willamette plant is also closer to the area of need, so the cost is not as great.

EIS Study Update

Tom VanderPlaat

Tom began by reiterating that a map will be created using the new topography study of the dam. It will show the 25' and 40' raise. Atlas Consultants did a master planning level replacement of the recreational facilities to identify potential locations for those. This could involve some road relocation around the lake. Part of the analysis was integration of existing facilities so as the water level goes down, the facilities that are already there could still be used. There was an effort to keep the facilities close together to minimize impact. The new map will try to show the maximum impact to private property from road relocation. The recreation facilities analysis is for the 40' raise, not the 25' raise, so that will need to be added with the new alternative. Jeanna and Tom will be going into the neighborhoods to discuss alternatives as far as road relocation, recreational facilities and water level changes.

Q: If the new and revised maps will be available in about 30 days, what is the process for getting the revised maps to the property owners around the lake?

A: We've heard that neighbors would like to meet with us and go over the map. We'll take suggestions from neighbors about the best way go about that. This is not the final construction design, although we are getting more accurate over time. But until it's built it's not final. Staff will share with the property owners what we know as soon as it's available but it is still subject to change.

Q: How will you get information to people who are affected but don't come to the meetings.

A: We will do our best to notify them. Using tax lots, we can determine where the land boundaries are. Neighbors have come to CWS offices, or staff have gone to them to show them where their property is in relation to the project area.

Q: Will the EIS also indicate those areas around the elevated lake surface that might be subject or prone to erosion or sloughing? How will that affect the property owners in question?

A: How big will the buffer be is one of the number one questions for most of the property owners in the area. When Scoggins Dam was built, buffers took whole sections. Staff will meet with the BOR to get an answer to that question. We will have to deal with access issues also, such as whether or not a boater will be trespassing onto private property when the lake is full.

Q: Roughly a third of the water needs in expansion are for stream restoration and providing more water into the Tualatin River. What part of the river needs it the most, way up towards the dam or is it downstream further? If the need is farther down, couldn't we just pump raw water from the Willamette into the Tualatin River right there, without having to use more expensive option and reduce the amount that we really need?

A: If we pump raw water from the Willamette into the Tualatin we are going to confuse the fish when they come up river. They may go into the Tualatin thinking it is the Willamette. That is one issue that is difficult to deal with in terms of environmental impact. There is already a lot of water coming into the Tualatin from outside of our basin. The longterm water quality needs are substantially farther upstream.

Q: How big a factor is longterm operating costs in the BOR decision?

A: A present worth analysis will be part of the economic analysis. The jurisdictions will need to know that as well.

Comment: If all four communities are able to go into the Willamette, that should reduce operating costs for water coming out of the lake but it will increase operating costs locally because they are treating and pumping it up from Wilsonville.

Public Review Process

Jeanna Cernazanu

Jeanna reminded the group that the project is following a federal process with the EIS, but we are also doing a local process and CWS is the lead agency that is working on this. This includes all of the input and coordination with the public. The local public process will meet and exceed what is required by the NEPA process. The NEPA process was established as a way to identify and disclose environmental impacts as well as inform and involve the public in those kinds of decisions. CWS will be following the EIS and NEPA process but it should also be understood that CWS will be proactive in working with the community as they continue to discuss the choices that are available.

She referred to public comments compiled into a packet for the meeting including an e-mail in support of adding the multiple source option and a phone conversation with a citizen who was in favor of the Portland option. She reminded the group that all of the public comment is included in the record and taken into consideration when looking at the alternatives.

Public Comment

Tom Brian asked if the public had any comments and reminded the group that the only decision made this evening will be whether or not to include the multiple-source option to be studied in the EIS.

Susan Stutz, Property Owner

Susan expressed concerns and frustrations with the availability of accurate project boundary information for affected property owners. She questioned whether or not the 25' raise is legitimately being studied or if it has only been mentioned to appease the BOR. This was based on the lack of 25' raise information on the updated project map that will be developed within the month. She also asked if the 25' raise area will be studied and the information will be shared with the public. She also wanted to know more information about where a buffer might be. Many people in the area are not willing to come to the meetings when they do not feel that all of the information is being shared. She requested that the proposed buffer be added to the updated map. She also feels that how much land is being taken from property owners is part of the environmental issue. She then asked for clarification about whether or not the property owners

should be going straight to the BOR to determine where the buffer will be, since CWS has been unsuccessful in obtaining that information.

Response from PSC members: The group clarified that it will be necessary to show where the road relocation is at for the 25' raise but that information is too recent to have been included on the updated map. It was also mentioned that the purpose of this meeting is to determine whether or not the multiple source option, which could include a 25' raise, should be officially included in the EIS study. They reiterated that staff is getting information out to the public as it becomes available. For the EIS, as much information will be provided concerning the second alternative as has been presented concerning the first alternative. The BOR will determine how much buffer is necessary but CWS will ask the BOR what they will require for a buffer and this may allow potential for making changes that minimize private property impacts. However, there are federal land acquisition requirements that need to be dealt with. Completion of the EIS may help in determining how the BOR will respond to property owners concerns as well as what potential impacts to property owners could be.

Rod Fuiten

How do we provide information on where the buffer might be, at this point in the process?

Tom VanderPlaat

I have been trying to progressively develop more accurate information as we go along. That was the reason for the topographic survey, to give the landowners a more accurate picture. As far as the road relocation, I have information on the 20' raise but I do not have information on the 25' raise. I don't think it is significantly different but we need to review those to make sure we are accurately presenting what changes could occur to the road.

Rod Fuiten

So you have a current topographic survey that you are confident will be able to answer some of these questions?

Tom VanderPlaat

It will continue to give us more information that we can share. It's a survey because we have to come up with accurate information for costs estimates.

Jim Doane

Would it be possible for us to say to the BOR what we think an appropriate buffer should be? I think this would help everybody.

Tom VanderPlaat

My concern with that is that I might have to go back and say that we made a mistake and we need more land than we thought.

Jim Doane

It costs us very little to make a suggestion. I think we could ask the BOR to take our suggestion into consideration. We do not have control over the process but I think we could make a suggestion.

Dick Schmidt

Would it be cost effective to install a turbine that is large enough to pay for the energy used in the pump back?

Response from PSC members:

That is a good question; it will be added to the other questions about the electrical production.

Doris Beman, Property Owner

Will you let all of the residents in the area know when you will have a meeting with the new map information? Would the 25' raise give a supply for 50 years?

Response from Tom VanderPlaat:

Yes, we have a mailing list of about 116 people. We will send out a notice of information to all of the land owners around there. The 25' raise, in concert with the multiple source option would give a 50 year supply.

Final Discussion of PSC

The PSC addressed the action item of including a second alternative in the EIS. There was a motion and second to direct the project to include the multiple source option for study in the EIS in addition to the 40' raise in Scoggins dam.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Next Steps

PSC and public will be notified of the next meeting time and date.

Materials provided at the meeting

- Agenda for 9/29/05
- extra packets
- Slide presentation, provided by Clean Water Services
- Letter from the Bureau of Reclamation requesting a second alternative
- Letter from the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District reaffirming their opposition to an irrigation exchange pipeline from the Willamette River
- newspaper articles