

**Sewer Infrastructure Advisory Group
Meeting Summary**

January 16, 2014

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Review Intermediate Optimization Results

City Council Chambers

Note taker: Adele McAfee

Committee Members:, Lynn Putnam, Mike Riley, Sharon Smith, Steve Hultberg, Dale VanValkenberg, Casey Roats, Steve Galash, Charlie Miller, Rob Von Rohr, Stacy Stemach, Nathan Boddie

COB Staff: Paul Rheault, Jon Skidmore, Aaron Collett, Tom Hickmann, Patrick Griffiths

Consultants: David Stangel (MSA), David Prull (Clearwater Engineering Group), Jeff Frey (Optimatics), Joel Wilson (WCS Engineering)

Facilitator: Libby Barg, Clark Worth (Barney & Worth)

Others: Jim Lord, Erik Huffman, Councilor Sally Russell, John Russell, Lupe Severson, Erick Peters, Andre Tolme, Terry Angle, Brady Fuller, Jim Frost

Action Items:

- ✓ Run 10% water conservation scenario for Mid-R
- ✓ Utilize Mid R loading only for the final optimization runs and for subsequent capital improvement plan development (voted by a show of hands)
- ✓ Provide more financial information to SIAG to help inform upcoming phasing decisions

Meeting Summary

Introductions announcements

The SIAG community outreach has kicked off with the first presentation given to the River West NA.

Intermediate optimization results

Joel Wilson (WCS Engineering) presented intermediate optimization results and initial phasing.

1. The Intermediate Solution is generally consistent with the Initial Solution
2. Optimization eliminated more north area lift stations, adding some capital costs, however, reducing overall life cycle costs
3. The SE Interceptor, Colorado Lift Station and Riverhouse Diversion selected as high priority projects
4. Optimized solutions for existing, 10-year, 20-year and 20-year plus 25% loading, provide insight for project phasing
5. Costs have increased due to inclusion of some condition based improvements

SIAG questions / comments

- **What is the cost of the local improvements?**
The cost analysis is still underway.
- **When will people with septic systems be connected to the system?**
That will not be determined as part of the Sewer System Master Plan. The Plan accounts for those homes being connected to the system.

- **The financial model should include the 5, 10, and 20 year projects (as long as the 20 year analysis doesn't slow down the process).**
- **Financial plan should include local area costs and rehabilitation costs.**
- **What's the difference between pipe condition improvements and local area costs?**
Pipe condition improvements include projects like the treatment plant pipe interceptor line. Immediate fixes are needed. An example of local area costs would be fixing odor problems in a neighborhood.
- **When will SIAG see costs?**
The cost are continued to be refined through the planning process. The City will present costs at the May 1 SIAG meeting.
- **Why are you adding deferred costs maintenance now?**
Deferred maintenance requirements (and associated costs) were always a part of the master plan. In order to create a comprehensive master plan/financial plan it is necessary to capture all projects and costs.
- **Are the condition improvements going into the optimization model?**
No, however if there is an option to divert flow away from a failing pipe or eliminate a pump station, the city will save the costs of rehabilitating by taking that facility out of service.

Next steps

- Evaluate additional alternatives and refine solutions
- Practical scheduling of Phase 1 improvements
- Develop preliminary local area solutions
- Quantify additional condition-based improvement costs.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:28 PM