

IAC Meeting

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 28, 2011 3:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M. EISENHOWER ROOM (BOYD ACRES)

MEETING CALLED BY	Tom Hickmann
TYPE OF MEETING	Infrastructure Advisory Committee
INVITEES	Andy High, Casey Roats, Courtney Snead, Eric King, Frank Turek, James Gattey, Jeff England, Kim Kampmann, Michael Magee, Nancy Loveland, Paul Rheault, Ray Auerbach, Tom Hickmann, Wendy Edde
NOTE TAKER	Kim Kampmann
ATTENDEES	Andy High, Casey Roats, Courtney Snead, Frank Turek, Kim Kampmann, Michael Magee, Nancy Loveland, Paul Rheault, Ray Auerbach, Tom Hickmann, Wendy Edde

Agenda topics

STORMWATER POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

WENDY EDDE / TOM HICKMANN

DISCUSSION	
	<p>Tom introduced Wendy Edde as the Stormwater Manager. The goal is to present an overview of Stormwater, describe the CIP that is associated with Stormwater and therein looking to the Committee for guidance on moving forward. The presentation explained the regulatory issues involved with Stormwater since its conception in 2007 and the costs involved. Tom pointed out one of the biggest concerns is the number of drywells and drill holes. This poses a potentially large regulatory issue for the City. Tom described the Underground Injection Control (UIC) process through diagrams (attached in the Powerpoint presentations). He explained the potential contamination to the well supply. Surfacewater is governed by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and deals with all of the discharges to the surfacewater. Tom pointed out that Wendy worked hard on this project and acquired the five year permit in 2007 beginning with the application process in 2003. The permit will be up in February 2012 and they will be reapplying for the new permit in August 2011 for another five years. Tom pointed out that there is one key issue with NPDES and that is you are required to treat with the maximum extent practical. This applies to Stormwater entering Surfacewater only, not stormwater entering UIC's. Wendy began her portion of the presentation and explained that in 2003 the City also applied for a Water Portion Control Facility permit for the underground injection controls. She further explained that Oregon is the only State in the nation providing municipal permits for Stormwater UIC. Currently Portland is the only one that has one. They are negotiating and working Statewide and expect to acquire the permit this year. This falls under the Federal State Drinking Water Act. In Oregon, all ground water is perceived as potential drinking water. Wendy showed a model that diagramed and showed the one to two year time of travel as well as the depth of the wells. This diagram also provided information on areas where the shallow areas occur. Wendy pointed out that anyone on the Private side who has a UIC within the one to two year time of travel cannot just get authorization, they are required to apply for a \$10,000 permit. This includes drywells and existing UIC's. While it's preferred, not all private drywells are registered. Wendy pointed out that we have a deadline for compliance within three years, which is why we are pursuing this so aggressively. Wendy informed the group that we are in the process of developing a Stormwater Masterplan which focuses on water quality and water quantity issues. In the beginning stages of developing the masterplan, they saw the need to set up the Utility with a funding source. They focused on our hot spots, flooding areas and the condition of pipes. This provided a good idea of the problem areas. It was also important to look at future design system strategies. The Central Oregon Stormwater Manual which is a design manual developed with other municipalities was revised in August 2010. Wendy pointed out that we were only addressing water quality and not the quantity. They considered the option of moving away from UIC's and going with pipe instead. They realized it would be quite expensive, in the 100's of millions of dollars to bring our system up to a level of '25 Year Storm'. Wendy gave a brief overview of the current budget and revenue projection of \$2.4 and \$2.5 M for utility. The majority goes to operations and maintenance. There is about half a million a year that goes toward the CIP budget. She explained that we currently have \$2M in reserves. Tom continued the presentation explaining that through the process of developing the master plan there are 110 areas identified as trouble/hot spots around town. This half million dollars also encompasses other costs: personnel, best management practices, street sweeping, and regulatory compliance. Because CIP projects are typically higher costs; the highest need projects have been identified, prioritized, and narrowed down to three. They are the Third Street, Franklin and Greenwood underpasses. One of the reasons these were selected as high priority is because when the underpasses flood, they impact the majority of the community. Tom pointed out that his biggest concern is that if the proposed three year completion timeline is expected UIC's, we will have some serious problems. Our hope is to negotiate a more realistic approach for completion, maybe 20 years or more. All those in the one to two year time of travel will be our top priority. We may be able to commit to these in a three year timeline. As a result of all of this information they are trying to focus this program on maintenance, regulatory compliance, public information and input, and looking to use any additional money for the three CIP underpass projects. To date our accomplishments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facility inventories • Resolving some of the regulatory compliance issues with MPDS • Continued discussions/negotiations on the UIC

- Masterplan will be completed by the end of this year
- Stormwater ordinance that is close to completion
- CIP projects: Drake and Mohema, some design on the Third Street underpass
- Public education efforts
- Monitoring
- RFP for risk evaluation posted
- Pipe cleaning and surveying

Tom showed the group photos of some of the problem pipe lines. He provided next steps:

- Underpasses
- Continued work on the UIC permit
- Groundwater risk evaluation consultant to begin, with results approximately August - September
- Permit negotiations
- Stormwater ordinance near completion
- Masterplan near completion
- Continued system maintenance compliance

CONCLUSIONS

Having presented the history and future issues for Stormwater, Tom moved the discussion to the CIP priority list to discuss a method for the committee to determine if they agree the City is moving in the right direction.

CIP PRIORITY LIST

TOM HICKMANN

DISCUSSION	As discussed, Tom reminded the group that the Stormwater Master Plan will be completed by the end of 2011. A placeholder for a new master plan is in place for 2012. The City may choose to move up the new masterplan if it seems conceivable. Tom explained that the Westside Meadows neighborhood flooded out in 2005 and 2007. The City signed a settlement agreement with the developer, the developer paid a settlement fee and the City took full responsibility for the property. This provides a dilemma for the City since this would not normally be considered a high priority. Therefore, the City is looking for a low cost solution. Drake and Dohema homes also flooded out and this project is almost complete. The Third Street underpass was a project the City had hoped to have completed by the end of 2011. Realistically this project will be completed late Spring or early Summer 2012. At the same time the City will be moving forward with the Franklin underpass and Greenwood. One of the committee members asked if preference would be given to local firms? Tom explained that due to the requirements of the ORS and best management practices the City could not give preferential treatment. The current plan is that construction would start by Summer 2012. By Summer 2013 between bonding and rate increases designated for construction, along with reserves and what the City is currently receiving, the cost for 2012 and 2013 is expected to be covered. Tom reminded the group that this only addresses the CIP and not the maintenance and operational side. Paul pointed out that these are enterprise funds and cannot be shifted to Streets or other non enterprise funds. One of the committee members surmised that based on the presentation what the City is looking for from the IAC Committee is to determine the City's plan to be reasonable, that the projects are adequately prioritized and the funds are available and/or additional funds required are within reach to complete the projects. Also taking into account that there are two sources of funding to accommodate the possibility of one fund being hit harder than the other. In addition to this the City is expected to present a plan that is attainable which this committee member believed was accomplished. The question was asked how much it would cost to complete all the projects as this would be beneficial information to the public to have a good understanding of the necessity to prioritize the projects the way the City has proposed. Tom stated that the cost to repair all of the problems would cost roughly \$135M. Paul also pointed out that another consideration for their prioritization is there is a dilemma when emergency vehicles are not able to get from one side of town to the other due to the flooded underpasses. This type of flooding situation is a real health, safety and welfare issue. One of the committee members pointed out that due to the high dollar amount needed to repair all problems, this would explain why the City was forced to create a list of priorities and why some projects had to be pushed out. Tom pointed out that there may be opportunities to have in-house staff perform some of the repairs at a relatively low cost in an effort to complete more problem areas.
CONCLUSIONS	

Tom concluded that Eric King's ultimate goal for the IAC Committee was for them to be presented with an overview of the CIP list and then the IAC be able to speak to Council, having received the information needed from staff to conclude whether or not they can support the plan that the City has laid out. As a recap, Tom stated that the committee had been presented information on water, sewer, transportation and now stormwater. Tom proposed that at the next IAC meeting the City would know whether or not the IAC believed that the CIP plan is appropriate and if so, receive final approval to move forward with the CIP's as presented at this and previous meetings. Tom stated if the Committee sees anything glaring to please bring those insights forward. It's important that Council know that the Committee is making an informed decision.

Eric is also requesting a spokesperson from the IAC to present at the Budget Committee meeting and, if applicable, to issue a recommendation for moving forward at the next IAC meeting the Committee will focus primarily on the priority list and consider approval of the CIP's for water, sewer, and stormwater. It was clarified that the Committee would be evaluating enterprise funds only. It was explained that an Enterprise Fund are the funds paid for by rate payers and general funds are paid by tax payers. The two funds cannot be intermixed. The funds can borrow from each other, but must be paid back.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Final 5-year CIP list and funding source will be provided to the Committee.	Tom Hickmann	March 14, 2011
The IAC will provide or not provide their final approval for the CIP Plan.	IAC Members	April 14, 2011
A follow-up budget meeting and the IAC spokesperson will hopefully provide their approval.	IAC Members	May 14, 2011
Will need the IAC spokesperson to be in attendance at the final budget approval	IAC Members	May 24-26, 2011
The Committee will be provided the exact date of the final budget meeting.	IAC Members	March 14, 2011

UPDATE ON NEXT COUNCIL WORK SESSION

PAUL RHEAULT AND TOM HICKMANN

DISCUSSION	
The Standards and Specification on are the agenda for the next work session. The Value Engineering Study for the Surface Water Project has been postponed as Public Works staff need time to review the study internally. Paul informed the group that he believes VE Study was a good process. Tom informed the group that areas that the VE team initially thought may be areas for changes, when reevaluated, disappeared once they considered the 50 year analysis. What was discovered is that places where the City may save on today, they would encounter that expense at a later date. The study did reveal areas for some small savings and provided good ideas to consider. One of the things that the VE team said and made very clear to the City was that the project as it is currently defined is believed to be fundamentally sound. Paul pointed out that the HDR contract agenda item has also been deferred as the contract cannot be discussed with council as it is highly dependent on the VE Study.	
CONCLUSIONS	
Paul stated that the IAC would be informed of the new dates for the VE Study and the HDR contract and that these items would most likely be on the April or May agenda.	

OTHER BUSINESS

GROUP

DISCUSSION		
A suggestion was made to do a field trip of the various Public Works sites, the digester, watershed, etc. It was also requested that the Committee receive a list of minutes to be approved. There was a question about the status of the January 28 th meeting minutes. The Committee members were informed that the minutes would be available at the next meeting.		
CONCLUSIONS	Tom will coordinate a tour for the Committee and the minutes for January will be available.	
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Tour of Public Works sites	Tom Hickmann	To be determined
Minutes from January 28, 2011 will be provided to the committee members	Tom Hickmann	March 14, 2011

List of minutes for approval	Group	April 25, 2011
------------------------------	-------	----------------

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.