

City of Ashland
Ashland Water Advisory Committee
Parks Department, 340 S. Pioneer
Draft March 30, 2011 Minutes

Committee Members Present: Pat Acklin, Alex Amarotico, Darrell Boldt, Kate Jackson, Lesley Adams, Don Morris, Amy Patton, Donna Rhee, Councilor Carol Voisin, Rich Whitley (Chair) and John Williams

Absent: Donna Mickley, Amy Patton and Alex Amarotico

Staff Present: Brenda Barker, Mike Faught, Robbin Pearce, Nancy Slocum, Pieter Smeenk and Greg Hunter

Carollo Consultants: Nikki Pozos via teleconference

Guests: Joseph Graf, 1160 Fern Street and Sheri Cellini, Conservation Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order by Chair Rich Whitley at 4:08 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Whitley asked the committee to review the minutes of March 9, 2011 at the beginning of the meeting. Boldt motioned and Morris seconded to approve the minutes and the vote was unanimous.

III. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA: Smeenk had new information from Carollo that Whitley wanted to discuss first and John Williams had a proposal for the committee to review and comment on.

IV. PUBLIC FORUM:

V. DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS:

A. Continue Discussion of Water Supply Options

Whitley told the committee that they may need to schedule another meeting to come to unanimous vote on 1 to 2 option packages to present to Carollo for financial costs breakdown. The agenda was revised to add the following two items; new information from Carollo and a proposal from Williams that was sent to the committee prior to the meeting via email.

Smeenk had an update which compared a scaled down version of the Talent Ashland Phoenix intertie pipeline (TAP) option to a back up Water Treatment Plant (WTP). His conclusion was that the WTP option doesn't provide for the same level of redundancy as a scaled down version of TAP (mini-TAP) or TAP. In addition, the City of Talent expressed an interest buying treated water from Ashland during the winter months via the potential TAP line as well as leasing additional water storage capacity during high demand periods.

Jackson expressed concern that tonight's discussion had only compared the mini-TAP versus a backup plan but not the full TAP option. She stated that TAP is the regional

solution that provides the quantity of water that is needed. All of the other options don't get to the City's future ultimate water need, which includes supply and redundancy. TAP was designed to provide a long-term water supply 12 years ago. The group has discussed deferring the cost of TAP, but in the mean time, construction becomes more expensive. Phasing of TAP is another thing, maybe the pump station can be built at a later time than the pipe, but that would still not provide the permanent, redundant source. If our watershed doesn't provide the water supply, TAP can and Ashland does not have to treat that water.

Williams discussed his proposal offering another water solution package for AWAC. The proposal addresses the public health and safety values that Jackson has addressed with the committee. Williams added that in Tech Memo 13, comment TAP, the volume of water may be restricted by the City of Talent pump capacities. Smeenck responded that based on a discussion with a Talent City Engineer, the capacity was likely to be adequate to extend out 50 years.

Adams mentioned from the last meeting that the future supply amount of an additional 621 acre feet may not be needed for as long as 28+ years out. This would be if 5% conservation is achieved on top of the current conservation goal of 5%.

Jackson questioned that if the demand for water supply diminishes during severe drought months or fire, etc. and TID doesn't provide enough water to supplement would the City be willing to have a reduction in accessible water of up to half? Carollo has indicated in prior information that the curtailment could be as high as 45% during drought months without a backup water source.

Williams continued discussion of his proposal stating that the WTP is historically susceptible to spring flooding. With climate change there is a potential for decreases in spring flows. Phasing in a new water treatment plant in a new location that is safe and fire proof could also address redundancy. Money spent on options should also be considered in a long term solution. Redundancy is the goal that TAP addresses. If a new WTP was started as an option and it was planned for expansion over 50 years, it would come down to an economic decision of capital expenditures. TAP will always be an option for the City to utilize. During the winter and spring extra water flows, TID supply is not a viable backup water supply, as well as recycling systems and storage that TAP doesn't provide for. Also, adding more storage capacity along Bear Creek or the WWTP could be investigated further. Economically, the City should invest in the future of water treatment.

Voisin asked how a new water treatment plant would provide redundancy. Williams answered that Ashland Creek was viable as a backup water supply, as was investing in recycling systems and storage that TAP doesn't cover. Smeenck added that the new WTP capacity could be gradually ramped up. The mini TAP was initially assumed to be used for emergency only. If used permanently, there would be no need for ramp up.

Pearce responded to questions on conservation levels that range from 5% to 15%. If the City can meet 15% additional conservation over the already achieved 5%, it could take care of the water shortage for anywhere up to the next 25 years. Conservation is typically the least costly supply source, and the cost per acre-feet wouldn't come close to the cost of other supply options. Whitley said 5% conservation wouldn't take a lot of infrastructure but any increase over 5% would take additional funding.

The Committee is still interested in looking into the option of obtaining additional water rights. The rights would come from different areas such as, TID, Ashland Creek and Lost Creek for example. Smeenk said this would be a general recommendation to include with all packages.

The Committee asked if it would be viable to provide additional raw water reservoir water storage as an option. Smeenk said currently, there aren't any more permits being issued for this type of storage.

Voisin stated she thought it would only cost between \$50k to 100k to look into the groundwater option. Patton brought up that the cost amount would be much higher than originally expected. The Committee would still like to keep this on the table as an option. Williams is concerned that not enough data would be provided to warrant spending the money for a study. Voisin stated it could be a Council approved capital improvement project with a cap on the expense.

Whitley informed the committee that Faught and Smeenk would put together a "straw person" to be used at the next meeting.

Public Input

Sheri Cellini responded to the question of groundwater and aquifers and tapping of shallow lakes. There could be a lot of drilling without knowing what is beneath.

Joseph Graf agreed with the sequence proposed in the committee's discussion thus far.

VI. NEXT MEETING AND SUGGESTED AGENDA TOPICS:

The next Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, April 6, 2011. Location will be in the Siskiyou Room at Community Development, 51 Winburn Way from 4:00 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.

VII. MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:45 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by
Brenda Barker, Administrative Assistant*