

City of Ashland Water Advisory Committee
51 Winburn Way, Siskiyou Room
July 28, 2011 Minutes

Committee Members Present: Pat Acklin, Lesley Adams, Alex Amarotico, Darrell Boldt, Donna Mickley, Don Morris, Donna Rhee, Councilor Carol Voisin and John Williams

Absent: Kate Jackson, Rich Whitley, Amy Patton, Mike Faught

Staff Present: Brenda Barker, Betsy Harshman, Greg Hunter, Robbin Pearce, Pieter Smeenk and Steve Walker

Carollo Consultants: Nikki Pozos and David Kraska via teleconference

I. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order by Pieter Smeenk at 4:06 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Smeenk commented on the minutes for the April 6th meeting. He said that the minutes were correct; however, his statement regarding the amount of time it would take to build the Talent Ashland Pipeline (TAP) line was incorrect. He said that the TAP pipeline could be installed in a month, which might be true if you had everything in place. In reality, the procurement, permitting and installation process will probably take a year to complete.

Smeenk asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 30th and April 6th meetings. Morris made a motion to accept the minutes with a second from Acklin. Minutes were approved as written.

Adams did not have time to read the minutes prior to their approval and pointed out two items for correction towards the end of the meeting. The first correction is on the March 30th meeting minutes, page 2, third paragraph, change it to read 5% achieved on top of a goal of 5% (not 15%). Item 2, page 4 of the April 6th minutes in the paragraph that starts off about Adams, change it to say by 2038 to be up to 10 MG per day (not in addition to). The committee agreed to the additional corrections.

III. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:

None

IV. PUBLIC FORUM:

The committee agreed that seeking more public input is important. Pearce stated that she is providing updates to the Conservation Commission. Voisin will try and update the Council, if there is time at the next meeting. Smeenk would draft an update for her to share with Council.

V. DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS:

1. **Project Status** – Smeenk announced that Whitley would be moving to Portland. Whitley will continue as chair throughout the remainder of the AWAC meetings.

The next meeting is scheduled for August 24, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. Pozzos will present the water quality treatment chapter; system analysis; and the model update and calibration. The

September meeting is an important one in that it will involve decision making. This meeting is scheduled for the 22nd, at 4:00 p.m. The following meeting in October will focus on money issues.

Smeenk stated that hydrant tests will be performed on Monday and reports will be given to Carollo. A water conservation and reuse summary has been submitted to the state which provided a synopsis of the 15 technical memos and all of the presentations from Carollo.

2. Water Supply Alternatives Update: Smeenk reminded the committee that two redundancy options were chosen at the last meeting, including the mini tap and the second water treatment plant. Looking at the modified option: 6 plus A (second water treatment plant), one of the challenges is figuring out the costs for staffing. It has not been determined how much time a second operator will be required to run two plants for 6 months. It will require at least one extra full-time employee. Including operations and maintenance costs, this extra position will add an additional cost of approximately \$80,000 to \$100,000 per year.

Voisin asked for clarification on a 6 month employee. Smeek responded that with the current proposal, it may actually take an additional 1.5 full time employees (FTE). The second plant running in the summer would be dedicated to using Talent Irrigation District (TID) water. Staff's internal idea for operational purposes has been to use less water from the creek and more water from TID. TID requires a 24-hr operator because of the constantly changing chlorine residuals and flows. If the delivery of TID water to the plant was fully enclosed in pipes, it might be different, but with the current system extra staffing will be necessary (at least initially). This would increase the operating costs by an additional \$150,000, which will have to be factored into the cost between the two alternatives.

Voisin asked why TID would be used if the reservoir was full like it is this year. Smeenk explained that the committee is working on designing a system for the worst case years with the hottest summers and the least water scenario. For the purpose of estimating, an assumption would be made based on the demands and how it would be most practicable to scale up gradually to the year 2020. Staffing levels may start out at one a half time FTE and increase over time.

Morris stated that one of the drivers for the additional water treatment plant is redundancy. One of the contingencies that would create a case for redundancy would be problems in the watershed such as fire, an earthquake, etc. He asked how much siltation could be handled. Smeenk replied that a lot of reservoir storage could be lost and the plant would still remain operational. Following the flood in 1997, less than 15% of the dam's capacity was hauled out.

Acklin commented that a second water treatment plant, using TID 6 months of the year would not provide redundancy during a flood in January.

Smeenk replied that it's not instantaneously available, but you can always fire up the plant and take water out of the swimming hole to treat it from there. The proposal is that the new 2.5 mg plant would be run year round and the existing plant would only be fired up during the irrigation season.

Smeenck asked for a recommendation on the different types of redundancy. He stated that if you have the two treatment plants, you have redundancy. Choosing mini TAP for emergencies only, would not provide instant redundancy. At least a day (possibly more) will be required to re-chlorinate the Talent Ashland Pipeline (TAP) and that water would require testing before its known if it can actually be used. If you went with the mini tap only, more finished water storage could provide the water that would be needed for a day or two.

Williams asked about the location for extra water storage. Smeenck said that would be provided by building Crowson II, which is potentially a consideration that should be added with each option. Building Crowson II is estimated to cost \$4mil to \$5mil.

Smeenck announced that bids were received on the Hosler Dam safety analysis. In that study they included a little bit of work to see what it would take to make the dam taller. That option is being looked at though is very limited and preliminary. It will more likely be looked at in the next water master plan update, not during this cycle.

3. Master Plan Overview – Kraska told the committee that the water reuse study had been completed and that they were now focusing on the comprehensive master plan elements.

Carollo hopes to wrap up the systems evaluation in August, followed by a draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). After the City reviews the draft CIP, a final CIP will be prepared for the AWAC members to review at their meeting in September.

Kraska explained that they will then step into the financial analysis, timing of the improvements and how rates will be affected. They plan to wrap up in October with the final financial analysis. In November, they will prepare a draft followed by the final report which will wrap up the final master plan.

Adams asked if the committee would be deciding between the two packages in September, prior to receiving a financial analysis. Smeenck responded that several things would be looked at, but those issues would not have anything to do with the redundancy options. She also wanted to know if they would get the documents prior to the meeting to allow members time for review. Pozzos responded that there would not be decision making during the next meeting, it would mainly just be a presentation. They would, however send out a draft CIP in advance of the September meeting. The financials would be submitted ahead of time, but will be provided by Shawn and he would need to speak to the timing of those documents.

The committee would like at least one week to review documents prior to each meeting.

4. Finished Water Storage Evaluation – Pozzos explained that finished water storage is water that has already been treated and held in storage tanks (also known as reservoirs). In the morning, a big peak in water use happens, but not as much around 10:00 a.m. She said that treatment facilities are not designed to deliver the peak hour demand, it is rather designed to use the treated water stored in the tanks during that peak period.

Smeenck said that one of the biggest challenges within the City's system is that every night from midnight to 4:00 a.m., reservoir levels in Crowson Reservoir drop dramatically.

Carollo provided a document titled Preliminary Storage Evaluation, dated July 28, 2011, which outlined storage evaluation criteria, including fire and emergency storage. In

reference to table 2 of the same document, reservoir fire flow information was provided. Smeenk explained that Crowson and Granite reservoirs required a higher gpm (4,000) fire flow because they service both residential and commercial customers. In comparison, the other reservoirs serving residential customers only require a 1,500 gpm flow.

The third type of storage is emergency holding in reservoirs to meet the demands of supply failure. It takes into consideration how much water is in holding (storage) to meet the city's needs if the treatment plant is jeopardized.

If a supply outage occurred on the hottest day of summer, current water storage would only meet customer demands for a half of a day while waiting for supply to come back on. If it were more in line with other water suppliers, a typical emergency supply would last a whole day. Some water suppliers have a 2 day holding capacity or more. Staff and Carollo will be looking for feedback from the committee regarding the amount of storage they feel is adequate for Ashland.

Per Hunter, who has been working with the City for 21 years, said that when he started working at the Reservoir in 1990, they needed Crowson II then. At that time, the plant was staffed 24 hours a day during the summer. He also described a recent incident that happened this summer, which caused the City to issue a "please don't use the water" notice. They had a failure during the unmanned portion of the night; the filters were backwashing continually which caused the tanks not to fill. When they arrived in the morning, they were at a critical level in the reservoir. The problem was that there was not an alarm to detect that particular type of problem, which would have alerted the operator by phone. They are in the process of installing a new computer routine and alarm sequence as a prevention mechanism.

Smeenk and Hunter agreed that if they had Crowson II for additional storage, it would not be so difficult. Smeenk added that an increase from 0.5 days of storage to 1.0 days would help. If a second plant was running at the same time or TAP, you'd also be able fill up the reservoir with that. The above described incident fell under the category of emergency storage, per Smeenk and Pozzos.

Pearce said that if irrigation policies, practices and procedures were in place, you could minimize some of the highs and lows and added that it did not always have to be a supply issue.

Smeenk said that the Mayor had asked the Fire Chief what he felt was needed during the worst case scenario during a large scale fire. His estimate was 5,000 to 10,000 GPM. Pozzos stated that is a very high fire flow. The challenge is that it would be highly unlikely that you could actually deliver that amount through Ashland's piping system.

Smeenk referred to table 2 and said that if you increased fire flows to the 1 x max daily demand, the City would actually need to add two Crowson II's. When you get redundancy you need less storage.

Kraska stated that the cost for storage is about \$1 per gallon.

Pieter asked for a policy recommendation to increase the storage policy to be more than .5 Williams asked for staff's recommendation. Smeenk stated that it is a policy decision and

said that if we built Crowson II we'd be half way between .5 and 1. The group seemed to agree that this would be a reasonable thing to put into the recommendation.

Acklin said that she was having a hard time, absent an updated data retrieval chart, figuring out costs and how everything would fit together to be optimal. She made a plea for another data retrieval chart to see how Crowson II, a treatment plant, mini TAP and how they would impact each other. Smeenk said that they are all interconnected and that if you change one, it affects them all.

Rhee stated that she has been hearing from staff that they have wanted Crowson II for a long time and felt it is important to listen to the people who do this every day for a living.

Voisin asked for clarification of Smeenk's statement that redundancy requires less storage. He replied that if you have a second plant and one of the plants goes down, you still have water coming in you that can replace in reserve, therefore reducing the amount of storage required. One of the rules is that it has to be not only emergency redundancy but immediately available redundancy as well. If TAP is chosen, it would have to be set up to go at any time.

Voisin asked that if the City had two water treatment plants, would Crowson II still be needed. Smeenk replied that if the committee chooses the 2nd option that was offered earlier as one of the straw men, which involved combining Crowson II with second treatment plant, it would do double duty. Crowson II would be called the clear well of the 2nd water treatment plant and would be built in that same spot.

Smeenk asked how the committee felt about fire storage and if it was worth spending money on in the public's view. He said that he was hearing yes. Rhee agreed that the public could not turn its back on the need for fire storage. Smeenk wanted this confirmed because when it comes up every year, it gets dropped out of the budget. He said that they would need 4 more million gallons if they go to 1 max day and it was decided to go half way. In that case, they would need 2 million gallons, equating to roughly \$2 million dollars.

VI. NEXT MEETING AND SUGGESTED AGENDA TOPICS:

The next meeting is scheduled for August 24, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room at 51 Winburn Way. Pozzos will present the water quality treatment chapter; system analysis; and the model update and calibration.

VII. MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:20 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by
Betsy Harshman, PWAdministrative Supervisor*