

CITY OF ASHLAND

ASHLAND WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES SEPTEMBER 28, 2011

CALL TO ORDER

Pieter Smeenk called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way.

Committee Members Present:

Pat Acklin
Alex Amarotico
Darrell Boldt
Joseph Graf
Don Morris
Amy Patton
Councilor Carol Voisin
John Williams

Carollo Consultants: (via teleconference)

Rachel Lanigan
David Kraska

Staff Members:

Mike Faught, Public Works Director
Robbin Pearce, Conservation
Pieter Smeenk, Engineer
Jodi Vizzini, Office Assistant
Steve Walker, Water Quality Supervisor

Public:

Julie Norman

Absent Members:

Lesley Adams
Sherri Cellini
Greg Hunter
Kate Jackson
Donna Mickley
Donna Rhee
Rich Whitley (Chair)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The August 24, 2011 minutes were not addressed at this meeting. The Committee agreed to review the minutes at the October 26, 2011 meeting.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Pieter Smeenk announced that Julie Norman would be making a short presentation to the Committee prior to the scheduled presentation of Chapters 5, 6 & 7 by Carollo Engineers.

PUBLIC FORUM

Ms. Norman presented information and displayed maps that pertained to the AWAC agenda Item III in Chapter 6 in the draft document section regarding the water holding capacity of Reeder Reservoir and sediment removal. She stressed that sediment is deserving of the Committee's attention and when considering options AWAC may want to use LIDAR maps produced by the State of Oregon, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries. Mr. Smeenk agreed that LIDAR maps are much more detailed and informed AWAC that the City of Ashland has these type of maps on hand.

DISCUSSIONS & DECISIONS

Project Status:

Mr. Smeenk stated that AWAC is coming close to the end unless the Committee finds things that are surprising at the next scheduled meeting. He pointed out that when looking at the choices, there is not much financial difference

between the two. He prompted Carollo Engineers to give an overview of Chapters 5, 6 and 7 and encouraged the Committee to ask questions of clarification during the presentation.

Chapter 5 Distribution System Analysis:

Rachel Lanigan recapped where the Committee left off from the August 24 meeting in Chapter 5, starting with Figure 5.5 which is finalizing the storage and pumping issues in the City. The Committee looked at Table 5.14, addressing storage needs. Mr. Smeenk asked Ms. Lanigan if this table assumes Nesting. Ms. Lanigan answered that it does not include Nesting.

John Williams questioned if the City built a new water treatment plant (WTP) would the new storage need be lower to meet fire flow level of service. Ms. Lanigan answered yes, as it has more to do with the emergency storage. Mr. Williams asked if Carollo Engineers would be explaining the cost difference. Mr. Faught verified the cost on the spreadsheets indicate \$8.4 - \$8.5 million for the TAP storage, and \$6.7 million for the storage with the new WTP.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Lanigan to explain how the two different supply solutions being considered affect the fire flow deficiencies in 2015 and in 2030. Ms. Lanigan explained that the fire flow analysis does not depend on supply, but instead is about pressure. The secondary supply alternatives do not come into play other than where the reservoir is located.

Pat Acklin summarized that as long as there is water in the reservoir, there is pressure in the system and it does not matter where the water comes from. Ms. Acklin asked Carollo if the size difference in storage affects the pressure, or if they are both full is there enough pressure. Ms. Lanigan replied Carollo used an average reservoir size in the model and the diameter is not that much different in the two tanks, which average 3 million gallon (MG).

Chapter 6 - Water Quality:

Ms. Acklin clarified that Chapter 6 is now Chapter 5.

Dave Kraska presented Chapter 6 reporting that Ashland is in compliance with current regulations but there is a critical date in 2013 regarding the Stage II Disinfectant Rule. Amy Patton questioned if algae blooms should be a concern and if so is it more a TID or a City concern. Mr. Kraska replied that as far as potable water systems go, it is a concern if there is an algae bloom in TID. Mr. Smeenk asked if it is getting more toxic or if there are more blooms. Mr. Kraska replied it is a localized issue. Mr. Smeenk shared with the Committee that after talking with an expert in this field, Ashland will have to do more testing.

Don Mickley shared his concern that Lost Creek Lake is now in the second year of algae. Ms. Acklin shared with the Committee that different environment conditions create different kinds of algae and she agrees with Mr. Smeenk that the best way to know is to test frequently. Ms. Patton inquired about chlorine issues, the disinfection bi-products (DBP) and how it relates to problems at the current plant, and its relation to the length of pipe and the introduction of chlorine. Mr. Smeenk answered that it was a contact time issue and not the same as a DBP problem.

Ms. Patton asked Mr. Kraska what is being done to address the chlorine issue and the potassium permanganate. Mr. Kraska explained the CT requirement as it relates to chlorine concentration (C) and contact time (T). The current WTP causes this to be challenging and needs to be addressed to make it a more reliable system. Ms. Patton asked Mr. Kraska to clarify what she read regarding the physical limitation to the length of pipe needed at the current WTP. Mr. Kraska explained this part of the report refers to the potassium permanganate being added at the head end of the WTP, which is used for taste and odor control. He explained how the current system limits the ability to control taste and odor. Ms. Patton asked if this could be addressed at the new WTP. Mr. Kraska stated that it could. Mr. Williams questioned if the new WTP was added, would this allow enough time to get the organic material out by adding the

chlorine and potassium permanganate at the old WTP. Mr Kraska confirmed that conceptually the proposed location would allow enough time. Ms. Acklin commented that there is not enough room currently between the overflow area and the Creek to put it in to allow enough time to work. Mr. Kraska confirmed there is not enough room.

Councilor Carol Voisin asked Carollo to explain what happens in terms of the current WTP's ability to do the flocculation and filtration process as it relates to continual turbid waters. Mr. Kraska replied that if the water becomes more turbid than it has been historically, using the current system will cause the operation costs to go up significantly and the water production will drop. Ms. Patton asked if there will be room at the proposed WTP site for sedimentation basins. Mr. Kraska replied yes. Ms. Voisin asked Carollo to clarify how turbidity is measured, and to explain a normal nephelometric turbidity unit (NTU) measuring process. Mr. Kraska explained the process and that finished tap water is below 0.1 NTU where water out of the Creek can be in the range of 1 to 5 NTUs. Ms. Voisin questioned if the new WTP could handle 50 NTUs. Several committee members agreed that having the space to treat the water would allow the new WTP to handle 50 NTUs.

Mr. Kraska finished Chapter 6 explaining the Scada System upgrades and the need for better security around the WTP. Mr. Smeenk explained the entire system needs upgrading before 2025. The Committee discussed if this should be an ongoing maintenance project, or one big project. Mr. Smeenk confirmed that the Committee had agreed it should be a separate project. Mr. Kraska stated that Carollo will add it.

Ms. Patton asked if WQ-2 on the spreadsheet is a temporary thing. Mr. Kraska replied it is primarily to make it reliable now. Ms. Patton also commented that it looks like a few CIP projects are expensive stop-gaps. Mr. Smeenk replied they are actually refinements that pay off. Ms. Patton questioned if AWAC wants to put in a major improvement now. Mr. Smeenk replied no. Mr. Kraska added the appropriate time to do this would be if, and when, the new WTP is selected.

Mr. Smeenk asked the Committee if they wanted to talk about the TAP water quality. A question was asked about arsenic. Mr. Smeenk replied it would be tested for that. Mr. Williams questioned if the TAP water quality would need to be verified at the point it enters our system to make sure the water quality is what Ashland expects it to be. Mr. Smeenk replied it was investigated initially and it was found there was no need to test.

Chapter 7 – Capital Improvements Plan (CIP):

Ms. Lanigan instructed the committee to look at the cost estimate assumptions on page one of Chapter 7 as she explained the planning-level cost estimates for each project. Ms. Acklin asked if Carollo has given consideration that Ashland is built on top of granite. Pieter reiterated that Ashland actually has good soil conditions, and granite is good to work with because it is conductive. He explained the costs outlined in the chapter are contracted out costs, which include design documents and processes so the numbers look big, but when the jobs are done in-house, they are much less expensive. Mr. Faught added however, that City of Ashland crews are limited in size. Ms. Acklin commented she wanted to make sure Carollo is using the standards and that the costs outlined actually apply to Ashland. Ms. Lanigan explained the cost range could be 50% high to 30% low.

Ms. Lanigan directed the Committee to look at the two CIP tables Mr. Smeenk provided representing the new WTP and the TAP Emergency Supply. Ms. Lanigan explained the projected new WTP project as it relates to long-term, short-term and total cost. Mr. Smeenk reminded the Committee and Carollo that the price of reservoirs has gone up. Ms. Lanigan asked Mr. Kraska to explain the new cost estimate. Mr. Kraska pointed out the new reservoir is \$7.8 million for a 3.6 MG reservoir at the unescalated cost. Mr. Smeenk questioned if AWAC should use 1.5 million gallons per day (MGD) or 3 MGD for TAP considering emergency needs verses available water in the summer. He added it is an assumption and that the size of the reservoir is still flexible. Ms. Acklin added that essentially there are

two values; one smaller and one larger and AWAC can estimate somewhere in between. Mr. Faught commented the economy of scale is relatively close.

Mr. Smeenck asked the Committee if any projects jump out that needed addressed. Mr. Williams asked to clarify if the need for a pump at Park Estates is to meet the fire flow level of service. Ms. Lanigan explained it also addresses the peak hour demand in the future as well as the fire flow deficiency, and it includes the Alsing Mountain area. Ms. Acklin commented it seems like the Park Estates developers should have paid for a bigger pump station when it was built considering it is \$2 million. Mr. Smeenck added something to consider could be a high zone surcharge on rates. Mr. Faught added when AWAC gets to the water structure rates, this conversation will need to happen. Ms. Acklin commented that it was the expectation of everyone at the time that the cost of developing this land, which was in the City limits, should have been borne by the developer as part of the City's policy. Mr. Williams asked to clarify if the \$2 million could be pulled out of the CIP and put in any year. Mr. Kraska replied the \$2 million is the cost to get the Park Estates/South Mountain area in compliance with the fire flow requirement. Mr. Williams asked if it is independent of other costs. Mr. Faught reminded the Committee that Ashland still needs to meet the fire flow, so it is a CIP cost. Ms. Acklin commented it could be something the Council makes as a policy in the future when dealing with these neighborhoods.

Mr. Smeenck added that timing is hard to determine at this point and if the City of Ashland employees were asked which projects should come first, most likely all would agree it should be Park Estates. The Committee deferred to Steve Walker for a confirmation and he agreed as it is currently insufficient and problematic.

Ms. Lanigan moved on to the pipe project priorities. Ms. Acklin asked if Ashland has been keeping up with the existing CIPs. Mr. Faught reminded the Committee that revenues have been down so capital projects have been cut, yet Ashland has been keeping up with the CIPs.

Mr. Williams asked to clarify why the subtotals do not add up in the cost column under general. Ms. Lanigan explained that \$200,000 is every five years and there are only three of them represented in the plan. Mr. Smeenck pointed out the order will be changed next month, making it confusing.

Ms. Acklin asked about a waterline revolving fund to do upgrades and questioned if it still exists. Mr. Smeenck replied it was the SDC reimbursement fund and was funded by developers. Ms. Acklin stated it was not an SDC fund but it was created in the budget during the era when SDCs were born. Mr. Faught commented that Ashland has an annual \$150,000 SDC fund for projects. Mr. Smeenck stated there is a list of projects from when they did the SDCs last time which is different from this list and AWAC will get the opportunity to change this list, which will change the priorities. Mr. Smeenck added that SDCs only pay for the projects that add capacity, so most of these projects will not get on the list.

Ms. Patton asked Carollo to look at Appendix B, page 21 in the Water Quality Chapter where it states "expected to be published in 2009, etc." Ms. Patton asked if this was a cut and paste and thinks this section is generic and needs to be updated. Carollo Engineers agreed and confirmed they will update it.

Mr. Smeenck reminded the Committee there are four chapters that have not been reviewed, but they are rewordings of other technical memos that have been waded through the last year. He added they will be ready to look at but they are reiterations of what has been covered. Mr. Smeenck let the Committee know the Operations and Maintenance Chapter and the Financial Chapter will be covered at the next meeting. Mr. Faught added that AWAC will need to recommend the rate structures as part of the financial package and choose either the new WTP or TAP.

Ms. Acklin added that it will be more about judgment and opinion as opposed to one clear-cut, obvious, inexpensive, practical choice. Mr. Faught stated that AWAC will need to take this decision and recommendation to the Council.

Ms. Voisin asked when the educational part for the community will begin. Mr. Faught stated he would like to talk to the consultants over the next couple of weeks and propose something. Mr. Smeenk added a simple explanation is needed. Mr. Faught added that part of the hesitation is AWAC has not made a decision yet and putting out two solutions is confusing and premature. Mr. Faught stressed to Carollo Engineers that AWAC would like their help on putting this public outreach piece together.

Mr. Smeenk asked the Committee if they thought the temperature shading information got out to the Community effectively. The Committee agreed it was effective.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

NEXT MEETING AND SUGGESTED AGENDA TOPICS

Mr. Smeenk confirmed the date of the next meeting is October 26, 2011 and reminded the Committee the presentation will include the O & M and the Financial Chapters.

*Respectfully submitted,
Jodi Vizzini, Office Assistant*