



**City of Lake Oswego/City of Tigard Water Supply Partnership
Summary of Oversight Committee Meeting #7
Meeting held May 3, 2010**

Lake Oswego Technical Committee Member Joel Komarek called the meeting of the Lake Oswego/Tigard Water Partnership Oversight Committee to order at 3:00 p.m. on May 3, 2010, in the Oswego Conference Room at the West End Building, 4101 Kruse Way, Lake Oswego.

Present:

City of Lake Oswego	Oversight Committee: Councilor Tierney; Staff: Joel Komarek, Jane Heisler, David Prock, Kari Duncan, and Laura Barrie; Brown and Caldwell Staff: Jon Holland
City of Tigard	Oversight Committee: Councilors Webb and Buehner; Staff: Dennis Koellermeier and Rob Murchison
Guests	Craig Stephens, 330 Durham Street, Old Town Board Member Brian Murphy, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Councilor Johnson was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING #6

Mr. Komarek asked for the approval of minutes from the last meeting held on April 5, 2010. Councilor Buehner motioned to approve, Councilor Webb seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed with Lake Oswego Councilor Tierney and Tigard Councilors Webb and Buehner voting 'aye' (3-0). Minutes from the April 5, 2010, meeting were approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Komarek asked if the guests wanted a few minutes to speak. Mr. Stephens wanted to encourage staff to look for cost cutting options. He is a tax payer and saw the estimated bill. Mr. Komarek mentioned that there would be discussion on the budget and the status of water treatment technologies for the Water Treatment Plant which would include costs. Mr. Stephens also mentioned that he does not like the cherry trees being cut down in George Roger's Park. Mr. Komarek stated that it is not the Lake Oswego/Tigard Water Project.

4. REVIEW/DISCUSSION OF FY 2010-11 DRAFT BUDGET

Mr. Komarek stated that the Draft Budget had been sent out for review a few weeks ago, but it had been revised again. The version that is in the packet is the latest draft. Mr. Komarek mentioned that attached to the last draft there was a document that highlighted some of the

recent changes. Councilor Tierney asked if this was coming in on budget as estimated through this year? Mr. Komarek asked Mr. Prock and Mr. Holland to respond. He mentioned that the major expenditures to date were for the Program Management Team.

Mr. Prock stated that the proposed budget tracks fairly closely with the 7-year projection. This is within \$300,000 to \$500,000 of what was estimated for the coming year. As project definition proceeds, we will relook at the projection to see if there will be any significant changes. For this year (2009–10), most areas are on track with the exception of the Brown and Caldwell contract. This contract may be underspent. Mr. Holland stated that there are two aspects:

- The first aspect is field investigations, particularly geotechnical and survey work; rather than being done prior to June 30 it will be pushed a little later in the summer.
- The second aspect is that some decisions have been made to focus the investigation a little more narrowly on a couple of projects. For instance, the intake on the Clackamas River has been narrowed down to a single location so there is less investigation of other alternatives.

Mr. Koellermeier asked about the numbers to Tigard adjusting up. He stated that Tigard was originally budgeted at \$4.8 million now it is at \$5 million. Mr. Komarek let Mr. Koellermeier know that he would look into the matter and get back to him prior to his City Council Budget meeting.

5. PROJECT DEFINITION UPDATE

Mr. Komarek gave a general overview of Project Definition. The second workshop to evaluate Treatment Plant alternatives was completed on the 21st of April. There is a series of 6 projects that run concurrently:

- River Intake Pump Station (RIPS) on the Clackamas River which is where water is diverted from the river

Originally, there was a range of alternate sites for the intake facility. As a result of the evaluation of the feasibility and the potential risks of locating a new intake structure at different locations either above the existing intake or below the existing intake, it has been concluded that the best location is at the existing intake or just slightly upstream of the existing intake. That is helping focus the geotechnical work that needs to be done. It is helping Eric Day, our Associate Land Use Planner, on focusing efforts to get the Land Use approvals. It is helping focus the permitting team on what and where permits are required.

- Raw Water Pipeline (RWP)

A range of alternative alignments to get from one side of the Willamette to the other were reviewed. Specialty subconsultants who have expertise in various types of trenchless methods to install pipelines particularly in river crossings where environmental issues are more sensitive have been added to the project. Along with those specialists and the internal analysis, those options have been narrowed down to

two preferred starting and ending points. Evaluation of means and methods is continuing. Meaning, do we want to do either a horizontal directional drill or do we want to look at conventional open cut excavation across the river.

There are two potential starting locations on the east side of the Willamette.

- One being through Meldrum Bar Park which would somewhat parallel our existing pipeline.
- The second starting point is also on the east side but more in unincorporated Clackamas County a little bit West of 99 in a place that is referred to as the Cottonwood site.

Once across the river on the west side, both options appear to be ending up in Mary S. Young Park at one point or another. There is a meeting with the City of Gladstone to talk about the Meldrum Bar Park site and then a week later there is a meeting with the Parks Superintendent of the City of West Linn and the Oregon State Parks Department Director to talk about concerns/constraints of being in the parks.

Councilor Tierney asked who needs to give us permission besides the two parks? Mr. Komarek answered that there will be a range of federal and state agencies. The Army Corps of Engineers, Division of State Lands, DEQ, and of course Gladstone, West Linn, and Oregon State Parks are the biggest. Mr. Tierney asked if this is part of the permitting processes which were discussed at a previous Council meeting. Mr. Komarek responded that yes it is and that Lake Oswego is having the city attorney review the collaborative environmental agreement that is being used to focus on how to go forward with permitting.

- The Water Treatment Plant (WTP)

This will be covered under #7 below.

- Finished Water Pipeline (FWP)

Field work has been started. Some Brown and Caldwell staff members have been walking the existing alignment. They are looking at locations where private property might be crossed, as well as riparian areas, resource conservation, or protection areas. Scopes of work are being developed for condition assessments for the existing pipeline. Assessments are being conducted to determine to what extent we can continue to use the existing infrastructure. Now that water is moving a greater distance and different treatment technologies are being considered, there needs to be an understanding about what that will do to the water quality in the distribution system.

- Waluga Reservoir (WR)

There is a need to come to an agreement or an understanding about how big the tank should be? How tall should the tank be? Where should it be located? Surveying is occurring in regard to the lot line adjustment. It has been mentioned before that the existing reservoir straddles water fund property and park property. Eric Day has been

shepherding the lot line adjustment process through our planning department to get the reservoir on one common parcel. Ms. Heisler and Mr. Komarek met with the Lake Forest Neighborhood Association about how they would feel about a reservoir that was 20 feet taller than the existing reservoir. Decisions should be made in the next month to two months about what seems to be an efficient size, the appropriate location, and the correct height.

- Bonita Road Pump Station (BRPS)

Possible locations for the pump station are being considered. Should it be closer to an area where there may be opportunities to connect to other regional systems? If that is done, how should the station be designed so that water can be moved both directions and maybe from alternate sources through the pump station? The whole objective of the project definition phase is to define what the designers should start designing once the project is handed off to them. Before the end of this calendar year, we will be coming to the Councils in a series of meetings, informing the Councils about what does this capital improvement program look like, what process did we go through to arrive at decisions for the various facilities, and then we will have the two Councils ultimately approve the supply facilities plan. At that point, the next phase is getting design teams on board.

6. COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

Ms. Heisler passed out the internal working calendar that is used for communications. She stated that the focus this month has been the Business Case Evaluation and the water treatment decision. There was a meeting with the Robinwood Neighborhood; notes are included from that meeting. There were about 55 people there. They have a large list of wants and needs. One of the most difficult things will be to get the neighborhood to come to some agreement about what is most important. The meeting appeared to be a good start to a long relationship.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that the team has developed a traveling PowerPoint presentation. There will be four or five people trained to deliver this presentation at other neighborhood meetings or community functions.

Ms. Heisler stated that a flyer was inserted in Lake Oswego's water bills: one side is conservation-oriented the other side is about the open house on June 24. There will be a presence at both Lake Oswego and Tigard Farmer's Markets. There was an internal communications meeting at the beginning of the month, and then a meeting was held with Tigard to try to understand each other's established communications conduits. One difference that was noted is in Lake Oswego's city newsletter, you only have to have something in two weeks before the newsletter shows up in people's mailboxes, whereas in Tigard it is six weeks. There was not an opportunity to put flyers in Tigard's water bills, because those bills are spoken for a good length of time in advance.

Ms. Heisler stated that the team is putting some provocative questions on Facebook. These will be drawn from the survey and will include questions such as why do people filter their water even though they say they love their water. There are 20 pals at this point, up from the 6 we had earlier.

Ms. Heisler said that tomorrow there is a meeting with four city managers from Tigard, Lake Oswego, Gladstone, and West Linn. They will be able to take advantage of the opportunity to learn a little more about the partnership, look at the alternative we are down to on the intake, and then the finished water line, the raw water line, and the treatment plant. This is so they can understand what might be coming. We want to get an idea of their concerns and issues with any of those alternatives so that we can work with them.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that Mr. Prock is presenting to the Planning Department in Lake Oswego. She asked Mr. Koellermeier if he would like the engineering staff from Tigard to give a presentation. Mr. Koellermeier responded that he would like to have a presence.

Ms. Heisler stated that the Parks and Rec advisory committee wants a presentation this month since we go through two of their parks and in front of a couple more. She said that Water Savvy #4, the partnership benefits should be out in the next week and then one on conservation will follow.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that there was a meeting with the Lake Forest neighborhood. Mr. Komarek and Ms. Heisler followed a presentation on pathways in their neighborhood plan. The neighborhood has identified a desired pathway that runs right through the reservoir site. We will continue meeting with them as there is more definition to the Waluga location and size.

Councilor Tierney asked who receives the Water Savvy's? Ms. Heisler responded that so far it is sent to people on the e-mail list, the two councils, and the Oversight Committee. Mr. Tierney mentioned that Lake Oswego's Councilors have not received it yet. Ms. Heisler responded that it would be taken care of. Councilor Webb stated that Tigard's Councilors are receiving it. Ms. Heisler mentioned that the weekly digest update for Council is sent to Tigard also. Mr. Koellermeier stated that he appreciates being able to use Ms. Heisler's updates because she is good at writing so it works for both cities. Councilor Tierney suggested adding Boards and Commissions and LONAC to the distribution list because the Water Savvy's are so informative. Mr. Komarek asked if they were also posted to the website? Ms. Heisler responded yes they were.

7. WATER TREATMENT PLANT – TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Mr. Komarek turned the discussion over to Mr. Holland, who is the project lead for the Brown and Caldwell Program Management Team. Handouts were distributed which gave an overview of some of the alternatives from the last workshop. Mr. Komarek mentioned that the data represents those alternatives that have been selected to move forward with further analysis with the exception of one. He explained what the different treatment techniques were and how they were grouped into 4 series. He then explained how each treatment technique was gauged with a circle. An open circle represents that the treatment technology does not address that treatment objective. If the circle is completely filled in, than that treatment technology does a good job at that particular function. When this workshop started, there were 18 alternatives that were being reviewed; by the end of the day, those 18 were narrowed down to 6 alternatives. One of the 18 alternatives was membranes, this was represented in the 3 series. This technology was screened from further analysis due to a variety of factors; it did not meet all the water quality objectives that we needed it to meet and the costs were quite high both in terms of capital and long-term O & M.

Mr. Komarek asked Mr. Holland to walk through the remainder of the information. Ms. Heisler asked which alternatives we ended up with. Mr. Holland responded that the entire 1 series and the entire 2 series is what we ended up with.

Mr. Holland began by stating that his goal was to give a sense of the process and the significant conclusions that came out of that process. As a reminder, this panel of experts includes some of the leading water treatment design experts in the country. There were 4 firms represented as well as an environmental health expert who works for the state of Utah. There was also operations staff from Lake Oswego's team and management staff from both cities. There were a few members from the public and the Citizen Sounding Board had a wrap up at the end of the day.

Mr. Holland mentioned that the goal of Workshop 2 was to take the 18 alternatives, evaluate them on the basis of how effective they are at meeting water treatment objectives, and look at a whole slate of other evaluation criteria such as how easy is it to operate, how reliable is it, what kind of chemical or power usage will it require, and then of course the capital and operational costs. At the end of that day-long effort, the panel was very clear that the whole membrane category (the 3.0 series) was not a good deal, given the water source and treatment objectives. It basically does the same thing as the conventional treatment alternative but it has a capital cost that is about \$30 million more. Mr. Holland stated that membranes offer a physical barrier and would make more sense if you did not trust your operations staff to run the plant well. Mr. Holland asked Ms. Duncan if she had anything to add to the discussion about membranes. Ms. Duncan mentioned that there are some footprint benefits. The membranes can be built a little smaller. Some facilities are attracted to membranes because then can be left to run without operations staff.

Mr. Holland moved on to the three site plans which were part of the handout. The site plans numbered 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 correspond to the same-numbered series. Mr. Holland explained what the differences were between each layout and that each alternative had different shading. He also explained the different columns on the page. Councilor Buehner asked about the size and cost of the ozone treatment. Mr. Holland mentioned that the information was shown in the documents.

Mr. Stephens asked if there was any concern about the ozone treatment option relative to the pvc pipes that people might have in their homes, could they become brittle or has the ozone dissipated before it reaches those pipes. Ms. Duncan responded that there is no more ozone in the water; once it hits the filters, the ozone is gone from that point on.

Mr. Holland explained the difference between the alternative 1 families and the alternative 2 families. Alternative 2 is called the active flow treatment which is a high rate sedimentation process. This means it can be done on a smaller footprint. It comes with a higher price tag for that smaller footprint. There is the base alternative 2.0 and then there are two variations; one with UV and one with ozone. Mr. Komarek mentioned it might be worthwhile to refer back to this page because it shows the treatment technology as it exists today and then shows the various options and suboptions and the effect they have in meeting some of these treatment objectives. You are paying for incremental improvement in your ability to respond to seasonal taste and odor or your ability to provide a better quality of water relative to trace organics. As Mr. Holland talks about the different processes, refer back to this page to see what that treatment process does

buy. The question ultimately for the Councils and the community is do we want to pay for that? Some of these might be issues that we have to be able to address as future regulations require us to do so or as future water quality changes. The treatment plant is meeting the objectives today, but it challenges Ms. Duncan's operators to do that 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, particularly given the nature of the river and changing water quality conditions. As we look into the future, do we want to prepare ourselves to be able to respond to the ever-changing conditions in the watershed and the potential for future regulations.

Ms. Heisler mentioned there was quite a discussion of the quality of our source water and maybe we really do not need all of these treatment technologies given that quality. Mr. Komarek stated that there may be some ways to mitigate some of those water quality concerns rather than buying expensive treatment. There may be other ways to get improvements in the quality of the raw water in the watershed. Public education, outreach regarding use of pesticides and herbicides, the quality of the waste streams that come into the river from the two plants, Sandy and Estacada, that discharge to the Clackamas. The personal care products and the endocrine disruptors are generally introduced to the river from the waste effluent from the treatment plants. Lake Oswego just had a turn in your unused pharmaceuticals day, rather than dumping them down the toilet. Some of those products are not removed from the waste treatment process so they end up in our drinking water supply. It may be more cost effective to address those issues through public outreach rather than buying an expensive treatment process that sits there.

Mr. Holland mentioned a discussion about chemicals, pesticides, personal care products, and endocrine disruptors. The panel mentioned it was a bit of a non-issue, but something to focus on that exceeds today's regulations is the disinfection by-products because likely those rules are going to get tighter and there is known health risks from disinfection by-products; that is why they are regulated in the first place. Some of these technologies do a better job at that. Councilor Tierney asked if that was demonstrated on the handout. Ms. Duncan stated that there is one line for enhanced disinfection by-product and the trace organics removal refers to the pesticides and pharmaceuticals.

Councilor Tierney asked for a moment to be spent on the water quality parameters, what do they mean, what are the health implications? He asked for an explanation on what the full circle/half circle really means. Ms. Duncan stated that this was something the panel had a difficult time coming to a consensus on, because you can have an empty circle, but it does not mean that that treatment process is not doing anything. It just means that that treatment process is meeting the current regulations but it does not have an enhanced effect. For example, our existing treatment process for disinfection by-product precursor removal meets the regulations right now. However, if the regulations were to get much more stringent in the future, which is possible, or if the water quality were to change on the Clackamas, we may have a difficult time meeting regulations with our existing treatment system. Therefore, it received a little bit of a wedge in the circle. Ms. Duncan went on to highlight the health effects of each of the items listed on the handout?

- Particulate removal – this refers to the particulates that are measured in terms of turbidity and particle counts. You could put sterile sand in a pitcher of water and there would be nothing wrong with it, but you would have a lot of particulates. Most of the regulations are focused on particulate removal because of the harmful things that can be hiding in them.

- Seasonal taste and odor control – taste and odor is not something that is a health effect. This refers to a fall event that occurs when a certain algae is in the river that produces some compounds that taste swampy and muddy and very unpleasant. We are able to treat these events with powdered activated carbon, but sometimes the treatment comes a little bit late because we do not have the ability to measure these events. It may not be enough treatment so your customers can still taste it. This is a big factor because taste is very important to people and a lot of times we find that people may taste the water one day and if it is not pleasant to drink, they make the decision that the water is not safe and they buy bottled water. Mr. Holland stated that Mr. Koellermeier mentioned that after spending many millions of dollars on a plant upgrade, the public will have the expectation that taste and odor will become a non-issue. Ms. Duncan stated that some of the components like ozone come into play here because that is something that you can turn on year round and remove that taste and odor. Powdered activated carbon you can run and remove an event.
- Enhanced disinfection by-product precursor removal – disinfection by-products occur when natural (or non-natural) organic matter in the river reacts with a disinfectant. In our case, we use chlorine to make the water safe from microbial contamination. The reaction between those two compounds creates a by-product and the products of those compounds have been found to be carcinogenic. It is a very important topic in the drinking water industry; something that as the years have gone by, there have been more strict regulations. We have low disinfection by-products in the city of Lake Oswego, but we see the regulations in the future becoming more strict and we have a desire to remain far below that regulatory limit because it is a known health issue. One of the reasons membranes got tossed out is that they do not do anything for these by-products or organics removals. Mr. Komarek asked Ms. Duncan to describe the balancing act that she has with respect to disinfectants; you want to provide water that is safe from microbials but you only want to apply enough to maintain a residual in your distribution system clear out to the farthest reaches without adding any more than you have to because that has the potential of increasing the formation of these by-products. Ms. Duncan responded that Mr. Komarek is right, they are between a rock and a hard place. There are microbials that have to be treated and so there is one set of regulations that say you have to add a disinfectant that has contact with the water for a certain amount of time in order to remove the harmful microbials or you have to have filtration that has a certain effectiveness. Then there is this other regulation which was put out at the same time intentionally that states if you have too much of a disinfectant or it is in the water for too long, then you can have growth of disinfection by-products.
- Trace organics removal – these are not regulated compounds. All of the studies that have been done to this point have not found health effects in humans from drinking water at the levels at which these are found in rivers. That being said, pharmaceuticals, herbicides, and pesticides are detected. Especially in the water that is downstream of wastewater plants. The drinking water community is doing a lot of research. It is an important thing to have on the radar, but there is nothing regulated right now. Most of the things that give enhanced disinfectant by-product removal also help with trace organics.

- Difficult microbials – this is basically talking about cryptosporidium which is what caused the Milwaukee, Wisconsin outbreak 15 to 20 years ago where even though the water was treated, the cryptosporidium still got through to the drinking water and killed a number of people. Mr. Komarek mentioned that there were 400,000 people sickened and several hundred died. Ms. Duncan mentioned that the thing about cryptosporidium is it is resistant to chlorine and it is very small. We need some alternative things to remove it. A very effective filtration system will remove it, so that is why most of what we have in our existing plant is effective. The reason that Portland is choosing UV instead of filtration is that UV removes cryptosporidium. Mr. Komarek spoke up that the UV treatment does not remove it, it inactivates or sterilizes it. Ms. Duncan agreed. Mr. Komarek said the membranes will trap it and keep it from getting into the finished water at all, the ozone will oxidize it, and the UV will sterilize it.
- Distribution system –this was how the system would affect water quality in the distribution system. Ozone was viewed as most advantageous. It is important to note that water leaving the plant is different than water at the tap. There is a lot of pipeline, there is changing chlorine residual, there is the things the water picks up along the line and that is an important component to think about. Mr. Komarek mentioned that one of the things that was identified early on is that it is not just Lake Oswego that is getting this water anymore it is Tigard now too. The size and the length of the system that this water travels is doubling. It is not stopping at Waluga anymore, it continues to go. When looking at treatment technologies that help optimize disinfectant residuals and help optimize quality of the water to prevent biological regrowth in the distribution system everything needs to be considered.

Councilor Tierney asked when the final workshop would be held. The answer was June 10, with a debriefing session for the program team on the following day. This information will then be brought to the Councils in a series of study sessions and joint sessions. There is a public open house on June 24 and a Joint Council Study Session on the 12th of July. Councilor Tierney asked if the Citizen Sounding Board would be meeting after the workshop. Ms. Heisler answered yes.

Mr. Koellermeier stated that he was fascinated by the Sounding Board. He felt they followed the process well which was encouraging because it is a pretty complicated subject matter. He was glad we were able to present the information in such a way people could follow it. It did not appear that price was the big issue, they wanted to focus on doing it right and getting the right water treatment system in place. Ms. Heisler told of an exercise that the sounding board went through asking them to rank various questions, #1 being not important and #7 being very important. Treatment was most important to most of them. We also asked them if you were spending \$100 on various aspects of the treatment decision, how would you divide that? As you can see, treatment was the most important to everyone (except for the one who put all \$100 on sustainability).

Mr. Holland mentioned it was interesting listening to the treatment experts. They can talk about options in terms of leaving flexibility in a plant layout to add something in the future if you decide you do not want to spend so much today on the upgrade. However, deciding on some of the alternatives such as what is going to get built today is a challenge. Councilor Tierney asked in the \$200 million project cost how much is programmed for the treatment aspect. Mr. Holland responded that the lowest is at about \$65 million. Ms. Heisler mentioned that these numbers are

not real yet. Mr. Holland responded that the detailed design cost estimates will tell the true price. He mentioned that there will be rate impact information after the 3rd workshop in terms of what does \$10 million do to a monthly water bill.

Councilor Tierney mentioned that he went to the Sounding Board dinner and he thought the expertise and the brain power that was brought in to discuss these complex issue and to filter it down to something that laypeople can understand was very impressive. It is important for everyone to understand how these decisions are being made. Councilor Buehner was very impressed with the quality of the experts and the thoughtful discussion. She stated that they tried to look at things from the treatment perspective but also what was practical, for instance how much it was going to cost in terms of operation maintenance vs. capital costs. The experts were also trying to be sensitive to the issues that some of the users may want more treatment rather than less for a particular reason. Ms. Heisler was very impressed with the Sounding Board members. It is a great group of people. Mr. Komarek stated that all of the information was good to hear and we will keep doing what we have been doing.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Komarek mentioned that the next Oversight Committee meeting will be held June 14, after the end of the 3rd BCE workshop. It will be 10 days or so before the public open house. He stated that the technical committee will be looking for some affirmation among the Oversight Committee members as to the outcome of the series of workshops with respect to how to move forward into the open houses and how should the Oversight Committee talk about their preference, if there is one, at these joint council meetings.

Mr. Stephens stated that it was great to meet everyone and he appreciates all the information. He mentioned that consideration of catastrophic risk and possible scenarios for catastrophic risk should be discussed. As we have learned with the financial markets and the BP rig, sometimes people ignore the possibility of catastrophic risk. It might be worth going through some possible scenarios and maybe there should be a shut off valve somewhere in the system. Mr. Komarek mentioned that that is one of the drivers behind why we are doing what we are doing. These facilities are critical life lines and they are potentially at risk. If they were to fail, we might find ourselves in a situation like the BP folks. How do we plug that hole or fix that break when it is 20 feet under the water in the mud. This needs to be looked into.

Councilor Tierney mentioned that if it is coming back to the Oversight Committee for guidance on a treatment, he thinks they are going to need a little bit more time. They will need to be a little more educated (those who cannot attend the all-day functions). The information needs to get to those who have to nod as opposed to nodding without the knowledge base. Councilor Buehner stated that the discussion of the process was useful for those that were not at the workshop. She believes that the discussion will have to happen at full Council level as well for both cities. So the Council members have a pretty good understanding of where did we start, where are we now, and what are the options. An explanation is needed on how we came to some of the recommendations. Ms. Heisler mentioned that the Lake Oswego City Council is getting a primer on May 12. Tigard was going to do it on the 11th, but it was changed to the 15th of June. Councilor Buehner stated that it is for the Council's sake but also for the rate payers. This is really complicated stuff. We need to think of worst case scenarios as well as the dollar.

Mr. Komarek asked if the Oversight Committee had any additional ideas about how they could feel more informed and comfortable in bringing information to their respective Councils or even an endorsement of one particular process over another. There is a study session in Lake Oswego, there is the open house, and Councilors are certainly welcome to participate in that; they can come and hear what their communities have to say and then there will be more information from the 3rd workshop and sounding board meetings.

Councilor Buehner asked about whether communications has considered putting together a video with some brief discussion on how this process works. Ms. Heisler responded that it has not been considered yet, but it could be. Councilor Buehner said that she is just trying to get some basic education to the rate payers. Ms. Heisler mentioned it would be quite complex to fit all the information in a 20 minute video, but it might be possible if it can be simplified enough. Mr. Komarek asked if a Water Savvy could be done around this information. Ms. Heisler stated we did have the treatment decision, but that was more on the process. Mr. Koellermeier thought it might be a good tool. Councilor Buehner would like to see people as educated as possible so they do not hear a statement and assume it is the truth.

Councilor Tierney mentioned the fact that the Clackamas is a good source of water. Ms. Duncan stated that some of the processes with all the circles filled in are for the worst of the worst water sources. None of our experts could say we needed that enhanced treatment because of our good quality water. Mr. Komarek stated that the experts said you have to match your water quality objectives with the quality of your water. We have good quality water so we do not need all the extras. Mr. Koellermeier mentioned that hopefully when we get to the end of this, the decision makers that have to face their critics and constituencies will have the knowledge about why water rates are doubling. Our goal should be that we are able to show we have turned over all the stones in the decision-making process. At this point, he is comfortable that it can be articulated.

Councilor Buehner asked when the council is supposed to make a final decision on the treatment process. Ms. Heisler said they have until September, but the point behind the July 12 meeting was to see if there was a meeting of the minds. Councilor Tierney asked if it was a council decision. Mr. Komarek said it is not characterized as a council decision in terms of the process itself. The councils are obligated by the agreement to approve the supply facilities plan which is basically the CIP for this program. Councilor Buehner stated that the council will be responsible for approving the supply facilities plan and approving the dollars.

9. ADJOURN

Mr. Komarek adjourned the meeting at 4:30 pm.

Attachments: None

Approved: June 8, 2010