



**City of Lake Oswego/City of Tigard Water Supply Partnership
Summary of Oversight Committee Meeting #13
Meeting held March 7, 2011**

Lake Oswego Technical Committee Member Joel Komarek called the meeting of the Lake Oswego/Tigard Water Partnership Oversight Committee to order at 5:33 p.m. on March 7, 2011, in the 2nd Floor Conference Room of the Tigard Public Library; 13500 SW Hall Boulevard, Tigard.

Present:

City of Lake Oswego	Oversight Committee: Councilors Bill Tierney and Mary Olson (arr. 5:45) Staff: Joel Komarek, Jane Heisler, Dave Prock, Alex McIntyre, Guy Graham, Kari Duncan, and Laura Barrie Brown and Caldwell Staff: Jon Holland, Bob Jossis, and Corianne Hart
City of Tigard	Oversight Committee: Mayor Craig Dirksen and Councilor Gretchen Buehner Staff: Dennis Koellermeier and Rob Murchison
Guests	Park Hill and Waluga Neighbors, JLA, Kennedy Jenks

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING #12

Mr. Komarek asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting held on December 6, 2010. Councilor Buehner motioned to approve, Councilor Tierney seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed with the quorum present; Lake Oswego Councilor Tierney and Tigard Councilor Buehner voting 'aye' (2-0). Mayor Dirksen did not vote because he was not a member of the Oversight Committee in December. Minutes from the December 6, 2010, meeting were approved.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Komarek gave the guests in the audience a chance to make a public comment. No comments were offered.

4. MUNICIPAL WATER RIGHTS UPDATE

Mr. Komarek stated that the cities of Lake Oswego and Tigard, as part of a joint municipal parties collective of water providers on the Clackamas River, have been involved in a municipal water rights extension process for the last two years. There is currently a contested case proceeding with the state of Oregon. On January 28, 2011, the Oregon Water Resources Department issued an amended proposed order, though a final order was expected. The amended proposed order provided an opportunity for the joint municipal parties, Water Watch and South Fork Water Board to file exceptions to the amended proposed order. The period for taking exceptions closed March

2, 2011. The joint municipal parties filed a short exception to the amended proposed order and on the 2nd of March, Water Watch filed about 30 pages of exceptions. This was not a surprise. Those exceptions are under review by outside legal counsel representing the joint municipal parties as well as the Attorney General's office at the state level. It is up to the Attorney General's office and the state's office to respond to those exceptions and incorporate those where appropriate into a final order that we hope will be forthcoming within the next 60 days.

Councilor Tierney asked what was in the amended order that varied from what was expected. Mr. Komarek responded based on the advice of the Attorney General's office the opinion was that the Administrative Law Judge erred in not allowing evidence regarding climate change to be admitted during the contested case proceeding. Councilor Tierney asked if the volume that can be taken from the Clackamas River changed. Mr. Komarek stated it would not change the volume.

5. OUTCOME OF VALUE PLANNING AND THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT STEPS

Mr. Komarek introduced Jon Holland and Bob Jossis. Mr. Jossis is a sub-consultant to the Brown and Caldwell program management team. Mr. Komarek asked Mr. Holland to talk briefly about Mr. Jossis's background and his role on the team. Mr. Holland stated that Mr. Jossis will be leading oversight of the four different design firms that are hired to do the detailed design work. Brown and Caldwell added Mr. Jossis to the team because of his 30+ years of experience doing water and waste water engineering projects similar to the types of facilities that are included in this program.

Mr. Komarek mentioned that the Technical Committee provided a brief memo summarizing the Value Engineering (VE) process in the Oversight Committee members' packets. The program management team selected the firm, RSR Solutions, Inc., from the Washington area. Over the course of a week in January, the VE team was provided a room at the City's West End Building. The project team took the VE team on a facilities' tour and provided them with background information on the various facilities and preliminary findings from the project definition phase.

Mr. Komarek mentioned that Value Engineering does not supplant the rigorous engineering work that had been done to date in the project definition phase, but it provides an opportunity for an objective group of experts to come together and brainstorm ideas about how to provide potentially a higher value and better performing product in terms of cost and function. The VE team met mid-week with the program management team to preview their list of ideas. Those ideas were further refined to ones that the collective groups felt had merit. Mr. Komarek asked Mr. Holland and Mr. Jossis to talk in more detail about the number of alternatives that were identified and the ideas that are still being evaluated.

Mr. Holland explained the document he handed out. The graph showed that "best value" does not necessarily mean cheapest and it also does not mean perfection. This is the mindset of the VE team when they start looking at the projects. They step back and reexamine what the project is trying to accomplish before they brainstorm alternatives.

Mr. Jossis mentioned that at the mid-week meeting, the VE team had about 150 ideas which were narrowed down to 35 or 36 recommendations. After life cycle cost estimates and construction cost savings estimates, there were approximately 30 options that were provided to Brown and Caldwell in a preliminary VE report. Brown and Caldwell reviewed the information and provided their responses to staff from Lake Oswego and Tigard in a workshop. About 12 to 13 VE

recommendations will be provided to the design firms, once selected, that could have a potential savings of \$12 Million.

There are two specific VE recommendations that the project team wanted to discuss with the Oversight Committee: finished water pipeline alternatives from the south side to the north side of Lakewood Bay and the location of the pump station.

Finished Water Pipeline Alternatives

Mr. Jossis explained that the Project Definition recommended alternative was Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath the lake. The VE Team recommended a route around the lake primarily utilizing State Street and B Avenue. An 11x17 color graphic was distributed. This graphic labeled both the entry and exit locations for the HDD alternative and the route the pipe would follow on State and B.

HDD Alternative

Entry location: Cabana Lane at 5th Street (would include open excavation up 5th Street to Evergreen Road, common point for both alternatives is 6th Street and Evergreen Road). Exit location: McVey Avenue at Erickson (common point for both alternatives). The estimate for the HDD alternative is about \$8 Million.

VE Alternative

Open excavation starting at McVey Avenue and Erickson, east on McVey to State Street, north up State Street to B Avenue, west to 6th Street and then back down to Evergreen to the common point. The estimate for this alternative is about \$10 Million.

Impacts from Each Alternative

HDD: The primary impacts for the HDD alternative would be to the residences at the entry point (Cabana Lane and 5th Street) where the drilling activities will take place, and the exit point (McVey and Erickson). Easements would be required beneath the private properties along the alignment. The primary noise impact would be at the entry location, where most of the equipment will be located.

VE alternative: On State Street, significant traffic disruption would occur to apartments and businesses as well as residential and commercial streets adjacent to State and B. ODOT specifies construction would only be allowed from 8 or 9 p.m. to 5 a.m. There are significantly more traffic control issues with this option. The State Street/B Street alternative is about twice as long but construction methods are less costly, resulting in only a \$2 million increase over HDD. On State Street, some existing utility relocation will be required.

Councilor Buehner asked about the railroad crossing. Mr. Komarek mentioned that the railroad would require an easement across the tracks for this subterranean use. Those requirements would be incorporated at design.

Mr. Komarek explained why the VE panel may have suggested the alternate route along State Street. The VE panel identified the constrained sites at both the entry and exit locations for HDD. The HDD alternative would require that three 42" diameter, 900' long sections of steel pipe be laid out from Maple Street to the end of Erickson for 2-4 months. This would create a barrier to cross traffic and block access for homes that have frontages facing Erickson. Brown and Caldwell's

trenchless consultant, Staheli Consultants, contacted two companies that have expertise in this type of drilling to get a third-party opinion on some of these issues and to find out if they could be mitigated and if so at what cost. Experts from the two companies spent several days looking at these sites and reviewing the geologic work that had been done to date. As a result of the meetings, it was determined that pipe strings could be placed on elevated supports and/or welded in shorter sections, largely overcoming the blockage issue.

These companies also gave input on the noise issues caused by some of the equipment that is typically used. This equipment includes centrifuges that separate materials that come up through the bore holes and shakers that separate the rock and other larger debris. The project team is trying to find locations around the United States where this type of operation is occurring in an urban environment to understand how these issues are being addressed.

Mr. Jossis responded to the question about how the VE recommendation could be \$2 Million more than the initial recommendation and still be considered a cost savings measure. When the VE team put together their initial estimate of the State Street alternative, they applied a factor to our HDD costs that would include things such as contingency, contractor overhead and profit, bonds and insurance. The VE team did not realize that the project team had already incorporated that mark up in the estimate for the HDD so these costs were double-counted. Initially the VE panel was anticipating a \$3 million cost savings. Once that error was corrected it made the VE recommended option \$2 Million more than the HDD option.

Mr. Komarek stated that the project team is sharing this information with the Oversight Committee in order to explain what the impacts are between the two options. At this point, given that there is no cost benefit to the State Street option relative to HDD, the project team is planning on proceeding forward with HDD as the preferred option.

Councilor Tierney asked if any work has been done on the easements that will be required for the HDD option. Mr. Komarek mentioned that there have been some internal discussions with the City's right of way legal counsel which has provided staff with examples of similar easement documents used by other public agencies. Councilor Tierney asked if there have been conversations with The Lake Corp. or the property owners. Mr. Komarek responded that The Lake Corp. is aware that this option would require an easement; the private property owners have not yet been informed. Councilor Tierney asked if the entry and exit locations would be in private property or in someone's yard. Ms. Heisler answered it is largely right of way but about six private properties would be affected. Mr. Komarek mentioned the project would need to acquire a subterranean easement from those six property owners, but the entry and exit pits would be in public right of way.

Councilor Olson asked if the costs of the easements were factored into the costs when comparing open cut with HDD. Mr. Komarek stated that easements are not included at the present time. He does not believe the easements will increase the costs by \$2 Million. Mr. Jossis mentioned that the easement cost should be minimal in this instance because the pipeline will be at least 30 feet below the properties and, for a large portion, it will be 120 feet below in hard, competent rock. If these were undeveloped properties with a relatively shallow pipeline that could impact the owner's ability to develop the property, the easement would come at a higher cost.

Councilor Olson asked if there was increased risk associated with HDD and has that been factored in to the cost estimate? Mr. Jossis answered yes it has and knowing that the HDD will be going

through hard rock is an advantage. If it was softer or fractured rock or an area where there were faults then there would be more unknowns that could increase costs. The first phase of an HDD project is a pilot bore that sets the alignment and provides the contractor more information about the conditions allowing for a guaranteed maximum price to be set. The project team has been conservative in the cost estimate for the HDD because trenchless construction is inherently riskier under normal circumstances. Councilor Olson asked for the price difference again. Mr. Jossis replied that it is \$8 Million for the HDD alternative and \$10 Million for the State Street alternative. Councilor Olson asked for the estimated year of this construction. Mr. Holland answered no sooner than 2013.

Councilor Tierney asked how long the construction would take if the pipeline was to go on State Street and B Avenue. Mr. Jossis answered approximately 7 to 8 months. Mr. Jossis mentioned the project would be on State Street itself for 3 or 4 months, figuring 50 feet a day. Councilor Tierney asked if the original plan was to go on North Shore. Mr. Komarek answered there was an early concept about paralleling the existing pipeline. That was discontinued from any further consideration when the project team got to looking at the constraints of the right of way, the narrow roads, the topography, the utilities and the traffic.

Councilor Buehner asked how long the neighbors will deal with construction, heavy equipment and noise. Mr. Jossis answered it is about a 4-month process. Mr. Komarek clarified that the impacts would only be at the entry and exit points.

Mr. Komarek mentioned that the team is moving ahead with addressing the issues that are inherent with the HDD alternative, easements, noise mitigation, etc.; but again the project team does not plan on spending any significant amount of time on the alternate alignment down State Street.

Pump Station Siting

Mr. Komarek mentioned that the VE panel proposed locating the pump station at the City's Waluga property as a means to provide some benefit to the partnership. Mr. Holland mentioned that when the VE panel first suggested putting the pump station at the Waluga site, the project team told them that idea was probably dead on arrival because of all of the current discussion about the Waluga reservoir. The project team envisioned that the pump station would be immediately adjacent to and/or affecting the same properties that would be most affected by the reservoir. The VE panel persisted in developing the idea and the project team took a harder look after understanding that the proposed site was on the north and/or northeast side of the reservoir. Mr. Holland passed around an aerial photo with the proposed sites highlighted. One site is basically the footprint of the existing home. The other site is a little to the north and is in the biggest clear area that exists on the property. The most obvious cost savings from this alternative is that the partnership already owns the site for water facilities. The project team has been looking at a number of alternatives in Tigard including the existing Bonita pump station site which has its own constraints; including, maintaining that station in operation while building a new one, providing access to the nearby businesses and potentially accommodating a widening of Bonita Road some day in the future. All other locations in Tigard would require acquisition of property. There are piping issues if the station is sited north or south of Bonita and in fact even if it stays on Bonita but west of the existing pump station, there are some fairly significant piping improvements that would be needed to the tune of about \$2 Million more than the cost of the

pipng improvements that would be needed if the pump station were to be built at the Waluga property. The project team estimates that the total benefit to this alternative is about \$3 Million.

Mr. Holland mentioned that besides concerns of the residents, there are some drawbacks in terms of a regional interconnection as an emergency water supply. If the pump station were to be constructed at the Waluga location, there would be a future pipeline that would have to be built from Waluga to Tigard to realize the benefits of the regional interconnect which is located at 72nd Avenue and Bonita Road. The question is when and if that would occur. The program team is not asking for a decision or to favor or remove any alternative at this point. There are still issues to be further researched about any potential site acquisition, permitting and other costs, and it would be nice to have feasible alternatives to the Bonita Road site and not say at this juncture that there is only one alternative to carry forward.

Mr. Komarek asked Mr. Koellermeier about Tigard's perspective on the potential for regionalization of water supply sources. Mr. Koellermeier mentioned that there is new information being developed daily. Regionalization is an important issue for Tigard. The good news is that the pump station is one of the last facilities that needs to be built and operational.

Councilor Olson stated she did not want to be selfish or crass but if the pump station is in Tigard should it be only Tigard's expense. When Lake Oswego was trying to find alternatives for the Waluga reservoir it was made clear that it would be solely a Lake Oswego expense because it was for our convenience or our desire. If acquisition has to be made for that pump station whose benefit is that? Mr. Komarek explained that the partnership IGA establishes that expenses arising from conditions imposed by a land use review body or regulatory agency are considered "project costs" and thus shared by the partners. On the other hand, expenses arising from any partners' action that only benefit that partner are allocated exclusively to the benefiting party. Siting the Waluga Reservoir at another site to appease Lake Oswego residents, is an example of an action not required by a land use condition and expenses incurred as a result would not be considered a project expense. In contrast, the design and location of the Bonita pump station, can provide future flexibility to secure access to other water supplies. Mr. Komarek stated that, if not today, certainly in the near future there will be value in having access to alternate sources of supply including the Willamette particularly if the Clackamas River supply is constrained. A pump station on the west side of I-5 facilitates access to regional sources and Lake Oswego could benefit from that flexibility.

Councilor Tierney asked if there is a problem with the original Bonita site. He also wanted to know the impacts, noise or operational, of siting a pump station anywhere. What would a pump station building look like in terms of design or elevation? Councilor Tierney mentioned that he shares in Councilor Olson's question, if things change, who bears the cost of change? Based on what Mr. Komarek stated, Councilor Tierney is not sure why Lake Oswego is picking up the full marginal cost of the Waluga reservoir. Mr. Komarek stated the decision for a taller reservoir was a decision made by the Lake Oswego Council to address neighborhood concerns. The taller tank provided no substantive benefit to Tigard and thus would not be sharing in the marginal additional pumping costs over time. However, Tigard is still purchasing its share of the capacity.

Mr. Koellermeier mentioned some issues to work through at the Bonita site. One is who owns it. The project team is coming to the conclusion that ODOT owns the facilities. There is a constructability issue, it is a tight site to build something new and keep the old pump station running. What complicates that issue more is that the site is the prime access driveway for a

whole group of businesses. The project would have to advance solutions for how to keep those businesses operating during construction.

Mr. Holland mentioned that was the first of Councilor Tierney's questions. Cost, noise, and what does the building look like. Cost of the pipe has not been estimated yet, but it would be along the order of a couple of million dollars if not more than that. Councilor Tierney stated we might save \$2 million today but have to spend \$2 million tomorrow at inflated price. Mr. Holland said or you might take the view that you have to spend \$2 million today vs. an uncertain commitment of perhaps more than \$2 million in the future. Regarding noise or operational issues, both water and sanitary sewer pump stations are located in residential neighborhoods quite frequently. The biggest noise source is the stand-by generator for power outages. It is a diesel generator and there are acoustic engineering or noise attenuation facilities that can be built. The generators almost never run because there are not many power outages; however, they do need to be exercised typically monthly for an hour. Mr. Murchison mentioned that this can occur at any chosen time. Mr. Jossis added that there are residential-rated exhaust silencers or even hospital-rated exhaust silencers. Mr. Murchison stated that a standard utility truck will visit the pump station weekly. Mr. Holland said these facilities are designed to blend in with a neighborhood. If this alternative goes into greater detail, the project team could bring examples or photos of residential scale buildings.

Councilor Olson asked where the access to this site would be. Ms. Heisler stated it would be the existing driveway for 4800 Carmen Drive.

Councilor Olson asked how often the reservoirs are visited. Ms. Duncan stated typically less often than the pump station. If a reservoir is remote from a pump station, it may be visited monthly to make sure that everything is okay. Ms. Heisler mentioned that the house is now empty and a typical single family averages 10 trips per day. Ms. Duncan stated it is also possible there would be a water quality sampling station on the property. That would be sampled during the once-a-week visit.

Councilor Buehner stated she would wait on the recommendation, but she believes the pump station should stay in Tigard. Councilor Olson agreed.

Mayor Dirksen mentioned that he did not find anything crass about Councilor Olson's question. These questions have to be asked and answered any time a change is made that impacts who benefits from the change and these impacts need to be weighed and evaluated.

Councilor Tierney agreed with Mr. Holland's opening statement, "dead on arrival." Mr. Komarek asked if the Technical Committee has their direction on that issue. Mayor Dirksen mentioned that final judgment should be withheld based on what might come out of the alternatives. When a final analysis is done and the existing site is deemed unworkable then an alternative will need to be chosen, but barring that he agrees the pump station should stay in Tigard. Mr. Komarek mentioned that the project team will do some additional work on the existing site. Councilor Buehner asked if there was an estimate on when Mr. Koellermeier would have all the information together. Mr. Koellermeier mentioned approximately 2 or 3 months.

6. MAPLE GROVE PROPERTIES UPDATE

Ms. Heisler mentioned Lake Oswego Council reviewed a resolution of necessity on February 22, 2011, and decided to hold that for 60 days. The project has had a fairly unsuccessful canvas of the

property owners in Maple Grove, where 75% of owners need to agree to lift the restriction that limits building to single family residences. Two West Linn Councilors have suggested mediation as a solution, and West Linn is working to find someone who could act as a facilitator or a mediator. That 60-day clock is ticking so it is important to get moving on this quickly, and it is important to know who we are negotiating with. The project team is presenting a Good Neighbor Plan to the Robinwood Neighborhood Association at a meeting tomorrow night. Staff feels they have an obligation to continue that good faith effort to work with those neighbors.

Councilor Tierney mentioned there are a lot of issues including who we are negotiating with, and who speaks for whom. The City of Lake Oswego has a public facility in another community and we have to be sensitive to that. He has heard the term mediator, but a mediator looks at two different sides and comes to some resolution. He does not believe mediation should be used in this case because it can only be facilitation. The 60-day clock is not a firm clock, it is 60 days to do some work; if more time is needed for those discussions to be fruitful he would support more time.

Councilor Buehner mentioned that there are two different kinds of mediation: there is just pure facilitation and then there is directed mediation. In this case, she believes a very strong directed mediation is necessary to come to a solution. Ms. Heisler mentioned the decision has not been made if it is mediation or facilitation. Staff just needs a way to get the issues out on the table.

Councilor Buehner asked if the meeting at West Linn was the first time the neighbors heard that the City of Lake Oswego could condemn the CC&Rs. Mayor Dirksen asked if there is an active homeowner's association. Mr. Komarek answered there is not and that is part of the problem. There are 80 property owners all of whom have different interests and perspectives. Some of whom have already signed a waiver lifting the CC&R restriction. Then there are several who are very vocal and who will settle for nothing less than the plant moving to a different city. Trying to round up that group and find those who can speak for the collective will be a challenge. It was mentioned that West Linn wants to take the lead on retaining the facilitator/mediator.

Mayor Dirksen asked if any of the CC&R's in this neighborhood have ever been challenged. Mr. Komarek responded not that he is aware of, but as we heard in the Council meeting at West Linn, there is at least one provision that is very onerous, restricting people of color and other ethnic backgrounds from owning homes in the plat and there are restrictions on fence height. There are some things we would like to clean up along with this particular restriction on single family dwellings. Councilor Buehner mentioned that most CC&R's that are older than the 1960s have very egregious provisions in them and there was a state decision 35 – 40 years ago that said they are totally ineffective at this point, but they are still in the documents.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that the City of West Linn has a waste water pump station in the plat and staff is not entirely sure how that got sited. Presumably West Linn went through a similar process.

7. FACILITIES DESIGN FIRM PROCUREMENT UPDATE

Mr. Prock mentioned that he was passing around a 5-page summation of the project's 4 packages of work. This document answers who the prime respondents were in the SOQ process and how they fared. Did they get selected to respond to the RFP or not? There is also a listing of the subcontractors or subconsultants. The date proposals are expected to be due is listed after the end of each title for the packages. This coming Thursday, proposals are due on the Water

Treatment Plant expansion. Following that, the proposals for the SCADA system are due on March 24, 2011. This firm will be providing SCADA guidance for the entire program. Councilor Buehner asked if all proposals will be in by July. Mr. Prock said yes.

8. DRAFT BUDGET OVERVIEW

Mr. Prock reviewed the draft budget that was included in the Oversight Committee's packets. From this year to next year there is an increase of about \$6.5 million that is related to the design consultants. Mr. Komarek mentioned that the Intergovernmental Agreement provides that the Technical Committee will present a budget to the Oversight Committee on the first of April. This is a preliminary view. Mr. Komarek asked the Oversight Committee to review the draft budget and send any questions to the Technical Committee via e-mail. Councilor Tierney mentioned that last year, the Oversight Committee made a recommendation to respective Councils. He asked if that would happen again this year. Mr. Komarek mentioned that the plan is to follow the same process as last year. The Oversight Committee would review and endorse the budget and then make that recommendation to respective Councils. Councilor Buehner stated she could then go back to the budget committee and say the Oversight Committee has approved the budget.

9. COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

Ms. Heisler stated that the communications team plans to do more outreach to civic groups and policy makers in both communities over the next several months. The goal is to promote a deeper understanding of the project and integrate the public outreach with the permitting and design process. Ms. Barrie handed out updated calendars. Ms. Heisler stated the team has been trying to make contact with various Rotary organizations and Chambers of Commerce and the West Side Economic Alliance. Mr. Komarek is going Wednesday to make a presentation at the IWB and then the Kruse Way Rotary next week. Ms. Heisler is still waiting for commitments on the Tigard Rotary and the Chamber. Lake Oswego's two new councilors will have a tour of the water facilities on March 14. Staff would like to make sure Tigard's new Councilor Mark Woodard gets a tour. Ms. Heisler asked if Marland went on the last tour. Councilor Buehner stated no.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that Tigard has graciously offered the project some of their annual video production opportunities with TVCTV. The communications team is thinking about some informational videos on issues identified in the survey that took place toward the beginning of the project.

Ms. Heisler stated that project staff met on March 4 with the City Managers from the four communities and provided them with the current project understanding.

Councilor Buehner asked if staff was still on schedule to go to the planning commission in Gladstone? Ms. Heisler stated the Gladstone planning commission heard a text amendment to their code that would change the river intake from a non-conforming use to a conditional use in the zone that it is in, which is an open space zone. Gladstone changed the definition the project team proposed but the outcome will work. The text amendment is going to the Gladstone Council tomorrow night.

Ms. Heisler mentioned that the communications team has the draft Good Neighbor Plan for the Robinwood neighborhood, which is being presented tomorrow night at the neighborhood

association meeting. Also on the agenda is the declaration of opposition from the Maple Grove property owners.

Ms. Heisler handed out the outreach schedule for Gladstone. Following Gladstone, the communications team will begin outreach on the finished water pipeline in Lake Oswego and then the finished water and raw water pipelines in West Linn. The goal is to get out ahead of the permitting and talk to the residents. This schedule gives an idea of what the conditional use and environmental permitting schedule is for the Gladstone area. Expect to see more articles on the water treatment plant including lots of opinion pieces in the various papers.

Councilor Buehner asked about some of the water treatment plant residents talking about what the impact on Kenthorpe would be if they move the plant to existing property only. She asked if there was any response from the people on Kenthorpe? Ms. Heisler mentioned that the project team has a drawing which will be shown to the neighbors at the meeting tomorrow night. The graphic shows what it looks like if it is all on Kenthorpe and what it looks like if the impact can be shared between the two properties.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEXT MEETING DATE

Mr. Komarek mentioned the next Agenda will include:

- Budget
- Pump Station Siting
- Maple Grove
- Review of what happened at Gladstone
- Outreach Plan for Finished Water Pipeline

Mr. Komarek stated that the Intergovernmental Agreement establishes that this body would meet no less than quarterly. He asked if the Oversight Committee would like to meet next month to review the budget, Maple Grove, and an update on the pump station? Councilor Buehner asked for it to be the first Monday of the month, which is April 4, 2011. It will be in Lake Oswego.

11. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Attachments: None

Approved: _____ April 4, 2011