

SOUTH FORK WATER BOARD
MINUTES OF BOARD MEETING
October 8, 2009

Board Members Present: Patti Galle, West Linn Mayor, Chair
Alice Norris, Oregon City Mayor, Vice-Chair
Daphne Wuest, Oregon City Commissioner
Scott Burgess, West Linn Councilor
Jody Carson, West Linn Councilor, (arrived Consent Agenda)

Board Members Absent: Rocky Smith, Oregon City Commissioner

Staff Present: John Collins, SFWB General Manager

Others Present: Laura Schroeder, South Fork Attorney, Schroeder Law Offices
Alice Richmond, West Linn Resident
Janelle Sisson, Gladstone Resident

General Board Meeting

(1) Call to Order

Chair Galle called the meeting of the South Fork Water Board to order at 6:06 p.m.

(2) Public Comments

Alice Richmond encouraged everyone to watch the moon at 4:30 am to watch the NASA rockets hit bottom of moon. Noting the discussion on page 2 of the July 9th meeting minutes about tiered water rates, she asked if the West Linn presentation on tiered rates had occurred.

Board Member Burgess reminded that he had invited Oregon City Commissioners and staff members to meetings being held in West Linn about tiered water rates. A few meetings had been held already.

Vice-Chair Norris asked if those meeting minutes could be made available for review.

(3) Consent Agenda

(A) Approval of the Minutes of the July 9, 2009 Board Meeting

Board Member Wuest moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Vice-Chair Norris seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Following the Carbon Study presentation, Line 2 of Board Member Smith's comments on Page 2 was corrected to read, "his experience about the conference with the ~~West Linn Planning~~ Commission" to reflect that he had talked to Oregon City's City Commission, not the West Linn Planning Commission.

(4) Clackamas Carbon Study Presentation—Jami Goldman, USGS

John Collins, General Manager introduced Jami Goldman and Joe Rinella of USGS. He explained that Ms. Goldman was working with Clackamas River Water (CRW) on conducting a carbon study and that she hoped to place testing equipment in South Fork's intake structure. He confirmed that no written recommendation was yet available from yesterday's Clackamas River Water Providers meeting.

Board member Carson arrived during the early part of the presentation.

Jami Goldman, USGS, presented the Clackamas Carbon Study via PowerPoint. She and Mr. Rinella responded to questions and comments from the Board as follows:

- USGS works with cooperators, such as state, federal, tribal, city, or county jurisdictions, that generally come to USGS with a problem and initiate a study. USGS scientists then create and conduct the study and then present the results so the cooperator can determine what to do with the findings.
 - If funding is available, USGS usually provides 40% of the funding needed, with the cooperating agency contributing 60%.
- **Mr. Collins** clarified that USGS has been involved since the Clackamas River Basin, the first group of water treatment plants and utilities that began working cooperatively. That group evolved into the CRW Providers.
- **Mr. Rinella** stated the Carbon Study had its origins three years ago, when USGS received permission from CRW, as part of its National Water Quality Assessment (NWQA) program, to study raw and finished drinking water to determine the type of contaminants present on a raw water intake versus the finished water site. In that analysis, CRW was found to have some of the highest disinfection byproduct (DBPs), but that was not necessarily the case at the other providers, which collect quarterly samples. USGS had shown that DBPs were at levels approaching concern. This sparked a desire to do a carbon study, which never proceeded due to funding considerations. The results of that USGS study were shared with all cooperators and the data included in two USGS reports for NWQA program.
 - The Carbon Study was being initiated now due to Ms. Goldman's thesis and the new advanced technology available to look at organic matter and carbon content. Ms. Goldman's thesis would compare the Willamette, Tualatin, Clackamas and Columbia River basins.
- **Ms. Goldman** clarified that the Carbon Study proposed to study raw, filtered and treated water and hoped to answer whether DBP formation was a function of the amount and character of organic matter present before disinfection or the disinfectants themselves. **Mr. Rinella** added that [DBP formation] also depended on when chlorination occurred and explained the various factors that might contribute to DBPs. Ms. Goldman would also study the potential for DBPs to develop from dissolved or particulate portions.
- Monthly samples would be taken via three continuous water quality monitors placed at Carter Bridge, MacGyver Park and South Fork and would be co-located with water quality monitors that are part of CRW instrumentation sites. These three sites would also be used as discreet sample sites as well as at the intake of any of the drinking water treatment plants that want to participate in the Carbon Study. Additionally, synoptic samples would be taken at fifteen other sites providing a more elaborate sampling regime for particular [storm water] events.
 - USGS hoped to have each water treatment method, sand, direct and conventional filtration methods, represented in the study to compare which method works better in addressing the sources of organic matter in the Clackamas River. They hoped that data would identify whether the treatment process or organic carbon component causes DBPs to form. South Fork was specifically desired as a test site because of the instrumentation associated with the study project and where like it would be placed.
- **Mr. Collins** noted that although Total Organic Carbon (TOC) might not be an appropriate way to understand organic carbon component in the scientific community, it was a standard accepted by EPA. A direct relationship existed between high TOC water sources and high DBPs.

- South Fork was chosen a potential sampling site because of the ability to co-locate the FDOM sensor with South Fork's existing water quality monitor, which was extremely secure and already set up to send real time data to the Portland USGS office.
 - The Carbon Study project could not support establishing an FDOM sensor at a different location because new water quality equipment and processes would also have to be installed.
 - The FDOM sensors would indicate changes in organic matter patterns, which USGS hoped to link to DBPs; however, sampling for DBPs would not be done at South Fork's intake.

Mr. Collins noted that Clackamas River Water Providers(CRWP) identified doing a carbon study as a goal several years ago, but had not planned it for this fiscal year. CRW knows the value of the Carbon Study and offered \$60,000 or \$67,000 in support, helping to launch Ms. Goldman's project. Placing the FDOM sensor in South Fork's intake would help CRW save about \$50,000.

- CRWP had a good meeting yesterday about the Carbon Study, but had not made a firm decision. He believed South Fork's water quality sensor was co-owned with CRW Providers in conjunction with USGS and strongly supported pursuing the Carbon Study project collectively as a Clackamas River Basin team effort.
- He noted one potential liability existed with regard to DBPs being cancer causing agents. Though samples would also be taken from other water treatment plants, the record would show South Fork was part of the drinking water study. If the entire basin worked collectively as water providers, all should favor and work together to be part of the Carbon Study.

Board Member Wuest believed that since everyone pulled from the Clackamas River Basin, the risks and/or benefits should be shared amongst all the providers.

Mr. Collins confirmed Ms Goldman had reviewed the deviations shown in the 5 years of daily turbidity and temperature averages South Fork had provided to CRW.

Ms. Goldman added that a certain level of turbidity was needed for the FDOM sensor so she reviewed a few years of turbidity data for the whole river. Kirk Carpenter was the expert in seasonal trends of the Clackamas River Basin, but she had been following all the discreet sampling sites, and all the rivers she sampled from were co-located with water quality monitors. Her work involved following past trends and seeing how they related to her data.

Mr. Collins stated that direction from the Board would be appreciated, especially given South Fork's unique relationship with CRW at the present time. No decision was needed tonight, but he hoped to give the CRW management group some feedback about South Fork's support.

Board Member Wuest requested clarification about how data would be obtained from other sites if the water quality sensors were placed at the intakes of the three different water treatment methods.

Mr. Collins explained that USGS needed to place the FDOM equipment side by side with South Fork's existing YSI multi-sensor monitor to track trends. The actual samples from the different water plants would verify that the trends meant something. Having DBP fluctuation trends track with the new FDOM sensor information would validate that FDOM sensors could be used to monitor and forecast DBP levels in the future.

Board Member Burgess explained that the monitor at the intake would test raw water. Ms. Goldman would send the samples from the three different after processes to California to determine the effect of the various treatments on the raw water. [Inaudible fill in]

Mr. Collins noted South Fork uses a conventional water treatment method so the reaction time with organic matter was likely longer than other methods. USGS would be able to see the differences in the treatment processes, which could result in changes in chlorination points or how water is purified in the future.

Board Member Carson supported participation in the Carbon Study as long as all the other water providers participated to reduce liability. She was not comfortable with having samples only from South Fork's intake.

Chair Galle did not believe South Fork should enter into any agreement with CRW as long as litigation matters existed, especially where liability might exist—on any level. She was even uncomfortable with any group process until the legal matter settled. She preferred to finish the litigation piece and then move forward in a cooperative agreement with all the water providers for everyone's benefit.

Vice-Chair Norris stated that having participation from the whole group of providers reduced liability and created the security she needed. No money would pass through CRW, so there would be no exposure there. If the data revealed negative results that would be against the whole group, so she believed South Fork would be protected.

Mr. Collins agreed South Fork's liability exposure would be limited. South Fork's participation for the three-year study would be a budgeted item, as with anything regarding the water providers. CRW would be meeting before South Fork held its next Board meeting, so he could report back with more information for the Board next month.

Board Member Carson corrected Page 2 of the July 9, 2009 South Fork Water Board Minutes to reflect that Board Member Smith talked to Oregon City's City Commission, not the West Linn Planning Commission, by deleting "~~West Linn Planning~~" from line 2 of Board Member Smith's comments.

(5) Business from the Manager

John Collins, SFWB General Manager, updated the Board on the following items:

- 1) Manager's attendance at ORWARN (Oregon Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network) conference in Pendleton, Oregon, October 14-16, 2009

Mr. Collins and one of his staff members would be attending the ORWARN conference. He and Board Member Carson saw a demonstration of an emergency water dispenser at the Regional Water Providers meeting. The dispenser earmarked for Clackamas County, purchased with grant money, is housed at CRW and would be used in a demonstration at next week's conference. He explained that mutual aid agreements for water and wastewater plants enabled providers to help each other during catastrophic events, such as Hurricane Katrina. West Linn and Oregon City were also members and he believed West Linn's Public Works Director would also be attending.

- 2) Treatment Plant Tracer Study Update

Mr. Collins reported that three of the four tracer studies were completed on the new reservoir and South Fork beat or bettered the theoretical detention times used during CH2M Hill's design process. Mixing zone times and testing were phenomenal; the State average is 2.0 and South Fork is at 4.3. The reservoir had a maximum capacity of 22 million gallons per day (mgd), but theoretically could use 30 or 40 mgd to predict South Fork's concentration, time for pouring and CT values. CH2M Hill would finish the tracer study tomorrow and present the results in a report and spreadsheet for South Fork's staff to use in doing daily calculations. He was glad to report that South Fork would be able to accomplish its goal of 53 mgd with the system.

3) SFWB General Manager's 2009/10 Goals

Mr. Collins presented his list of working goals as requested by the Board during his evaluation, and explained that he expected to present a synopsis of what he had accomplished at his evaluation next year.

Vice-Chair Norris stated she is a big believer in performance benchmarks, which is a growing trend. She suggested calling the list a work program and then naming specific goals for performance measurement.

Chair Galle said she would like to include some items to the work program and asked if other Board members wanted to add anything.

Vice-Chair Norris believed the Board had difficulty in the past between the work program goals Mr. Collins set for himself and the goals the Board set together for South Fork to achieve.

Chair Galle believed the presented goals could work as an outline or starting place for the Board to then adjust according to its desired direction.

Board Member Burgess commented that he would like to see Mr. Collins continue and improve communication, which was also a goal of the Board, especially since West Linn was expecting a steep water rate increase. Better communication was needed about the wonderful things being done at South Fork and those related costs. People do not think about water. Such information was not in West Linn's newsletter. [re: Master Plan] Perhaps it was a branding issue and people needed to be hired.

Chair Galle did not believe all the responsibility was on South Fork because West Linn was not doing anything. As partners, South Fork, West Linn and Oregon City should share the responsibility of communicating with the public. The Board's expectations of Mr. Collins should equal those expectations of the two cities since all were working toward the same goal. She did not believe in dividing the responsibility, each entity needed to work toward addressing communication about water. South Fork's involvement with the Regional Water Providers and its website was also part of that effort. She suggested that Board members review the presented list for further discussion and suggestions next month.

Board Member Wuest added Mr. Collins could also further describe what the goals meant to him, such as "develop and facilitate discussion in the adoption of the budget."

Mr. Collins explained he had included that item as a goal to inform the Board that the budget took up a lot of his time for one full quarter. Being South Fork's General Manager and facilitating the Board's needs were only one part of his duties; he also acts as Plant Supervisor and person in direct responsible charge for water production. Purifying drinking water was the critical mission that dictated the mass majority of his job. The rest of the goals noted what he was able to do and the products he was able to put forward. He would further articulate such points so the Board clearly understood what was specifically involved in the listed goals.

(6) Business from the Board

Board Member Carson circulated a pamphlet distributed at the Regional Water Provider Consortium meeting that highlighted all the events and activities done to get the word out about conservation. A presentation was also done on the emergency water distribution system. She had a complete document depicting how the program worked and what was involved available for anyone to review. The Consortium believed knowledge about water conservation had increased thanks to all the news spots, PSAs and rain gauges packaged with instructions. The number of people visiting the website and accessing materials had certainly increased.

Chair Galle noted the Regional Water Provider Consortium website calculated how much water was needed each week according to one's zip code, which was based on the weather and atmosphere. The Consortium would allow the link to be placed on other websites. The Consortium's website also included step by step instructions for many projects, like fixing a leaking toilet.

(7) Executive Session –Adjourn regular meeting and convene Executive Session.

The July 9, 2009 regular meeting of the South Fork Water Board adjourned at 7:20 p.m. and the Board convened its Executive Session.

- (A) To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(f)
- (B) To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(h).

Respectfully Submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc.
for John Collins, SFWB General Manager