

## Meeting Summary

### **Attendance:**

#### **Policy Steering Committee:**

Kirk Andrews, Banks City Councilor  
Tom Brian, Clean Water Services Chair  
Gordon Martin for Jim Doane, Tualatin Valley  
Water District  
Mark W. Eves, Lake Oswego Corporation  
Herb Hirst, City of North Plains Councilor  
Brian Moore, Tigard City Councilor  
Alfredo Solares-Vega, Cornelius City Councilor  
Ed Truax, City of Tualatin Councilor  
Lee Weislogel, Sherwood City Councilor

#### **Consultants:**

Lisa Obermeyer, Montgomery Watson  
Kristen Kibler, Jeanne Lawson Associates

#### **Clean Water Services:**

Jeanna Cernazanu, Public Involvement  
Coordinator  
Craig Dye, Watershed Management Mgr.  
Bill Gaffi, General Manager  
Mark Jockers, Public Affairs Mgr.  
Charlie Logue, Technical Services Director  
Tom VanderPlaat, Water Resources Program  
Manager

#### **Congressional Staff:**

Martin Doern, Office of US Senator Smith  
Mary Gautreaux, Office of Senator Wyden  
Avalyn Taylor, Office of Congressman Wu

#### **Partner Staff:**

Rob Dixon, City of Cornelius  
Kevin Hanway, City of Hillsboro  
Mike McKillip, City of Tualatin

### **Welcome, Introductions**

**Tom Brian**

Tom Brian, Committee Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. An agenda was distributed, which included the customary public comment period at the end of the meeting. Citizens will have 3 minutes each to speak. The Committee, staff, consultants, and audience introduced themselves.

### **Update on Congressional Authorization**

**Tom Brian**

Tom Brian gave recognition to the congressional representatives who were at the meeting (see attendance). He thanked the offices of Congressman Wu, Senator Smith, and Senator Wyden for their efforts in getting the congressional authorization for the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to work with the partners on this study. The request of \$2.9 million had not yet been approved.. He thanked all the congressmen and their staff for their work.

Tom Brian, Tom Vanderplaat, Bill Gaffi, and two key representatives of the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District had the opportunity to meet with the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation Mark Limbaugh. He had been in Seaside for a water conference. They discussed the study in more detail and asked for his support in the study and in their efforts in getting the \$2.9 million in funding. They will

now have some follow-up to do with his office and ask the congressional representatives for support in strengthening this working relationship.

**Response to issues and questions  
from last meeting**

**Tom Vanderplaat  
Lisa Obermeyer**

Tom Vanderplaat coordinated responses to the questions that were raised at the last meeting.

**Questions/Issues regarding conservation:**

The study is being finalized and is reaching a decision point. Conservation will continue to be an element that will be examined at every opportunity and factored in for M&I and agriculture and throughout the EIS process.

**Questions/Issues regarding dam safety:**

The issue of safety is paramount for the study and EIS. Safety of the dam and other safety issues will need to be addressed and will be a component of the permitting process. Safety will need to meet current standards and also the water resources department's and Bureau of Reclamation's standards. That issue will continue to be studied. The Partners will participate in a seismic study with the Bureau of Reclamation on the current dam and a potential raise.

**Questions/Issues regarding hydropower:**

This issue will be dealt with as part of the permitting process. We will keep our options open as to how hydropower will come into play in the EIS. Because hydropower brings in another level of complexity to the project, we will only study the ability to incorporate hydropower in a future process. There will be a limited amount of analysis of the capacity and capability of the system.



**Questions/Issues regarding Hagg Lake neighbors and the buffer zones:**

There was a concern by the neighbors about whether the issue of buffer zones could be resolved. We will continue to work with the neighbors. The issue will be discussed as we go through the EIS—some of the areas may be driven by other things, such as biological resources, engineering, access, etc. So we will likely encourage the neighbors to give us input on the buffers and aesthetics. We will frame that discussion as part of the EIS process. We may set up some type of neighborhood committee to help address that issue.

**Questions/Issues regarding other source options for further study**

We are finalizing a technical memorandum that is now being reviewed on additional source options for further study, including a couple of proposed coast range dams and the dredging of Hagg Lake. Dredging may have limited opportunities, but it has challenges including water quality, cost, local geology (slide areas), time factor, and sheer volume of the material that would be excavated. At the next meeting, we will give you more technical information after the technical memo has been reviewed.

Tom Vanderplaat said if there are other questions, the committee and public should let staff know and they will get answers. There were no questions raised at this time.

**WSFS Report-Executive Summary  
Questions and Comments**

**Lisa Obermeyer**

In September Lisa Obermeyer had walked the committee through the work and results of the feasibility study. Prior to the December meeting, the Draft Executive Summary had been distributed to the committee for their review. Lisa Obermeyer gave a recap of the Feasibility Study and the Draft

Executive Summary. Because this is a draft document, she asked if the committee had any comments or questions from their review.

**Q:** How long is the comment period on the draft document?

**A:** No official comment period has been set. This document was considered as technical data and not as a decision document, so no deadline was set.

**Q:** There should probably be a date to receive all comments before the document becomes a “final” report. Is January 15<sup>th</sup> an appropriate date?

**A:** Yes. CWS staff agreed that they would accept comments on this document until January 15, 2004. All comments and questions should be directed to Clean Water Services by January 15. Tom Vanderplaat’s and Jeanna Cernazanu’s e-mail addresses are available on the Clean Water Services website.

**Q:** As we listen to these presentations, it appears that there are still two options still being studied that don’t seem like they are going to work out—the water exchange pipeline for the irrigation district and the dredging option. Are we at the point where we can just eliminate these options rather than continue to spend money and time on them? Why spend money studying the impacts of an option that will not be accepted?

**A:** Lisa Obermeyer responded that the Willamette River Exchange Pipeline is technically feasible, but the willingness of the irrigation district is an issue. The obstacles with that option are outside of the technical realm and now needs to be handled by the policymakers. She said there is not much money required to study technical aspects of the Exchange Pipeline. Tom Vanderplaat added that this is a NEPA process. When the study moves into the EIS process, other options may be eliminated, but for now, we are looking at technically feasible options. Tom added that in the next meeting or two, the PSC will make a recommendation on the preferred action for EIS.

**Q:** Is the Bureau of Reclamation going to look at the Exchange Pipeline regardless of what we do with it?

**A:** They will ask us why we eliminated it.

**Comment:** You explained why dredging did not look feasible. We started with a large universe of options and you narrowed it down to the study of the three source options with a few options still on the table. It seems reasonable to eliminate dredging based on the early analysis to spend the money on the other more feasible options.

**Response:** Eliminating further options is a decision that will be made in a month or two at a more formal recommendation point. Tom Vanderplaat said there would be more information on dredging at the next meeting. Tom Brian confirmed that one of the next meetings in February or March would involve making some recommendations on eliminating further options. Clean Water Services must have enough technical information available on all the options to help the committee justify any recommendation. There would be additional technical information provided in February or March.

Lisa Obermeyer gave a quick PowerPoint presentation on the hydrologic study, which gives an estimate on how much water is going to be supplied each year for each of the options. She explained how the exceedance charts work. The amount of water actually supplied is a function of reliability of the system. The results of the exceedance charts are summarized on page 11 of the Draft Executive Summary in “Hydrology Impacts.” The percent of demand met at 90% reliability is shown. The charts show the reliabilities for the current dam and the 20 and 40 foot dam raise. The charts also add in the diversion tunnel option. The exceedance charts show that not one of the options alone meets the demand. Lisa Obermeyer explained that the technical study is being finalized and that the next phase of study will

require policy level discussions based on the technical information. The different partners will need to address their reliability needs and discuss what will happen on years with low water availability. The PSC asked some questions:

**Q:** Why wouldn't the irrigation exchange pipeline provide 100% reliability?

**A:** The Willamette River pipeline would meet 100% of the agricultural demand. However, the other needs still aren't met by the water in the reservoir.

**Q:** Isn't it just a function of the diameter of the pipe?

**A:** It depends on what you apply the water to. Our scenario only shows the water replacing irrigation water demands. The reliability for the other needs could still fall short. Theoretically, the exchange pipeline from the Willamette River could give you 100% reliability if it was applied to more demands than just irrigation.

**Comments:** There are public concerns about using the Willamette water for drinking water or for pumping the Willamette River water into the Tualatin. These numbers are only looking at Willamette River water as a replacement source for agricultural irrigation water. This will also require discussion as the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District does not wish to change water sources for their uses.

**Q:** Does the tunnel from the upper portion of the Tualatin River into the reservoir defeat the purpose of keeping adequate supplies in the Tualatin for water quality and fish?

**A:** The water would only be taken out and stored in the reservoir during high flows. It would be stored in the reservoir for later use. Only excess winter water would be captured in the tunnel, which would help with flooding problems. Also, during the summer, Barney water could be diverted into Hagg Lake.

**Q:** Which fraction of flow would be diverted from the upper Tualatin?

**A:** Maybe 100cfs depending on what flows would go into the tunnel. At Gaston on December 8th, there was 335 cfs going down the Tualatin. At West Linn, 1867 cfs. Proportionally, the tunnel would take a small amount compared to West Linn flows, but a larger percentage compared to the Gaston area. It would provide some flood benefit at Gaston and to about Dairy Creek. One other issue will be the construction and size of the boring machines. You could also look at building tunnels that would capture larger flows. We will need to look at the flooding issues. There was a comment that floods themselves are also beneficial, so CWS should not remove all flooding to fill the reservoir.

### ***Related Studies***

### ***Tom Vanderplaat***

Tom Vanderplaat wanted to remind the PSC about other studies that are currently underway. Clean Water Services has a contract with the University of Washington for a Climate Change Study. We are also getting more information on the Regional Water Supply Update, which will provide better information on the demands from the various jurisdictions. Discussions are underway with the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation on flood control related to the tunnel and the raw water pipeline. The Bureau of Reclamation will also be leading the work related to seismic concerns for the dam raises.

The Joint Water Commission (JWC) and the various jurisdictions are leading other projects. The City of Hillsboro is leading the studies for the tunnel and the raw water pipeline from the dam to the water treatment plant. Kevin Hanway of the City of Hillsboro has more technical detail on these projects. Because these projects have a federal nexus of Hagg Lake, they are being pulled into the overall study for permitting.

### **JWC Raw Water Pipeline and Sain Creek Tunnel**

**Kevin Hanway**

Kevin Hanway distributed maps of the area and the pipeline and tunnel projects. He then gave a presentation on the tunnel that would cut from the upper Tualatin and feed Hagg Lake and the raw water pipeline from Hagg Lake to a water treatment plant. City of Hillsboro is taking the lead for the JWC on the local aspects of these projects, such as land use and public involvement.

Hillsboro has been studying the Raw Water Pipeline since early this year. Two alignments are shown on the maps that Kevin Hanway distributed. The cross-country alignment seems to be preferred by property owners who have said it will have less impact on field drainage systems. There have been 3 public meetings to date, and the City has met with several of the stakeholders that are potentially affected by the pipeline project. The City will have a report in January and there will be more public meetings in early before a decision is made in late 2004.

**Q:** How many property owners would be affected by either of the pipeline alignments.

**A:** Unsure.

**Q:** How does the pipeline cross the creeks and meet environmental standards?

**A:** The tunneling/pipeline construction can be built by boring under the creeks. The EIS will evaluate the processes for construction impacts.

Kevin Hanway explained that the City is working on timing issues so that these projects could be included in any permitting that Clean Water Services is coordinating. The City is examining the order that projects might be built. It seems that it would make the most sense to build the pipeline, then the tunnel, then the dam raise. He said the City of Hillsboro will be asking the Joint Water Commission for approval to issue an RFP for further investigation of the Sain Creek Tunnel. There has been no work done yet on the Sain Creek Tunnel. By the end of 2005, the City of Hillsboro will be ready to go into final design with the assumption that all these projects will be built. Kevin Hanway distributed a handout and explained why the City of Hillsboro believes a package of the tunnel, pipeline, and dam raise would be an efficient approach.

**Q:** For the raw water pipeline, how many CFS could flow through?

**A:** The raw water pipeline would be capable of 250-300cfs. It would be a 96" pipeline. The pipe is sized based on demand. This is not final. Depending on who participates in the project, this could be changed. More questions can be asked depending on demand, needs, and participation.

**Q:** Would hydroelectricity affect the flow capacity?

**A:** It may affect the driving head. This could be looked at more.

**Comment:** Lake Oswego was surprised at how low the cost of adding hydroelectricity was when they researched it for their City. Staff replied that little has been done to analyze hydroelectricity, but it could be considered.

### **Clean Water Services Watershed Permit**

**Charles Logue**

Charles Logue gave a presentation on the NPDES permitting for wastewater and stormwater discharges. Clean Water Services is organizing the permitting process based on an overall watershed context of quality, quantity, and habitat. He announced that the public can go to the Clean Water Services website for more information and to get information on the DEQ public comment deadlines and public meetings. They expected to have the permit issued in late January or early February.

**Q:** Are the temperatures of the water in the future expected to be lower/higher?

**A:** We are expecting, through flow augmentation, reuse in lieu of irrigation demand, and shading, that the temperature of the Tualatin River in the future will be improved over the next 20-25 years. The trading credits component of the program is for 20 years out. The climate study may also have information that can be added to this work.

**Acceptance of Key Source Options  
and Next Phase of Project**

**Tom Vanderplaat  
Jeanna Cernazanu**

Jeanna asked the committee if they concurred with the results of the analysis and accepted the findings of this report. If they did accept the report, the project would be moving from one phase to another, but not making a decision on an option. In a few months, with more information, they would be making a decision on a proposed action or preferred alternative to take forward in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

We did get a letter from the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District expressing some of their concerns about the irrigation exchange pipeline. As we go along we will be learning more technical and public opinion information about the key source options.

**Q:** Is the tunnel a subset of the dam raise option?

**A:** We are proposing it would be incorporated with the dam raise.

**Q:** What about the Stimson Dam option in terms of continuing to work on it? It is not included in the report.

**A:** It is not among the options in the study because we did not do the same level of analysis on it, but that does not mean it will be eliminated. The report is just the options that have been preliminary studied. It does not preclude other options we can study in the future.

**Q:** Are we being asked to approve Table ES-2 on page 6 of the Water Supply Feasibility Study Report?

**A:** Yes, that is essentially the decision asked to be made about accepting the entire document.

They briefly discussed the feasibility of Portland increasing the Bull Run supply. More information will come from Portland in the next few months. Several stated they did not feel this was a very feasible option.

The committee chose to hold off on accepting the study document until the public comment period ends on January 15<sup>th</sup>. Tom Vanderplaat added that the committee will need to start thinking about public policy questions, such as ownership of supply and source diversity. He asked them to think about what was important to the jurisdictions and their customers when developing the policy criteria.

After the Water Supply Feasibility Study document has been accepted, the next phase will begin with consultants Montgomery Watson Harza and David Evans Associates. The next steps will include the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Final Environmental Impact Statement, and permitting.

**Q:** Will we have more information about Portland supply and Stimson in one month?

**A:** We will have some information, but not a lot. We can still study them.

**Q:** At what point will we begin discussing the water rights and who will be using the new supply?

**A:** We will be developing a water rights strategy. That will happen during the environmental permitting.

**Q:** Is there a correlation between who pays for the study and water rights?

**A:** Cornelius, Banks, and North Plains are not going to continue funding the next phase of the study. That water allocated to them under the next phase of the study has now been allocated among the other 6 cities, Clean Water Services, and Tualatin Valley Water District. They have already paid for the feasibility study portion. The City of Cornelius will be a water customer of the City of Hillsboro, which will involve an Intergovernmental Agreement between the two cities.

**Q:** Is it too late for the Lake Oswego Corporation to become a financial partner in the study to acquire water rights?

**A:** We can discuss the Lake Oswego Corporation's participation. Some of the jurisdictions are studying other sources, so their interest may change as the study progresses.

**Q:** Is the public aware that their jurisdictions are looking into the right to get raw water, but not necessarily acquiring drinking water?

**A:** Treatment and distribution to the customer will need to be discussed.

***Public Comment***

Members of the public who wished to make comments were asked to fill out a card and give it to Tom Brian, Committee Chair. Tom Brian called the names from the cards and each person was allowed to speak for 3 minutes.

**Greg Edwards, Property Owner**

53535 SW Scoggins Valley Road

Mr. Edwards was concerned about what he had heard about the free-flowing line from the dam to the water treatment plant. (The raw water pipeline would connect to this line.) The presentation discussed the dangers of contamination and the ability of the line to protect the supply against contamination. He does not believe that this line could protect the supply from contaminants. If someone wanted to contaminate the supply, they could do it through the reservoir, Scoggins Creek, or Sain Creek. He did think the line would protect Scoggins Creek from erosion. From a safety point of view, he didn't think the argument about security was very sound.

Tom Vanderplaat asked if Mr. Edwards was saying that the pipeline wouldn't provide source protection or that Hagg Lake is vulnerable to contamination. Mr. Edwards stated that Hagg Lake is vulnerable to contamination.

**Doris Beman, Property Owner**

50519 SW Scoggins Valley Road

Ms. Beman lives right above the dam. She says if the Stimson Dam is built, it would cut their property in half and take their private water supply. She wanted to comment on Lisa Obermeyer's statement that 5 out of 100 years the current dam wouldn't fill. She said the reservoir is low now. She is not sure if this dam is a good use of public money, if it isn't reliable. She doesn't understand why a larger new dam in the basin could be built. She wanted to know why.

Page 4 of the Water Supply Feasibility Study report states that in the 1970s a second major storage site was not found due to public opposition. Ms. Beman stated that there is public opposition now.

She believes if the feasibility study report document is accepted then the committee is making a decision now by eliminating options that weren't studied, such as a new dam. She added that it looks like the decision has already been made about which option to choose.

She also added that people should pronounce Hagg correctly. (Pronounced with a long A sound).

### **Sue Marshall, Executive Director of Tualatin Riverkeepers**

She appreciated that the committee postponed approval of the feasibility study report until a designated public comment period. She said she understands, the process is in the early phase, but the Tualatin Riverkeepers would like to have more information about what you have been working on date, especially related to the flow regime and how that will relate to temperature, water quality, and biological impacts of the overall system. Also, they would like to know more about the location of the irrigation exchange pipeline. They would like opportunities to be able to comment on any alternatives, in case there is an alternative they might prefer. She would like to see discussion and public input on any of the options and alternatives.

### **Larry Beman, Property Owner** 50519 SW Scoggins Valley Road

Mr. Beman asked on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 you'll be building it) whether they thought the Stimson Dam will be chosen and built. Tom Vanderplaat said that they don't know.

Mr. Beman mentioned that 20 foot would be current standards and 40 foot would be built for 50 years down the road. He didn't think the taxpayers would be very happy about an investment that was built only for today's needs. He added that if the dam was built it would cut their property in half and they would lose their water supply. He said he will be turning 70 soon and does not want to have to move. He said his wife's parents had owned the property where the existing dam is. Their property will be affected a second time with the Stimson Dam.

Mr. Beman doesn't understand why the lake cannot be dredged.

Tom Brian responded that Stimson Dam is a very new idea and that is why it isn't in the report. He added that there is not much known about its impacts at this time. Mr. Beman said he felt the residents around the lake deserved to know what was going on. He thinks the agency knows more than they are telling the public. There are millions of dollars being spent on these studies, yet nobody mentioned the fault line until recently. He offered to show cracks at his house caused from the earthquake. He doubts what he has heard about the dam not being at risk of damage during an earthquake.

### ***Next Steps***

Tom Brian reminded the committee and public that the public comment period for the Water Supply Feasibility Study report document will end on January 15<sup>th</sup>. He said the public should send all comments to Clean Water Services.

Jeanna Cernazanu asked if they had any comments about the location of the meetings. She thought they might hold meetings at different locations to allow different communities better access. The committee seemed ok with the location being held at a location accessible for the potentially affected neighbors.

The next meeting will be scheduled for after January 15<sup>th</sup>.

### ***Meeting Adjourned***