

EUGENE WATER & ELECTRIC BOARD  
WORK SESSION  
EWEB BOARD ROOM  
DECEMBER 18, 2007  
5:30 P.M.

Commissioners present: Mel Menegat, John Simpson, Patrick Lanning, Ron Farmer and John Brown.

Others present: Randy Berggren, Tom Buckhouse, Debra Smith, Jim Wiley, Terry Bequette, Marc Anderson, Marty Douglass, Lance Robertson, Mel Damewood, and Judy Chase of the EWEB staff; Ruth Atcherson, City of Eugene minutes recorder; Faye Stewart, Lane County Commissioner, and members of the public.

President Menegat convened the Work Session of the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB).

### **DRAFT 2008 GENERAL MANAGER GOALS**

General Manager Randy Berggren introduced the topic. He said he had put together a set of three goals to propose that were consistent with what the Board had assigned as goals in the past and had retained the first goal, the Operational Performance Measures (OPMs) and strategic initiatives. He provided a brief overview of his proposed three goals. He said he scheduled the goals for further discussion on January 2 and for approval on February 5.

Commissioner Brown asked where regional water issues were addressed. Mr. Berggren replied that the water issues were addressed in a strategic initiative for the present.

Commissioner Brown asked how Commissioners should respond to a timeline question for water issues. Mr. Berggren responded that there were pending decisions. He explained that EWEB had to see how the Water Board reacted to its application, which could put it on hold. He said work with the Springfield Utility Board (SUB) was beginning to support a regional supply. He related that EWEB had started to try to work with Creswell, but this had not “gone anywhere.” EWEB was now working with the city of Veneta.

Commissioner Lanning said it seemed like the opportunity for a regional water supply would be a good legacy. He encouraged Mr. Berggren to undertake this “sooner rather than later.” He added that he did support the goals as presented.

Commissioner Farmer agreed with Commissioner Brown. He said if he would drop one goal it would be the first one, not because he did not feel it was important. Rather, he felt that EWEB’s staff already did a good job of addressing it. His other concern lay in strategic staffing. He stated that as long he could be confident that the General Manager made sure the plan was “moving along” he did not see a need to include it in the goals.

He wished to ensure, as a more minor thing, that EWEB continue progress in securing future water rights and emergency supply capability for the Water Utility.

Vice President Simpson commented that he had picked the third goal as one that could be dropped, if any were to be dropped, because he felt that EWEB staff was “all over it.” After listening to Commissioner Farmer he found himself agreeing that the first goal could be removed, not to remove it as a goal but to allow the set of documents to be more focused. He added that he “could not agree more” about the need to provide leadership regarding a regional water supply. He also supported the second goal. He averred that it stayed in line with his desire for strong public outreach activity. He wanted to maintain the goal in the forefront.

President Menegat supported the goals. He disagreed that the first goal could be left off the list. He underscored that the General Manager was responsible for running the utility. He felt the legacy was important but the day to day operations had “brought us to where we are.” He thought the first goal was important because EWEB should always do its job well. He also appreciated the second and third goals.

Mr. Berggren summarized the input. He had ascertained from the Board that there was a strong desire to replace *GM Goal #1* with the addition of a regional water supply goal. He said he would return with a revised version of the goals at the January 2 meeting.

Commissioner Lanning perceived the first goal as “business as usual” and was not certain it should be called out as an actual goal. He noted that it would still be a part of the evaluation process. He commended Mr. Berggren on the good work in developing the timeline to achieve the goals.

## **PRE-DISCUSSION OF BOARD APPOINTMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, LIAISONS, OR COMMITTEES FOR 2008**

Mr. Berggren noted that this was the first time a discussion had been held in advance of the appointments as liaisons and committees that would occur after the first of the year.

Commissioner Farmer said he currently served on the Northwest Energy Coalition (NVEC). He remarked that when considering such appointments there were two considerations: the value of “new blood” and the value of continuity. He thought it would make sense to have Commissioners serve for two-year terms in their liaison and committee member capacities.

Vice President Simpson related that he had served on the McKenzie Watershed Council (MWC) for three years. He thought it might be a good time to put someone else into that position. He noted that he served on the Executive Board of the alliance and had for the last year and a half. He said he would be interested in continuing as the alternate for the NVEC.

Vice President Simpson observed that the General Manager Performance Evaluation & Compensation Subcommittee had not met in a while. He did not perceive a need to change its

membership.

Mr. Berggren surmised that the committee had wrapped up its work as of August 2007.

In response to a question from Vice President Simpson, Mr. Berggren affirmed that the Building Advisory Team (BAT) was still active.

Vice President Simpson asked if the Temporary Committee for Recruitment of a New General Manager had met. Commissioner Farmer replied that it had not met since the summer.

Commissioner Brown related that he was the Board Liaison for Municipal Water Rights Issues and there had been no meetings related to that as nothing had come up.

Mr. Berggren commented that to the degree that there was a need for a Commissioner to be available as a liaison EWEB had kept that as a position, but he could not recall anything that had come up.

Commissioner Farmer suggested the position be removed from the list.

Commissioner Brown preferred to remain on the BAT.

Commissioner Lanning related that he had served as the Liaison to Special Districts for years and had never been asked to do anything in that regard. He also had been a member of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and had served as chair in the previous year. He said he would serve on the Executive Committee in the present year, but this was his final year. He recommended that the person who would serve as alternate have a serious interest in continuing with LCOG.

President Menegat stated that he served on the Board of Directors of the Western Generation Agency (WGA), a partnership between the Clatskanie Peoples Utility District (CPUD) and EWEB. He explained that it had been formed as "kind of a partnership" with Georgia Pacific also. He said the WGA Board consisted of three members from EWEB and three members from CPUD and involved a cogeneration facility "on paper." He related that WGA held about four or five meetings per year, most of which were held as telephone conferences. He indicated his willingness to continue to serve on the WGA. He suggested that the position include an alternate because if a Commissioner was missing from a meeting, the respective utility lost its vote.

Mr. Berggren pointed out that the temporary Committee for General Manager Recruitment had a sunset date of December 2008. He said he currently did not believe he would retire before 2009 or 2010, but his contract expired at the end of 2008.

## REVIEW BOAT LANDING ALTERNATIVES

Public Affairs Manager Marty Douglass stated that the background memorandum entitled *December 18 Boat Landing Discussion* dated *December 11, 2007* contained the latest OBEC engineering information relative to all of the sites that were under consideration and the results of the formal and informal survey work that was undertaken. He noted that all of the information had been posted on the EWEB Web site and all interested parties had been informed of the present meeting. He said there had also been “a couple” of articles in the *Register-Guard* and the *McKenzie Reflections*. He was confident the word was out. He reported that two additional customer comments had been received, an email from Leaburg Dam Road resident, Judith Olsen, and via a telephone conversation with Jim Boyd of the McKenzie Flyfishers. Mr. Boyd had not taken issue with the characterization of the position of the fly fishers in the memorandum but wished to point out that he was one of the members that preferred the Water Board Park site. Mr. Douglass asked Marc Anderson, project manager for the boat landing, to speak about it. He added that the *Boat Landing Matrix* reflected the public participation components that had been distributed to the Board regarding decision criteria.

Mr. Anderson explained that EWEB had proposed to the Federal Energy Regulation Commission (FERC) that construction might occur as early as 2009 or possibly 2010 depending on the necessary permitting process. He said the decision point on site selection was scheduled for June 2008. He said the *Boat Landing Matrix* had been designed to provide a summary of the information collected to date from the engineering consultants, OBEC, and other sources. He reviewed the five potential sites, the associated costs and the levels of environmental compatibility and public acceptability. He noted that EWEB had contacted the owners of the Goodpasture property and determined they were willing to sell, given the “proper incentive price.” He also noted that the Goodpasture site was not zoned for a boat landing and, in a previous iteration, the County had been unwilling to grant a zoning change.

Vice President Simpson asked why fill was not a viable option for the Ike’s Landing site. Mr. Anderson replied that it was because Ike’s Landing was in the flood plain. He explained that any structures placed in the floodway tended to raise the water level during flood events. He underscored that EWEB would not be able to place fill there without either revising the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) floodway maps or providing substantial mitigation, such as excavating upstream and downstream of the fill area in order to maintain conveyance of the flood waters.

In response to a question from Vice President Simpson, Mr. Anderson affirmed that he considered Ike’s Landing to be so unviable as to be crossed from the list of potential sites.

Mr. Anderson also did not consider the Old Hatchery site as proposed without any elevation to be viable for the same reasons. Vice President Simpson asked if the water became slack at the bridge. Mr. Anderson replied that in his estimation the slack water occurred near the Goodpasture Bridge. He added that he did not have a strong feel for where the current subsided.

Continuing, Mr. Anderson explained that the proposal for an elevated site at the Old Hatchery had arisen from the last meeting with McKenzie area residents. He noted that EWEB's Engineer, OBEC, had estimated it would cost circa \$3.6 million.

Commissioner Farmer noted that the backgrounder indicated a cost of \$2 million. Mr. Anderson responded that as they were finalizing the matrix he had received the final estimation from OBEC. He explained that the \$2 million number had been his best guess prior to receiving that information.

Commissioner Brown recalled that part of the direction from FERC regarding this project was that EWEB was to identify a funding source. He asked if one had been identified. Mr. Berggren replied that \$1 million had been identified in the current budget, but EWEB had not been able to find another resource. He underscored that no grants would collaborate on funding for something EWEB was required to do.

Commissioner Brown asked how FERC had been kept in the loop. Electric Division Director Jim Wiley replied that EWEB had submitted a progress report that included the status of the funding and had not received a response to date. He added that FERC had also been made aware of the public process. Mr. Douglass stressed that FERC had been made aware of everything EWEB had done to bring the boat landing project forward.

Commissioner Brown acknowledged that there was always someone who took issue with every potential site for the boat landing. He wanted to underscore that EWEB had taken the initiative to petition the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to reduce the speed limit from Vida to the Leaburg Dam to 40 miles per hour regardless of whether the boat landing was constructed or not.

Mr. Berggren clarified that EWEB had not initiated a formal process but had brought the issue forward to the legislative representatives.

In response to a question from Commissioner Farmer, Mr. Anderson confirmed that \$1 million of the estimate for the Goodpasture site was for highway modifications.

Commissioner Farmer asked if this would meet ODOT requirements. Mr. Anderson replied that EWEB staff did not know this at present. He explained that to determine this would require substantial engineering and a submittal to ODOT, which would approve or deny it.

Commissioner Farmer thought the biggest issue at the site was safety. He wanted a reasonable estimate of what it would take to solve the safety issue to ODOT's satisfaction. Mr. Berggren

responded that he was uncertain that EWEB could achieve that level of surety about cost until a plan had been submitted to and approved of by ODOT. He remarked that there was some potential increase in road safety that would come with a change in the speed limit.

Mr. Wiley added that in terms of the modifications that would need to go in at the site he did not believe it would cost less than \$1 million.

Commissioner Farmer wanted to know how much the property at Goodpasture would cost. Mr. Berggren responded that staff had not obtained an appraisal, but that they had done some internal work and estimated the property cost to be approximately \$500,000, based on previous sales.

Commissioner Farmer ascertained from Mr. Douglass that EWEB already owned Ike's Landing and Water Board Park. He asked who owned the Old Hatchery property. Mr. Berggren replied that the land was owned by Lane County. He explained that EWEB would be creating new land with the fill in the lake. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Farmer, Mr. Anderson stated that the other land involved was owned by ODOT.

Commissioner Farmer asked who owned the Indian Creek property. Mr. Anderson explained that part of it belonged to ODOT and another piece of it was privately owned. He said it would cost \$250,000 for 1.1 acres.

Commissioner Farmer asked if the option existed to return to FERC and say that EWEB could not find a viable site and that it was not high on the priority list of the area residents for EWEB to build a boat landing. Mr. Berggren responded that EWEB could try this and had tried it before. He recounted that the boat landing proposal had arisen in anticipation of an 18-inch lake raise. He called the boat landing a requirement that was a remnant of an action EWEB did not take. He said EWEB had extended the argument that it was no longer needed in the first request to no avail.

Commissioner Farmer noted that safety issues regarding the Water Board Park site were discussed in the background. He asked to know where it would fall on the Safety Priority Index System (SPIS). Mr. Anderson responded that EWEB had not received the final report from DKS Associates, specialty traffic and signal sub-consultant whose services had been retained by OBEC. He said he would ask DKS to include this information in the report.

Vice President Simpson asked if highway improvements to Water Board Park would include a turn lane. Mr. Anderson replied that \$200,000 included detector loops and signage but no turn lane. Vice President Simpson asked for an estimate of cost for inclusion of a turn lane. Mr. Anderson said he would ask OBEC to look into that possibility. He noted that there was an active slide approximately 60 feet from the intersection. He explained that in order to build a turn lane they would either have to cut into the bank or build an elevated platform over the lake. He was not certain that either was possible.

Commissioner Farmer asked if there were any indications that additional river usage would result from the construction of another boat landing. Mr. Anderson responded that he was not certain but would guess the answer to be no.

Commissioner Farmer asked if staff thought there would be more traffic traversing the dam should Ike's Landing be closed. Mr. Anderson estimated that traffic would increase by less than 10 percent. Mr. Douglass added that some people felt that traffic could increase substantially in that event.

Mr. Anderson remarked that he was a steelhead fisherman who launched at the site "all of the time" during steelhead season. He had observed that the road over the dam was "very busy."

Commissioner Brown thought that EWEB had an opportunity to provide a better facility. He shared his concerns regarding Ike's Landing, which he felt was inadequate. He thought the Goodpasture site was "a good idea." He discussed some of the challenges presented by highway changes, which included proximity issues to existing home sites which would cost a lot of money.

Commissioner Lanning asked if it would take further engineering to know whether or not the Goodpasture site would meet the application regulations. Mr. Douglass replied that more engineering study would give part of the information but the other part needed specific to that site was what the County's inclination would be to rezone it. Mr. Anderson concurred.

Commissioner Farmer asked why the application to rezone the property had been rejected previously. Mr. Douglass replied that he had surmised that a traffic study had been performed and the site was found to require some highway adjustment. He thought a petition to rezone the property had been made but he could not recall whether the County had turned it down or had backed away from the project without taking action.

Commissioner Lanning remarked that it was unclear to him why EWEB was still faced with the issue of building a boat landing. Mr. Berggren said it was unclear to him as well. EWEB had made the request to remove the requirement and FERC had denied it.

President Menegat asked for additional information on the Goodpasture site. He said at this point he would consider the sites at Water Board Park or Goodpasture. He thought the Old Hatchery site was beyond what EWEB could do both financially and in terms of permits.

In response to a question from Commissioner Farmer, Mr. Anderson explained that the water level two miles upstream arose when the river flows go up, which is a long way from the dam. He said there was a point at which the dam could not control the level of the river. Mr. Wiley added that regulations were based on a 100-year flood event. He noted that the flood of 1996 had raised the river above the level of the roll gates.

Commissioner Farmer asked how many cubic yards of fill would be needed for the sites that

went into the river. Mr. Anderson replied that it would take 2,000 cubic yards. He said it would create substantial necking of the lake at that point. He noted that in the flood of 1996, a 45-year flood event, “there was no dam, it was all McKenzie River” with no placid water.

Commissioner Brown remarked that ODOT had put fill into the lake to build a turn lane and had put riprap in. He said ODOT had been able to “trump” the FEMA requirement.

Mr. Anderson stated that the FEMA flood maps had been revised since then.

President Menegat adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

---

Assistant Secretary

---

President