

EUGENE WATER & ELECTRIC BOARD  
WORK SESSION  
EWEB BOARD ROOM  
JUNE 3, 2008  
5:30 P.M.

Commissioners present: John Simpson, Ron Farmer, John Brown, Mel Menegat and Bob Cassidy.

Others present: Jim Wiley, Debra Smith, Mark Freeman, Sheila Crawford, Dick Helgeson, Tom Buckhouse, Jeanine Parisi, Marc Anderson, Kevin Biersdorff, Terry Bequette, Jim Origliosso, Mark Oberle, Marty Douglass, Cathy Bloom, Karl Morganstern and Krista Hince of the EWEB staff; JoAnn Ernst and Rich Cunningham; Fred Willer, OBEC Consulting Engineers; Tom Lanfear, Lanfear Consulting; Sandra Bishop; Wade Hicks, City of Eugene minutes recorder.

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

#### **STRATEGIC DESIGN 16 (INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY) STATUS UPDATE**

Treasurer Jim Origliosso, with Information Services Manager Terry Bequette, presented the first update of the strategic direction policy regarding information technology (IT) known as Strategic Design 16 (SD16). He said further updates would be presented approximately every six months.

Mr. Bequette provided a power point presentation regarding the status of SD16. He outlined the *Five Focus Areas For IT Governance* within SD16, which he listed as Alignment, Value Delivery, Risk Management, Resource Management and Performance Management. Within the area of Resource Management, he stated that it included development of both human resources and infrastructure in their application to all aspects of IT within EWEB. He reviewed the *IT Artifacts in Existing Board Business*, which included the Capitol Improvement Program, Operating Budget, Consent Calendar Items, EWEB Web Site, and Governance Framework. He reviewed the *Draft Technology Plan* and referred to his 5-Year Technology Plan Worksheet as it applied to SD16, stating that significant work was due to be implemented. He stated that the Automated Metering Infrastructure (AMI), Automated Meter Reading (AMR) and Work, Asset, Customer Information, Financial Replacement (WACFR) projects would have major implications for EWEB throughout the next five years.

President Simpson asked if the aforementioned policy implementations would result in higher integration of the information technology department within all aspects of EWEB. Mr. Bequette replied that it would. He said the goals of SD16 would be to standardize all IT work processes, as well as to dramatically reduce the IT infrastructure itself. He projected that full implementation of SD16 would cost between \$10 and \$20 million dollars, a figure which was not currently included in the EWEB capital budget going forward.

Commissioner Brown thanked Mr. Origliosso and Mr. Bequette for fully explaining the acronyms used in their presentation. He ascertained from Mr. Bequette that the AMR project was still in a planning stage and that EWEB was not financially committed to it at present.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Origliosso and Mr. Bequette when the final decision would be made as to when or if a financial commitment would indeed be made. Mr. Bequette referred to his Five-Year Technology Plan Worksheet, explaining that while various stages of the AMR project were listed, the exact date upon which a financial commitment would be made was as yet undetermined. He hoped to have this decision brought before the Board later in 2008 or early in 2009.

President Simpson said he would like the AMR portion of SD16 brought before the Board sooner rather than later and asked that the AMI/AMR business report be brought before the Board as soon as possible.

Commissioner Cassidy said he would like the Performance Measurement quotient of SD16 to be clarified. He wanted to know if any aspects of that focus area would be changed with budget increases. Mr. Bequette responded that they had not yet fully identified what specific elements of Performance Measurement other than network availability would be incorporated into SD16 at the corporate level. Mr. Origliosso added that he hoped to have more detailed options regarding Performance Measurement available before the end of 2008, preferably in time for the Board's budget discussions.

Commissioner Brown asked if there would be any change in the current state of reservoir controls under SD16. Mr. Origliosso said that he did not know the Water Division's plans in that regard.

Commissioner Brown asked how the IT department was handling the issue of backing up critical data as it was explained in a recent audit. He asked if this issue would be addressed by SD16. Mr. Origliosso responded that it would not.

President Simpson asked if there were any plans for a teleconferencing system between the Eugene and Roosevelt offices. Mr. Origliosso said there was nothing specifically planned currently, but that some sort of teleconferencing system would be implemented.

President Simpson asked if the new phone system was up and running at the Roosevelt location. Mr. Origliosso replied that it was not.

President Simpson asked if the fiber optic feed between the Eugene and Roosevelt locations was redundant. Mr. Origliosso responded that he did not know.

President Simpson asked Mr. Origliosso to describe the mission and vision of the IT department in a nutshell. Mr. Bequette responded by quoting from the EWEB charter, saying that IT was deeply imbedded in every aspect of EWEB and that all EWEB business units had a stake in the

reliable use of IT. He said that it was the IT department's mission to manage IT resources to maximize EWEB's investments and ensure appropriate safeguards.

President Simpson asked if the Energy Management & Control System (EMCS) was the system used to assist EWEB's energy traders in their business. Mr. Bequette said that it was not; he said the EMCS was a data management subsystem used to facilitate communications between substations, dams and other EWEB facilities. He said the system that supports traders is the Energy Trading and Risk Management (ETRM) system.

President Simpson asked Mr. Bequette and Mr. Origliosso if they had any further remarks. Mr. Origliosso thanked the Board for their attention and said that he looked forward to returning to the Board in six months with another update on SD16.

## **GOODPASTURE BOAT LANDING DESIGN/PERMITTING PROCESS**

Senior Engineer Marc Anderson, and OBEC consultant Fred Willer, and Tom Lanfear, Lanfear Consulting, provided a power point presentation regarding the design and construction plans for the Goodpasture Boat Landing project, and said that in addition to the Board's approval of the plan, they were also seeking approval of their method of obtaining approval from Lane County for it.

Mr. Anderson showed a powerpoint slide of the preliminary layout of the Marine Board Design that had been presented to the Board on February 25, 2008. He said this design had been commented on by the public at a meeting on May 1 and, based on those comments; he and his colleagues had developed a final draft of the design for the project. He then showed the slide of the final draft. He explained that this final design did not include certain items that the public had suggested be included, namely the inclusion of an automatic gate at the entrance of the landing and a concrete panel fence along the highway adjacent to the site. He related that, in response to public concerns regarding the issues, a motion activated nightlight would not be included for the restroom facilities at the site and picnic tables would not be included in construction plans.

Mr. Anderson said the budget for the project had increased by approximately \$100,000 since the previous update to the Board, due primarily to the addition of the concrete panel fence. He also noted that the current cost estimate included \$4,000 for soundproof windows to be installed in the house directly adjacent to the site.

Mr. Anderson said the timeline for the project had not changed since their previous update to the Board; they were still targeting completion of the project for September of 2009, which would coincide with the end of the inwater work period.

Mr. Wiley reiterated that the points of Mr. Anderson's presentation were currently only suggestions and recommendations to the Board, and not approved plans awaiting implementation. He stressed that they were willing to follow the Board's recommendations regarding the execution of the project.

Vice President Farmer arrived late to the meeting at 6:09 p.m.

Commissioner Cassidy confirmed that EWEB was mandated to complete the boat landing project by September of 2009. He asked Mr. Anderson which agency had issued that mandate. Mr. Anderson replied that the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee (FERC) mandated it. Commissioner Cassidy asked if there was a deadline for requesting approval from Lane County regarding the project, and if so what that deadline was. Mr. Anderson replied that they would need to get approval from Lane County as soon as possible in order to fully comply with any re-zoning dictated by Lane County in their Land Use Compatibility Statement (LUCS).

Vice President Farmer stated for Commissioner Cassidy's knowledge and benefit that there was a separate recreation plan relative to re-licensing of EWEB dam facilities that was implemented by a citizens advisory committee, but that was not relative to the boat landing site.

Mr. Anderson explained that EWEB would need approval from Lane County to build at the site as it was currently zoned RR-5. He listed three possible avenues to pursue in that regard: approval from the Lane County Planning Director, the obtaining of a special use permit to build on RR-5 lands within Lane County, and possible rezoning of the site. He said his staff recommended that they pursue the first option. It was staff's belief that it was the most efficient and cost-effective avenue for implementation of the project.

Commissioner Brown asked what was included in the \$267,000 allocation for labor. Mr. Anderson replied that this figure included anticipated future costs of environmental specialists, project management and engineering work.

Mr. Anderson said that to date EWEB had spent \$930,000 on the project, of which \$570,000 was for the cost of the property and the remainder of which was for labor and engineering costs.

Commissioner Brown asked why the budget for the proposed restroom facility at the boat landing site was significantly lower than that of a restroom facility constructed previously at Waterboard Park. Mr. Wiley replied that the Waterboard Park restroom facility included both the restroom and a visitor center.

Vice President Farmer asked if the budget allocation for EWEB labor on the project would be an accounting allocation coming out of EWEB's annual budget. Mr. Wiley affirmed that it would.

President Simpson asked if any cheaper options had been explored regarding the issue of the concrete sound wall as listed in the budget. Mr. Willer responded that the figure for the concrete sound wall was based on similar projects completed by OBEC Consulting.

Mr. Anderson opined that a six foot concrete wall would not provide adequate protection from noise pollution. He believed that any wall created for that purpose would need to be approximately 14 to 20 feet tall.

President Simpson asked Mr. Anderson why it was being referred to as a sound wall in his presentation if he believed the height as planned would not provide adequate sound protection. Mr. Anderson said the wall would primarily be used as a physical boundary to prevent trespassing onto the adjacent property; the classification of the structure as a sound wall was a misnomer.

President Simpson asked if the Lane County LUCS provided for a public challenge that would come after the Planning Director's approval of the project. Mr. Lanfear responded that the first opportunity for the Planning Director to notify the public of the project would come after EWEB had turned in applications for access permits to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

President Simpson said he was attracted to the timeliness of the LUCS process, but he did not want EWEB to undertake any actions that could be perceived as evasive or deceptive with regard to any public challenge to the proposed project. He also asked if the LUCS process had been successfully used by any other regional agencies or applicants. Mr. Lanfear replied that, while he did not know of any instances where a boat landing had been proposed in a residential zone such as this one, it was a common practice for any state agencies including ODOT to go through the process dictated by Lane County's LUCS.

Vice President Farmer asked what the consequences from FERC would be if for any reason EWEB could not meet the September, 2009, completion of the project. Mr. Anderson said that he did not know, but that he had conferred with the FERC Compliance Manager for EWEB, Suzanne Atkinson, and believed they could reasonably request extensions of time from FERC to complete the project without penalty. He added said that fines remained a possible consequence of late or untimely completion of the project.

Mr. Wiley said EWEB had completed their submittal of the project to FERC by March 31, 2008, including in that submission all relevant timelines for completion. He related that they had not heard back from FERC regarding any aspect of the project schedule. As such he believed they could reasonably ask for extensions so long as EWEB continued to act in good faith. He doubted they would be subject to fines, but stressed that he could not provide any guarantees as to that issue.

Commissioner Brown asked if the suggestions from the public were going to be discussed in the Work Session meeting or during the Regular Board Meeting. President Simpson preferred to discuss them in the Work Session.

Mr. Anderson, in response to a request from Commissioner Brown, listed the Changes Requested by the Public:

- Additional car parking
- Angle the ramp further downstream
- Add coloring to the concrete ramp panels
- Plant trees along south edge of parking area
- Plant no more trees along west property line
- Relocate bathroom and RV pad to eastern edge of parking area

- Install no picnic tables on the site
- Install automatic gate and tire spikes at ramp entrance
- Install a concrete (not cedar) fence on west property line
- Install a fence on highway-side property line
- Provide no lighting at the site

President Simpson indicated that he was in favor of no picnic tables at the site in response to the public's concern that the site not be used inappropriately. He also said that there were various security and maintenance concerns involved in having an automatic gate at the facility, and as such he was not in favor of an automatic gate either.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Mr. Simpson's concerns about the automatic gate, but suggested that the option be left open for it should it prove necessary.

Mr. Anderson said that one possible strategy to prevent inappropriate use of the boat landing facility would be to hire a seasonal caretaker for it. He noted that he did not agree with the public's suggestion to install a fence on the highway side of the site as without an automatic gate it would serve no purpose as far as preventing inappropriate use of the facility.

Commissioner Brown said, given as it was not a particularly large portion of the budget for the project, he saw nothing wrong with a highway fence. He felt it might provide an appropriate deterrent to inappropriate parking near the facility.

President Simpson said he would be in favor of a highway fence, as it would provide an effective perimeter control system for the boat landing facility, particularly if it had been requested by a large enough group of people. Mr. Anderson responded that approximately four or five people, all immediate neighbors to the site, had voiced their support of a fence.

President Simpson said that he was concerned that any fence constructed would propose significant adversity to animal populations at the site if it were to be constructed all the way down the waterline. Mr. Anderson responded that a concrete wall could not be constructed within 50 feet of the water line, but a cedar fence was permitted. He said the adjacent property owner was insistent that any fence constructed goes all the way to the water line to prevent trespassing.

Commissioner Brown said that he wanted to accommodate a fence and that to the maximum extent possible he wanted to accommodate the adjacent property owner's wishes for a cedar fence.

Mr. Anderson said he perceived some liability in not providing lighting at the site, and thought the lighting should be motion activated. Mr. Simpson expressed concern regarding elements of ambient light pollution from the property. He said there should be no glare interfering with adjacent local properties.

Commissioner Brown asked how they could be expected to accommodate the goal of light minimization was a caretaker to be employed at the site. Mr. Anderson replied that he had not

investigated that matter as of yet.

Vice President Farmer supported staff's recommendations as they were submitted. He said he had recently reviewed 46 boat landings throughout the State and the one common element to all of them was that there were no gates or fencing used. He saw no reason to build the amenities being currently discussed for the Goodpasture site. He was also not in favor of a caretaker being employed at the site.

Commissioner Cassidy averred that a caretaker at the site could be beneficial to community relations regarding the site.

Mr. Anderson offered that the accommodation of the use of a caretaker would be a good, inexpensive strategy to use in order to get the special use permit necessary to proceed with construction.

Commissioner Brown concurred.

Commissioner Menegat voiced concerns regarding the project, particularly its \$1.8 million price tag and the uncertainty regarding the permits necessary to begin construction. He argued against building such an expensive and logistically complicated project and said that if such a boat landing were indeed federally mandated, they should spend the lowest dollar amount possible.

Commissioner Brown countered that he did not want the Board to go through this approval process if the project would never be approved. He said it was a smart move, both financially and from a public relations standpoint, to construct the boat landing.

President Simpson agreed with Commissioner Brown.

Vice President Farmer suggested that if the approval and logistical process involved in the project proved insurmountable, EWEB should simply donate the site to the State or to the County.

President Simpson agreed with Vice President Farmer.

President Simpson, hearing no further comments from the Board or from staff, adjourned the work session at 6:50 p.m.

---

Assistant Secretary

---

President