



The following questions have been posed by Commissioners prior to the scheduled Board Meeting on January 7, 2020. Staff responses are included below, and are sorted by Agenda topic.

2020 Appointment of Board Liaison Assignments & Committees (LAWSON) - When we appoint Board Liaisons, I believe the EWEB Climate Liaison with the City of Eugene should be on that list too. Commissioner Schlossberg is currently serving in that role (and may continue to do so). Is there a reason that assignment is not included?

RESPONSE: *There is no reason that the Climate Liaison appointment is not included other than it was created “off cycle”. We would recommend that it be included in the annual roster, and we will send an update memo reflecting this suggestion.*

Base Level Water Storage Tank Upgrades (PRICE/KELLEY) - Please explain the water quality issue associated with pumping water into reservoirs.

RESPONSE: *We are assuming that this question pertains to the memorandum statement “hydraulic issues exist which result in inefficient filling and draining cycles affecting water quality”. Presently, a combination of poorly configured transmission pipelines and large reservoirs can create temperature layers and inadequate mixing, therefore water does not turn over enough in our reservoirs resulting in potential stagnation without chlorine (water aging). Overall, we operate the system to keep water age acceptable, but with reservoir upgrades the operations will improve mixing and reduce water age.*

When in 2021 will the College Hill reservoir construction begin? Will it occur before or after the 2021 track championships?

RESPONSE: *We are not far enough along in the planning or design process to know if the start date will be before or after the track championships. As we work through the planning and administrative process, and as we get closer to settling on a target date, we will look to adjust dates if possible to avoid any conflicts with known activities in the area, including all street work.*

I don't think the College Hill reservoir process should be different than other two.

RESPONSE: *It is our intention that the public process at all sites will be similar. However, the College Hill Site has different land-use requirements. The E. 40th and Hawkins site are both included in the “South Hills Study” Overlay Zone, while College Hill is not. The primary difference will be that the process for the E. 40th Site and Hawkins Site will follow the rules of the PUD development procedure, while the College Hill public process will be driven by EWEB.*

Consent Calendar

CONTRACTS

CH2M Hill Engineers Inc. dba Jacobs – for engineering services for the Carmen-Smith upstream and downstream fish passage facilities at Trail Bridge powerhouse (PRICE) – Generally speaking with regard to the fish passage plans, is there any indication that the current EPA will change the environmental requirements? If so, we will continue to use the more stringent plans?

RESPONSE: *The requirements for fish passage are contained in the new Carmen-Smith FERC license, having been required by the Federal fish agencies (National Marine Fisheries and US Fish and Wildlife). The same*

requirements are also in the Carmen-Smith Settlement Agreement. It is highly unlikely that either NMFS or USFWS would modify their fish passage requirements, which were negotiated by regional staff, now that the license has been issued. Were they to want to modify the requirements, they would need to get the approval of the other settlement parties, which include Oregon agencies and three Native American Tribes, and then they would need to make their case before FERC. FERC would also then ask for concurrence from all other parties to the license. So, while it is possible, it is highly unlikely that the fish passage requirements contained in the Carmen-Smith license will change.

Halvorson Contracting – for the Roosevelt Operations Center consolidation and interior remodel construction services (PRICE) - Is the cost and redesign part of the original plan? I don't know the background on what went into the original planning, but I am wondering if this fix is enough to provide us what we need, or we will keep tinkering with the space. Was the idea always that we would remodel as we grew into the space or was there a miscalculation on our needs? I understand that sometimes new space issues arise and organizations change - I'm just looking for some background.

RESPONSE: The original remodel plan for the ROC had approximately 75 employees in Customer Service and related groups remaining in the HQ building. In addition, the Electric Dispatch was going to move to a new or modified building at Hayden Bridge. Original estimates from 2016 were around \$4.4 million for the capital portion of this work. After work had started on the original scope, the scope was updated by staff and the board, to move the remaining HQ folks to the ROC and include the Electric Dispatch in the ROC instead of at Hayden Bridge. While this consent item would be the second revision to the construction contract, the total project cost, including engineering and the additional parking lot will be right around the \$4.1 million. As the building technically has a capacity of around 1600 people, there is the potential for future renovations, which will be accounted for in normal budgeting, but not part of this project or contract.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

General Pacific Inc. – for the sale of discounted heat pump water heaters to EWEB customers (MCGAUGHEY) - I think we should consider a quota to guarantee some of the heat pump water tanks end up in low income homes.

RESPONSE: Although we don't currently set aside a percentage of HPWHs for Limited Income customers, the incentive for Limited-Income qualified customers is much greater (\$1,700 vs. \$800), with an additional option of a loan up to \$2,500 dollars. The program is also attempting to encourage landlords to take advantage of the program for rental properties. At this early stage, we feel it would limit the program to place a quota on a specific segment.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2006, Revisions to EWEB Public Contracting Rules - (HART) - I believe that the issues with QBS approach in contracting were addressed in the last legislative session. Can you please refresh my memory as to what the problems were, what was done to fix them, and if that shows up in the revised contracting language being proposed?

RESPONSE: The proposed revisions to the EWEB Contracting Rules reflect the QBS changes incorporated in the latest revised statute. The QBS process was addressed during the last legislative process. The challenge with the prior QBS process was that it limited public agencies' ability to consider pricing during selection of an architecture or engineering firm. The revised process allows pricing to be requested and evaluated from up to the three firms after an initial evaluation of qualifications.

Resolution No. 2007, Declaring surplus for certain real property no longer needed for utility purposes. (LAWSON/PRICE) – What is the rationale for selling the property next to potential treatment plant site?

RESPONSE: *When we acquired property in Glenwood for the 2nd Water Treatment Plant we acquired two parcels, one smaller than the other. During the subsequent preliminary design a site plan was developed which placed all improvements on the larger tax lot. The smaller tax lot, which is the subject of this surplus discussion, is bisected by a SUB transmission line easement and encumbered by a bill board and a cell tower. It has more value to the owner of the transmission line (SUB) than to EWEB as we did not show any treatment plant improvements on that tax lot. In general, EWEB will not need the smaller parcel, we have a potential buyer, and there may be a way to use this opportunity to discuss a more holistic approach to utility operations (SUB and EWEB) in Glenwood with the City of Springfield facilitating land-use changes.*

CORRESPONDENCE

International Paper Spill Debrief Follow-up - (PRICE/KELLEY) – It appears that in July 2019 we asked IP to share expenses for monitoring the Keiser slough impacts on the river and to date nothing has happened. The total cost was \$24,000. Why wouldn't we just do it as part of our budget? That slough has a lot of impact on our drinking water quality. As indicated in Action Item #4 there is bacteria in the slough water and in past instances IP has discharged storm runoff into the slough which it normally discharges into the river below our intake. I see lots of reasons to just incur the cost as part of our protection program. I will ask others to also consider this financial outlay as to me this is not acceptable to let IP dictate the conversation and timeline.

RESPONSE: *Even without IP's support, we believe the Keizer Slough monitoring station would be a strategic location for real-time monitoring capabilities and are planning to move forward with a proposal to fund the station entirely within the Source Protection budget. Given IP's initial willingness to consider helping with costs, EWEB staff believed it is important to partner with IP and allow IP time to evaluate the proposal to provide a collaborative opportunity around water quality with our upstream neighbor.*

Why would IP voluntarily share monitoring expenses? How often have they been fined in the past? I know they were fined last year, but is it a gamble they are taking (paying \$0 if there are no fines vs. paying \$24k upfront every year to help insure there are no fines)?

RESPONSE: *During the January 2019 debrief meeting EWEB staff asked IP staff if there was any interest in sharing expenses for the proposed water quality monitoring station in Keizer Slough. EWEB staff recognized this would be a voluntary effort on behalf of IP and that IP was under no obligation to provide any funding for the monitoring station. However, IP staff indicated this was a possibility and to send in a funding proposal. The proposal was a one-time equipment cost estimated at \$24,000. EWEB proposed to cover the installation costs and all subsequent maintenance costs, so IP would only provide funding during the first year. The monitoring station would offer both EWEB and IP real-time monitoring capabilities in Keizer Slough to identify changes in water quality conditions. The station would not preclude IP from potential fines in the event of a future spill or release, but would give them a heads-up if water quality conditions changed dramatically and also provide an opportunity to improve response times and facilitate notifications, even if the release originated from non-IP sources.*

The material states that the \$20,000 fine could be used towards mitigation. Do we know what happened with that fine?

RESPONSE: *The funds were paid to EWEB and we are investing in the wetland restoration this winter. The enhanced wetland will help treat urban runoff from the 48th Street stormwater basin.*