



The following questions have been posed by Commissioners prior to the scheduled Board Meeting on April 6, 2021. Staff responses are included below and are sorted by Agenda topic.

Record of Decision: Final Design Report (Siting) for E. 40th Water Storage Project (PRICE) Why is the project total for alternative A \$21.3 million with PV, but total cost is \$19.9 million for alternative B? Is the NW tank construction planned for 2031 in alternative A? There is an 8-year break, but the total cost only goes up \$1.5 million.

RESPONSE: Below is another version of the option tables to help make the comparison easier. For option A, the estimated 2031 costs for construction of Tank 2 were brought back to Net Present Value (NPV) (i.e. “today’s costs) with the assistance of our Finance staff. Although we’ve seen construction costs escalate at a rate greater than inflation, for modeling the estimated construction cost inflation and estimated CPI roll back are nearly the same. As a result, the main cost differences are summarized on the top of Page 7 of the report (and below). “Alternative B has inherent savings in mobilization costs, reduced earthwork and backfilling quantities, reduced costs associated with tank construction efficiencies, and reduced site restoration work.”

Rod’s comparison	Option A	Option B	
Item of Work	Split Construction Costs in millions (Tank Two in 2031 presented in 2021 NPV dollars)	Continuous Construction Costs in millions (2021 NPV)	Difference
Blasting for both tanks - 2021 common costs	\$4.50	\$4.50	\$0.00
Tank One (SE)	\$5.80	\$5.50	\$0.30
Tank Two (NW)	\$6.10	\$5.50	\$0.60
Excavation/Backfill for Both Tanks	\$4.10	\$3.70	\$0.40
Utilities for Both Tanks	\$0.40	\$0.40	\$0.00
Site Restoration for Both Tanks	\$0.40	\$0.30	\$0.10
Total	\$21.30	\$19.90	\$1.40

Consent Calendar

CONTRACTS

McKenzie River Trust – for the acquisition and management of floodway properties affected by the Holiday Farm Fire from willing sellers. (PRICE) Regarding the \$1.5M for property acquisitions, is that amount in addition to what the Board already approved or does this amount come out of the \$3.9M previously approved?

RESPONSE: This request is not in addition to what was approved by the Board in March. It is included in the “Resiliency” category of both the 2021 \$3.95 million (Table 1 from the resolution) and the overall five year \$12 million (beyond 2021) approved by the Board at the March 2021 meeting.

Table 1: Budget Amendment Request

	<u>Water</u>
Approved Operations & Maintenance Budgets	\$20,200,000
<i>Proposed Investment Levels:</i>	
Risk Based	\$2,250,000
Resiliency	\$1,550,000
Strategic	\$150,000
Total Projected O&M Budget Amendment	\$3,950,000

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) – to provide monitoring and consulting services for source water protection and Holiday Farm Fire response. (PRICE) When illegal camps are reported, does LCOG contact the appropriate agency/property owner to address the situation? I just want to make sure this is happening regularly.

RESPONSE: *Yes. LCOG is continuing to manage the illegal camp ID web application. The email list that LCOG uses for weekly reporting goes out to all the right agency people (or other property owners) that would need to respond if camps are identified on their property, but LCOG is not actively contacting agencies that camps were identified on their property. As a takeaway, we emailed LCOG to confirm which email addresses they have on file for EWEB point of contacts and we will make sure they have the appropriate contacts to account for any changes in roles and responsibilities at EWEB.*

In addition, EWEB is doing illegal camp surveys with Willamalane and City of Springfield, which was once/month over the winter and is now ramping up to every other week and will move to weekly during the summer. Although some garbage was discovered (and cleaned up) at the Hayden Bridge Boat Ramp, the last report from this survey work, issued 3/17/21, revealed no new camps and that previously reported camps have been cleaned up. These reports can be occasionally provided to the Board. Camps identified by these surveys are actively cleaned up as they are found and are also recorded on the LCOG web application for tracking.

CORRESPONDENCE

Free Charging at Public EWEB Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Stations (MCGAUGHEY) Where are the current Blink stations?

RESPONSE: *EWEB currently has two public Blink stations in front of the Headquarters Building and two public stations in front of the Roosevelt Operations Center (ROC). These stations have a fee structure managed by Blink. Additionally, EWEB has four internal Blink stations for its fleet at the ROC which do not have a fee structure.*

It appears we are redoing the Blink charging stations at HQ and ROC. Both of those facilities are closed to the public and soon the HQ will be totally vacant. If we really want to have meaningful statistics etc. why not place the new chargers at a place like Oakway Mall, 5th Street Market, Courthouse, U of O, etc.?

RESPONSE: *Headquarters (HQ) and the Roosevelt Operations Center (ROC) currently have 2 Blink-owned public charging stations at each location. These stations are accessible to the general public 24/7 and once replaced, they would retain this level of access. Additionally, the ROC has 4 internal charging stations for EWEB fleet vehicles, which are not accessible to the public.*

All four public stations at the ROC and HQ will be fully visible by EV owners through applications such as PlugShare. Because HQ is within walking proximity to restaurants and shopping stores, the stations will offer

users an opportunity to charge while being able to do other activities around town, which is a great convenience when waiting for charging that can take over an hour. If HQ is sold, the new stations, which are more user friendly and modern, would continue to offer additional benefits to EV owners.

Considerations for EWEB to own charging infrastructure outside of its own buildings are being explored, although they present additional challenges, including metering, maintenance, and contractual arrangements with landowners. In having these EWEB-owned stations at the ROC and HQ, we can begin to explore and evaluate the various potential challenges and benefits of this approach for future efforts.

EWEB does support public and commercial charging infrastructure through incentives, including a \$1,000 rebate for commercial stations, which have been utilized by entities such as the City and the County. Additionally, EWEB is working to bring fast "Level 3" charging stations to Eugene and Springfield through Electrify America, who is responsible for the largest public Level 3 network in the Untired Sates.