

**CITY OF NEWBERG STORMWATER, WASTEWATER, AND WATER CAC MINUTES**  
**WEDNESDAY, December 2, 2020 6:00 PM**  
**City Hall, 414 E. First Street, Newberg (teleconference meeting)**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Members Present:	Jeremiah Horton	Denise Bacon	Casey Creighton
	Mike Gougler	Meryl Kunkel	Leonard Rydell
	Connie Woodberry	Peter Siderius	

Staff Present: Brett Musick, Senior Engineer  
Doug Rux, Community Development Director

**III. COMMITTEE INTRODUCTIONS**

Everyone present introduced themselves.

**IV. ELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

Meryl Kunkel was nominated for Chair and Committee Member Peter Siderius was nominated for Vice Chair.

**V. COMMITTEE PURPOSE AND GENERAL BACKGROUND**

Senior Engineer Musick gave a background and purpose of the Committee which was to update the various master plans to implement the Riverfront Master Plan.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Water Master Plan Technical Update**

Heidi Springer from Murraysmith gave a presentation on the Water Master Plan technical update. She discussed the project goals, Riverfront area water service, HB 2001 and middle housing impacts to the water system, seismic resilience evaluations, adequate water capacity and pressure, analysis process, water demand, criteria for good water service, and fire flow analysis results. There was insufficient fire flow at some of the dead end facilities in the Riverfront area and looping them would improve available fire flow. For the area south of downtown, the small diameter pipe grid could not support the 2,000 gallons per minute fire flow.

There was discussion regarding where the looping system would be located and seismic resiliency.

**B. Wastewater Master Plan Technical Update**

Emily Flock from Keller Associates provided a presentation on the Wastewater Master Plan technical update. She explained the drivers for the update, goals/objectives, project overview with scope and schedule, Hydraulic Grade Line (HGL) and surcharge, evaluation threshold vs. design criteria, impacts of the evaluation threshold adjustment, and planning criteria.

There was discussion regarding the evaluation threshold, size and lifetime of the pipes, growth projections, infiltration study, and projects to reduce Inflow & Infiltration.

SE Musick asked which was acceptable, the evaluation criteria proposed at 2 feet below rim or design criteria proposed at 85% full pipe.

CDD Rux said at the last master plan update there were questions about how the two feet below rim might affect those with basements.

Ms. Fleck said if the evaluation threshold was reduced, that would expand the scope and mean more projects for different areas. They would prioritize the projects, and the first concern would be overflows.

Committee Member Connie Woodberry asked what would be the concern if it was left as is. SE Brett Musick said if they left the threshold as it was, it would resolve some of the issues and in a future master plan update it would be reevaluated to address additional issues. If the threshold was modified, they would still prioritize the projects in the current alignment. The concern was impacts to the funding availability. The end result would be the same over time for what projects would be able to be completed.

Committee Member Peter Siderius asked what thresholds were used by surrounding cities. Ms. Flock said there were a few who used 1 foot above the top of pipe, but a lot looked at preventing any surcharging. The end goal would be not to have any surcharging in the system.

Peter Olsen from Keller Associates gave an example of the city of Stayton who as they progressed with making improvements changed their threshold to 85% full pipe to be more aggressive in their improvements. It would not change how much money was available, but it would make the Capital Improvement Plan larger.

Committee Member Peter Siderius was a proponent of maintaining infrastructure and supporting what they had before expansion. If it lengthened the projects, that was the wise way to go.

Chair Meryl Kunkel asked about the issues with people's basements. CDD Rux said these were areas north and south of downtown where there were many homes that had basements. The question came up for the 2 feet below the rim and if there was a surcharge if overflows would go into basements. At that time, it was left at 2 feet below the rim, but since they were doing this update staff thought the topic could be revisited.

Mr. Olsen said it was a lengthy discussion and debate. Staff at the time said if there were overflows and backups in basements it was due to maintenance issues and blockages, not the Hydraulic Grade Line. That was way the 2 feet below the rim was maintained.

Committee Member Peter Siderius asked if they would be replacing pipes that would keep them at that level. If that was the case, he would rather go with the 85% full pipe.

Mr. Olsen said they would not design a new project to surcharge anything above 85% full pipe.

Committee Member Peter Siderius was comfortable keeping it at the 2 feet below the rim until the next update in 10 years.

Committee Member Leonard Rydell thought if they changed one pipe at a time between two manholes, they might get rid of several problems upstream. Mr. Olsen said that was correct. As they made improvements, the Hydraulic Grade Line would drop.

CDD Rux said adjusting the threshold could add additional costs which might correlate to increased SDC charges.

Chair Meryl Kunkel asked what the difference in cost would be if they adjusted the threshold. Mr. Olsen said they had not evaluated that yet as they were waiting to get direction from the Committee on the threshold. It would add to the contract if they wanted a comparison.

There was discussion regarding population projections and growth and how the new numbers showed a decreased growth rate from what it was in 2017.

Mr. Olsen said the consultants were comfortable with leaving it at 2 feet below the rim even though it would add extra projects. It most likely would not change what projects would be accomplished due to the amount of funding.

Committee Member Connie Woodberry said the question was if the methodology they were using now would be adequate for the next 7 to 10 years. Mr. Olsen said the threshold provided more than enough projects for the City to work on in the next 7 to 10 years.

Committee Member Connie Woodberry asked if there would be an event that would trigger a review of this decision before the standard 7 to 10 years. Mr. Olsen said this update was due to a change in conditions due to the Riverfront Master Plan. They did not know what other event might trigger a review.

Committee Member Peter Siderius asked about the development that might occur north of town. CDD Rux said that was taken into account in the growth projections.

Chair Meryl Kunkel was comfortable moving forward with the 2 foot below the rim given it would not change the funding situation.

Committee Member Casey Creighton thought the same. It looked like most of the major trunk issues were being upsized so that everything up higher would flow better.

Committee Member Leonard Rydell thought due to what people were going through this year it was not a good time to try to solve all the problems at once. It might be better to try to fix the worst situations rather than adopt a new standard, however he did not know enough to make a decision right now. Each of the options had a cost and he would like a comparison of those costs.

Committee Member Peter Siderius said it was not in the scope of the project to get comparisons. He asked if they changed the threshold, did the State require the City to make the improvements by a certain time period. Mr. Olsen said it was up to the City.

Committee Member Peter Siderius said since the City was already replacing pipe at the 85%, what was the harm of changing the threshold to 85%? Mr. Olsen said there was no harm in it.

Committee Member Peter Siderius thought if there was no harm in it and the City would still make the decision about the costs, the 85% should be the threshold they were looking at.

Committee Member Connie Woodberry agreed. She thought it should be the standard they were trying to reach. How they managed the roll out of the improvements was not the same as setting the standard.

Committee Member Leonard Rydell was concerned about the rates going up if they adopted a new standard.

Committee Member Bacon wanted to know the numbers before a decision was made. They needed to be cautious about raising rates.

There was discussion regarding the process for rates which was performed by the Citizens Rate Review Committee.

Committee Member Peter Siderius asked about the timeframe for the improvements at the current threshold given today's budgetary constraints. SE Musick stated they were to be done over a 20 year horizon. The projects that did not get done were moved into the next round of the master plan update. CDD Rux clarified they were sizing the infrastructure based on the population forecasts they were required to follow. They were not allowed to plan past the 20 year horizon.

There was discussion regarding the improvements in the master plan that were chosen to alleviate the bottlenecks and problem areas. They were on most major trunklines.

Ms. Flock said if the threshold was changed, additional bottlenecks would have to be addressed with Capital Improvement Projects and some would have to expand in their length in terms of reducing flow all the way up the line.

SE Musick clarified if they stayed with the 2 feet below the rim, the projects in the current CIP would be maintained and they would add the Riverfront Master Plan projects in. If they changed the threshold, the consultants would do more analysis to add more projects to the current CIP. They would be increasing the amount of improvements needed.

Committee Member Leonard Rydell said his concern was there would be more work to be done than citizens had the money to do. They needed to get the most bang for the buck and they would make the most impact by improving the worst problems first. The worst problems would not be found by changing the threshold.

Mr. Olsen said the projects on the list represented the worst problems. If the threshold was changed, they would be looking at phasing those projects in and an entire line would not be improved in one project because there were higher priorities in other areas. The highest risk areas were overflow areas and would be addressed first even if more projects were added.

Committee Member Peter Siderius said the threshold would not change the priority list, but it would expand the list of priorities.

Committee Member Leonard Rydell was still concerned about rates and SDCs going up. They had not been told what the chances were of the standard resulting in a major problem down the road. It was currently working and he did not think they needed to fix it right now.

**MOTION: Peter Siderius/Leonard Rydel** moved to maintain the threshold at 2 feet below the rim. Motion carried (8 Yes/0 No).

## **VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

## **VIII. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

SE Musick reminded the Committee to check their City email addresses and to finish the security training by December 12. He would send out links to the existing master plans.

## **IX. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

None

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 PM.