

1. Introduction

Brett Arvidson, Oak Lodge Sanitary District Manager of Planning and Engineering, called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm. Those present introduced themselves.

2. Overview of SWM Strategic Plan

Brett Arvidson explained the purpose of and the driving forces for the SWM Strategic Plan project currently underway. Items noted are

- a. The Oak Lodge Sanitary District Customer Survey conducted late last year showed that quite a few of the residents of the District are not sure of the services we provide.
- b. Those customers that had specific comments about our services are satisfied with the sanitary sewer service but expressed definite concerns about surface water issues.
- c. Heavy rains last January showed severe problems in the Boardman Watershed.
- d. Stricter testing and water quality requirements under the new MS4 permit are being negotiated with DEQ.
- e. Complicated jurisdictional matters due to overlapping entities – Clackamas County, Oak Lodge Water District, WES, NCPRD, and the Cities of Gladstone and Milwaukie.
- f. SWM rates charged by the District have not increased in almost 10 years, and are not keeping pace with the cost of provision of service and project construction.
- g. The current ordinance has not been updated since it was originally adopted, and is obsolete. Brett noted that he has a list of over 80 items in the ordinance that need to be updated or added.
- h. Changing land-use patterns within the District.
- i. Environmental issues are of concern to District residents.

The Strategic Plan process will determine overall goals and determine revisions in the ordinance needed to further the process originally outlined in the District's Surface Water Management Master Plan. The help of the SWM CAC will be necessary to further the process and ultimately recommend the completed Strategic Plan to the Board of Directors. Brett wants to see five results from the Strategic Plan process. They are 1) updated ordinance, 2) path forward for jurisdiction issues between Oak Lodge Sanitary District, WES, Clackamas County, and ODOT, 3) O & M activities clarified, 4) Capital Plan revamped with a change in emphasis from the River Forest Creek basin to the Boardman basin, and 5) A financial plan for the SWM Program. Included in each of these items will be outreach to the community to assure that the District is moving in the direction residents wish.

Brett then reviewed the issues arising from those questions on which customers seemed to place the most importance. Those are:

- a. Prioritize spending, projects, and maintenance work.

Meeting Notes

- b. Are other agencies fulfilling their responsibilities, or is Oak Lodge Sanitary District maintaining facilities belonging to other agencies in order to protect the interests of our customers?
- c. Current development standards – are they adequate as applied to public and/or private development? What are the best solutions to handle surface waters in the District resulting from development?
- d. Riparian area protection – what is our proper role and what is our responsibility?
- e. Flooding – what is our role, given that our mandate from DEQ is based on surface water quality, not flood abatement?
- f. Private Property owners? 70% - 80% of the storm drainage facilities inside Oak Lodge Sanitary District are on private property. Is it an acceptable use of public funds to maintain those facilities? How should the District best provide for staff access to those facilities?
- g. Will rate increases be necessary to support the SWM program?
Brett discussed the looming need for increased service charges because within two years there will be no funds available for projects – the maintenance costs will consume the entire income from the program. Committee members and Brett discussed the issues outlined above.

3. Program Review – Libby Barg, Barney & Worth, Inc.

Libby Barg with Barney & Worth and Brett Arvidson then reviewed facts relating to the District's current program and the Strategic Plan program. She explained that to the District's advantage, approximately 75% of the surface water in the District is in watersheds that are totally contained within the District's boundaries. There are only small areas in the most northerly and southerly areas of the District that flow to watersheds not completely within our boundaries. The surface water within the District currently does not have any significant problems meeting the Total Maximum Daily Load limits imposed by DEQ on waters entering the Willamette River. The limits are based on 303(d) Listed parameters dealing with elevated temperature, bacteria, and Mercury.

4. Policies and Priority Actions – Electronic Polling – Clark Worth, Barney & Worth, Inc.

Clark Worth explained the electronic polling devices supplied to all attendees. Each question was projected onto the screen, Clark explained the question briefly, and then attendees all voted using their polling device according to the type of question (yes/no, number value range). The questions and results were:

SWM CAC Meeting November 12, 2009
Meeting Notes

- a. Where do you live? Results:
 - Oak Grove – 42%
 - Jennings Lodge – 33%
 - Oatfield Ridge – 17%
 - Milwaukie – 0%
 - Gladstone – 0%
 - Portland – 8%

- b. How long have you lived in your community? Results:
 - Less than 5 yrs – 7%
 - 5 – 9 years – 7%
 - 10-19 years – 21%
 - 20 years or longer – 64%
 - Can't recall – 0%

- c. How long have been on the SWM CAC? Result:
 - Less than 1 month – 8%
 - Around one year – 0%
 - 2-5 years – 8%
 - More than 5 years – 38%
 - Not on the SWM CAC – 46%
 - What is the SWM CAC? – 0%

- d. What is your ideal breakfast? Result:
 - Coffee! – 0%
 - Eggs, bacon, toast, etc. – 24%
 - Cereal – 50%
 - Grapefruit – 0%
 - Leftovers – 8%
 - Any of the above – 17%
 - Breakfast? - 0%

- e. How many miles of stream are located in the District? Result:
 - 2 miles – 0%
 - 6 miles – 23% (correct answer)
 - 10 miles (0%)
 - 15 miles (23%)
 - 21 miles (54%)

Attendees were asked to rate the following Statements using a range of importance, with "1" being Not important and "7" being Very important. Results are expressed as a mean of polling entries.

- f. Form community partnerships to enhance opportunities for planning, development, and implementation of SWM programs. Mean result = 6.417

Meeting Notes

- g. Form *partnerships with other entities* – public and private – to plan, develop, implement, and operate structural and natural facilities to benefit the surface water management program. Mean result= 6.6429
- h. Seek ways to enhance the operation, maintenance, and function of existing drainage facilities. Mean = 6.5
- i. Address both water quantity and quality in seeking solutions to existing surface water problems within the community. Mean = 6.75
- j. Evaluate and address opportunities for resolving community concerns related to safety issues posed by existing SWM systems. Mean = 5.5
- k. Find solutions to surface water management problems which encompass larger areas of the community – neighborhoods and drainage basins – rather than focus solely on individual properties. Mean = 6
- l. Incorporate wildlife habitat preservation and restoration into surface water management activities. Mean = 6.1818
- m. Evaluate the potential use of private property and acquire easements for the purposes of operating, maintaining, repairing, and/or replacing natural and man-made facilities existing on private property. Mean = 6.333
- n. Maximize the use of natural systems. Mean = 6.3571

The following statements are meant to show the priority at which attendees felt the actions should be rated. This exercise shows how those voting feel the District's resources should be allocated.

- o. Reduce flooding. Mean = 5.5455
- p. Eliminate pollution. Mean = 6.0769
- q. Improve maintenance of existing systems. Mean = 5.5385
- r. Minimize development impacts. Mean = 6.3333
- s. Acquire land for flood and pollution control. Mean = 3.9167
- t. Improve wetland management. Mean = 5.7692
- u. Improve fish and wildlife habitat. Mean = 5.7692
- v. Develop citizen involvement programs. Mean = 6.4615

SWM CAC Meeting November 12, 2009
Meeting Notes

- w. Develop citizen involvement programs. Mean = 6.4615
- x. Develop community education programs. Mean = 6.5
- y. Develop new facilities. Mean = 6.1538

Prioritization Results:

1. Reduce flooding. 12% - T 3rd
2. Eliminate pollution. 19% - 1st
3. Improve maintenance of existing systems. 6% - T 8th
4. Minimize development impacts. 11% - 5th
5. Acquire land for flood/pollution control. 0% - last
6. Improve wetland management. 6% - T 8th
7. Improve habitat. 8% - T 6th
8. Develop citizen involvement programs. 8% - T 6th
9. Develop community education/outreach programs. 12% - T 3rd
10. Develop new facilities. 18% - 2nd

Clark discussed with the committee how the polling results conducted at this meeting reflect the priorities of the original SWM CAC members and how they understood the wishes of the community at the time the original SWM Master Plan was developed. The results show the community to be very much in support of the existing policies. The same questions and the same polling devices will be used at public meetings throughout the District to gather responses from the community. The results will be cumulative, and, at the end of the process, will include the answers of all participants.

5. Public Outreach Plan – Libby Barg, Barney & Worth, Inc.

Libby reviewed the planned program. There will be presentations at meetings, a mailing of information regarding the plan, and a web page for the project in order to reach as many members of the community as possible.

The committee members asked about wording used in the questions and publications. The question was whether the terminology should be “surface water” or “stormwater”. All agreed that many residents do not understand what surface water is, but do understand stormwater. However, the concern is that using “stormwater” indicates that the main point of the program is flooding when the District’s permit requirements involve only water quality of surface waters, not flood abatement. It was suggested that the terminology “Surface Water Quality Management” be used. Discussion followed among the members over these terms. There was a general agreement that Surface Water seems to mean existing streams and rivers to the community, whereas Stormwater only seems to mean heavy rains.

The District’s MS4 permit, the permit that dictates the water quality requirements for surface water, relates to stormwater mainly as it impacts all surface waters.

In reference to funding problems and proposed rate increases for the SWM program, Mr. Earl Moore, a resident of the District, asked if the District could fund the projects using bonds similar to those recently approved by voters for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements Project. Libby explained that use of bond funds is one option that will be considered during the financial portion of this project. Brett added that the District's current bonding authority is limited to the wastewater treatment plant project. Paul Savas, president of the Board of Directors, commented that the process leading up to the use of bonds to fund the treatment plant project took approximately four years beginning with a project very similar to the current Watershed Strategic Plan project. Mr. Moore asked about the original SWM Master Plan project which he believes stated that all of the project listed in the plan would be completed by 2010 at a cost of \$10 million. Brett replied that 45 out of the 70 listed projects have been completed, and the ones that are left are the most complicated and expensive.

6. Next Steps – Brett Arvidson

Brett discussed the next steps to be taken in the process. He emphasized that the SWM CAC will be an important part of the process and the frequency of meetings will be increasing. The next meeting will be scheduled for early- to mid-December.

Mr. Earl Moore asked if enforcement of regulations would be part of the next steps. Brett explained that the first step to allow enforcement actions is to strengthen the current Surface Water Management Rules and Regulations to include enforcement provisions. Enforcement provisions are at the highest importance in his list of changes to be made to the Rules and Regulations.

Libby Barg explained the process that Barney & Worth will be following in the near future. The steps will involve

- a. Public values determination / Stakeholder interviews
- b. Customer Survey
- c. Community briefings
- d. SWM Workshop
- e. Electronic polling
- f. Community events

SWM CAC members will be asked to participate in the process as trained attendees at community meetings, much as committee members attended meetings to discuss the wastewater treatment plant project. Libby commented that the Oak Grove/Jennings Lodge/Oatfield Ridge communities tend to be close-knit and residents gain much of their information from their network of neighbors and community groups.

Because there will be more frequent meetings in the future, members were asked to notify Libby of meeting dates that would NOT work for them to allow scheduling that would avoid those days/dates. (Libby can be reached at 503-585-4043 (office), 503-949-9047 (cell), or by e-mail at libbybarg@barneyandworth.com)

Meeting Notes

Committee members were asked to consider whether or not they wanted to expand the size of the current Committee. There are currently twelve members, and originally the Committee consisted of 15 members. There are three vacant seats that can be filled. Tom Foeller asked that any new members be brought up-to-date on the local situation(s) so they will be able to participate fully. Currently most members of the Committee have a significant amount of experience with the District's Surface Water Management program.

Brett stated that he will extend invitations to other entities to participate in the process. He mentioned Clackamas County, Water Environment Services, and North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District as potential participants.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Moore stated his position regarding flooding on property owned by his family on SE Addie Street. He stated that he believes the District should remove the "dams" present at culverts installed at and near SE McLoughlin Boulevard in order to allow the Boardman Basin to drain in the same manner as it did in the 1940's. He also mentioned that the culvert under SE Jennings Avenue appears to be full of debris, which he feels is also caused by the presence of the same dams. Mr. Moore was asked to stay after the meeting to allow the consultants to discuss the situation with him and gather information.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.