CITY OF TROUTDALE

AGENDA
TROUTDALE CITY COUNCIL - REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
TROUTDALE CITY HALL
104 SE KIBLING AVENUE
TROUTDALE, OR 97060-2099

8:00 P.M. -- January 17, 1995

1. ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE
2. DISCUSSION: Sewage Treatment Plant Local Limits Study
3. DISCUSSION: Stark Street Improvement Project
4. ADJOURNMENT.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor
Dated: 1-13-95

F:\AGENDA\011795CC.AGE

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council - Work Session
Troutdale City Hall
Council Chambers
104 SE Kibling Avenue
Troutdale, OR 97060-2099

January 17, 1995 7:00pm

Mayor Thalhofer called the meeting to order.

PRESENT: Smith, Ripma, Thompson, Kight, Lloyd, Burger-Kimber and Thalhofer.

Mayor Thalhofer: First item on our agenda is a discussion of the sewage treatment plant and local limits.

Mr.Galloway: Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, as you may recall over a year and a half ago we completed the anaerobic digesters, a major upgrade to our treatment plant, and that gave us the opportunity to handle the sludge requirements that our sewage treatment plant system placed upon us. Although we haven't really addressed some of the hydraulic or volume and organic loading needs of the plant since our major upgrade back in 1979. This began to manifest itself in the summer of 1993 when we had a couple of incidences where we failed to meet the permit requirements that DEQ placed upon us and in September 1993, they wrote us a letter which basically said you will have to take a look at seeing what needs to be done to take care of those shortfalls in the treatment plant. We went through the budget process and budgeted money to conduct capacity studies to determine what the short comings were in the plant. We went through the competitive processes and selected CH2M Hill as the consultant to do that study and in addition to looking at the capacity of the plant. We also asked them to look at whether or not imposing local limits might do something to improve our situation. In other words, restricting the amount of pollutants that some of the industrial users put into our system, perhaps to either buy us time, or defer some of the improvements to the plant that might otherwise be required. They have come close to concluding that study and the purpose here tonight is for them to, in a somewhat informal session, provide information to you and respond to any questions that you may have as to what that study has come up with. When they conclude that, I will talk a little bit about where I think we want to go and respond to any questions that you may have as well. Speaking on behalf of CH2M Hill (the project manager for this particular project), Clem Correia is here tonight. He'll introduce the members of his staff from CH2M Hill who are here, and he will conduct most of the presentation. In the audience we also have with us Mike Sorenson, the Superintendent of our treatment plant, and Darrell Worthington our Environmental Specialist for public works. If there are no questions I'll ask Mr. Correia to begin the presentation.

Councilor Kight: I have one. Just going through this real fast, you have a lot of acronyms and for us that are new people on the city council what is B.O.D. loading?

Mr.Galloway: B.O.D. (and I think that Clem as he touches on those will give a brief explanation)- but since you asked, Biochemical Oxygen Demand. It's an indication of the organic load that is in the waste water stream as measured in a test that is conducted under certain circumstances over a five day period to determine the amount of oxygen that particular sample consumes.

Clem Correia: I would like to introduce three members of our staff from CH2M Hill- Jason Smith, Environmental Engineer for CH2M Hill. He worked on the local limits analysis study, Mike Sudaquist, Senior Manager from our office, and Mark Laswell, our Regional Manager. You should have a hand-out that I put together for the presentation. Basically we will be touching on waste water treatment background. I will try to give you a simple explanation of what waste water treatment is, what it does and what needs to be accomplished at the treatment plant. The second is to state all the objectives for the study we have conducted.

We are almost done with the study as Jim said at the beginning of the introductions. We are going to talk about the industrial impact (it is something we found out from this study), some projections, impact on the unit processes, short and long term improvements, and have some open discussions. The second page that you have in your hand-out basically shows you a processes flow schematic of the Troutdale Waste Water Treatment Plant. In most treatment plants there are three parameters that we look at when we would design. There are other parameters, but in this case the ones we looked at in Troutdale were flow, and BOD which stands for biochemical oxygen demand. I think the explanation that Jim gave is the simplest one because it's kind of an empirical type of definition for what it really is, but it is the demand of oxygen required by the microorganisms in the waste water. There is a five day period in which the demand for the oxygen demand to know what it would take to treat the BOD, the organic content of the waste water and remove it out of the water, that's what that is. TSS stands for total suspended solids. As it says, suspended solids are the solids in suspension in the flow and the objective of the treatment plant is to remove these two items out of the flow. How do you remove it? You don't really remove it, you find ways to separate these two items and one will go to the river and one would go to a solids complex which you have at the treatment plant, the digesters that were installed a year and a half ago. Looking at the parameters, the flow comes into the plant to the headworks, (which is a physical process) removes some screens and some grit, it goes into a primary clarified which is a physical process and solids would be removed at this primary clarified. Then you have an aeration basin which is a biological process, you have a secondary clarifier in which more solids would be removed, you have disinfection which is a new facility in the treatment plant, then you have to remove the fecal Polyborus in the waste water and then you discharge it into the Sandy River. There is a recent requirement in your NPDS permit which is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit. Each treatment plant has a permit, you have to meet these standards for BOD, TSS and Fecal Polyborus. The only way you can remove these Polyborus is by disinfection. Before you had a chlorine system, now you have UV, Ultraviolet. I am not going to get into the definition of UV but basically it's a process used to remove fecal Polyborus. In terms of the solids, the solids are removed from the primary and secondary clarified. At your plant you have a thickener which thickens the sludge and then sends it to a digester and into a storage and then out to a disposal. You have two very distinct streams in your treatment plant, a liquid stream, and a solid stream. So, a year and a half ago, you took care of your solid stream, but the problem now is your liquid stream. That is the problem we wanted to address when we under took this study. I want to make it clear that you understand that there are two separate streams in a treatment plant- liquids and solids.

Councilor Ripma: What did we do a year and a half ago that took care of the solids?

Clem Correia: You installed a digester complex. What you are looking at is the heart of your treatment plant. If that process does not work you can't really make your treatment plant meet requirements and that's what we will explain later, but I just wanted to point out this is the heart of the treatment plant, the aeration basin and secondary clarified. I will get back to this slide if necessary. Before I go on to the next slide, I want to point out the objective of this study. CH2M Hill was hired by the City of Troutdale to look at and assess the problems that your treatment plant was experiencing as well as look at the local limits due to the industry in the city. We took a look at the historical data that the treatment plant had, since 1905 to 1994. We did a desktop study as well as field testing. We went out there and did some testing on the actual facilities to find out what the limitations are. So basically the focus of the study was to investigate what was wrong with the treatment plant, why the treatment plant wasn't meeting permit and that way, come up with some short term and long term improvements. This graph is a comparison between industrial and domestic loads, to the treatment plant flows and loads. You have three major industries in the city which are Edgefield, Burns Bros. and Waste Water Management, which is next door to the treatment plant. We looked at the data of those three industries to find out what would be the comparison of the domestic flow that comes from the residences versus the industrial flow in terms of BOD and TSS. We found something very interesting. 10% of your flow as it's shown here, comes from the industry and 90% comes from domestic. On the other hand, when you look at the BOD the biochemical oxygen demands, 70% comes from industry and 30% comes from domestic or residences. Same for TSS, even higher, 80% comes from the industries and 20% comes from domestic. What does that mean? That means that your plant was originally to have domestic waste water coming into the plant with concentration loads a lot lower than what the treatment plant is seeing right now. This graph shows why that happens, because of the industries. The industries contributed more than 50% of the load coming into the

treatment plant.

Councilor Kight: Did you get detailed enough in your studies to identify what Waste Management, Burns Brothers or Edgefield was giving as disproportionate?

Clem Correia: Yes, and Jason can elaborate on that. The next is a table, and Jason will explain to you what this graph table means. He will give you an analysis of the local limits.

Jason Smith: Basically what this table represents is the concentration. Not on a mass basis, but the concentration limits that each of the industries would be required to meet. What we were asked to do was an analysis for chlorine, because it is known that Waste Management uses chlorine in their stabilization process. They bring in sewage from holding tanks and to stabilize that, (before they discharge it) they use a chlorine disinfection process, a lot like the POTW (Public Owned Treatment Works) used to do until they switched over to UV disinfectant. Also, because the BOD and TSS are limited by your NPDES permit, what you can discharge into the Sandy River or the treatment plant can discharge into the Sandy River. We were also asked to look at those. BOD and TSS are common in industries such as restaurants. Edgefield brews beer that has a lot of BOD in it and also TSS and that's from the hops and yeast and stuff like that. Finally FOG (fats, oils, and greases) are a typical sort of different compound and it requires a different analysis and I will talk about that as I go through this limit. FOG's is fats, oil and greases, and as you can see it is broken up in polar and non-polar. Polar is typical fats that are used in a restaurant such as animal fats that are used in burgers and stuff like that. Non-polar comes from an oil, gasoline, a petroleum base, or something like that. So the fats, oil and greases they log into one acronym like that, but they can actually be based as polar and non-polar.

Councilor Ripma: You started off saying that these limits are being imposed. I guess I'm missing a step here.

Clem Correia: I guess we need to explain. When we look at the data for the treatment plant, the treatment plant was originally designed for whatever comes into the treatment plant. The BOD and TSS that the plant was designed for was 200. In the last few years the BOD and TSS-(mainly the BOD) exceeds 400, 500 and 600 and as I showed on the graph about the industry versus the domestics, that is due to the industry, -the increased BOD is due to the industry. Does that answer your question?

Councilor Ripma: Are you saying these are limits you are suggesting be imposed.

Clem Correia: Suggesting, that's correct.

Councilor Kight: Your chart that you've got going, you have red limits and you've got calculated limits and I assume that calculated limits are the limits that you are dealing with right now? Are you talking about the waste water that's coming into the plant, or are you talking about that which is going out into the Sandy River?

Clem Carriea: That which is coming into the treatment plant, those numbers of 250 and 250.8 would be numbers enforced, suggested to be enforced to the industries, so that the concentration coming into the treatment plant should be the ones that the plant was designed for.

Councilor Kight: Which is the first column.

Clem Carriea: That is correct

Councilor Kight: Then why do you have a second column?

Jason Smith: I'll go ahead and take a step back and kind of start from why local limits are necessary and that may kind of answer some of the questions as we go along. Now when we go through and do local limits, we try to figure out first of all what the plant can handle. Based on the design loading and what you can have coming out into the river. What we do is we will use the limits imposed by your NPDES permit of the river and we'll back that by the efficiency of removal that you get at the plant. We will also worry about not killing

off your biological processes and we'll back all that as to how much you can have coming in from the front. Then what you have coming at the front of the plant is right here, this is what we calculate the plant will be able to handle, then we impose a safety factor that will account for the growth factor for the City and also the industries you have coming in, and that's taken off and that kind of goes to air and that's how much you are going to grow. Then you take out the domestic and commercial, because we can't regulate that. This is what you're going to see in your treatment plant no matter what, and then what you have left over after you subtract these two bubbles out of what you can have at your headworks can got to the industries and then based on their flow you can come up with the local limits.

Councilor Ripma: How are the local limits enforced? Are they forced to dilute there flow with water?

Jason Smith: No, they will either have to use a pretreatment technology such as maybe just clarifying and let the solids settle out, or they may have to clean their grease traps more frequently. Now currently, the plant is not experiencing any trouble with fats, oils and greases in their operations. What they are experiencing trouble with is in their collection system in their pipes and pumps out there under the streets. Those are clogging. They are having to clean them frequently. That analysis is done on a slightly different scale. It's kind of a difficult analysis to do so what you do is you usually take an EPA recommendation and what other POTW treatment plants have used as far as FOG limits go, and that's what we have suggested in our report, by what we've seen at other treatment plants. What these local limits are designed to do, is buy the treatment plant a little time because right now for the most part, the treatment is maxed out. It is having trouble meeting the treatment requirement for the load that it is receiving right now. The hope is (if this is adopted), that the industries would try to meet these limits and would reduce their BOD and TSS loads to the plant and that would give the Troutdale treatment plant a little time to catch up before they may need to do some plant expansion.

Councilor Kight: What do you mean a little time?

Jason Smith: Well, right now they are maxed out and Troutdale is growing at a rapid rate compared to other areas around here. With that increased load (domestic commercial load) that's going to increase that domestic commercial bubble and if the industrial bubble remains the same then the treatment plant is really going to have trouble meeting the current loadings (and then some) with the growth of this area. Since this area is going to grow anyway, what we tried to do is reduce the industrial bubble for now with these local limits. What we tried to do is reduce that bubble until we can expand the plant and get more capacity for more loading at the front of the plant, and then we can expand the industrial bubble again. Any other questions on local limits?

Councilor Ripma: It's 250 BOD TSS local limit, how does that compare with other cities?

Jason Smith: It's actually right in line, I see BOD TSS limits go from 100 to 2000 milligrams clear.

Councilor Ripma: Do cities around us impose them? Portland?

Jason Smith: Yes. In fact the pretreatment for Portland they have 25 other chemicals.

Councilor Ripma: Gresham too?

Jason Smith: Yes.

Mr Galloway: A piece of comparison, Councilor Ripma, 250 is the ball park of normal domestic sewage.

Councilor Ripma: It strikes me that instead of us expanding our plant we are pushing the problem off to our customers and they will have to bear some of the load. I am not saying it's unfair, I just wonder if gee, that this is an awful easy solution and almost too good to be true and I just wondered if other cities do it. It sounds like they do and maybe we should.

Jason Smith: In a lot of municipalities that have treatment plants or POTW, they impose limits on industrial users just because typically their waste stream is stronger and basically more rancid than anything else they see and so it's their way of regulating what they're getting.

Clem Carriea: We'll go on then to the next page which is...we're going to talk a little bit about projections. The graph that you see is population projections, provided by the City of Troutdale to use in our study. Basically we are looking at ten thousand people right now and at build out, about twenty-five thousand. I am just showing where we're at and the build out at twenty-five thousand people, that will take place in 2021. The next graph is a flow, what you are looking at basically is a graph that shows flow on the Y axis and the years all the way from 1994 and 2021. What we did, as I mentioned at the beginning, was we looked at the historical data from Troutdale from 1985 all the way to June of 1994. What you are seeing is based on the analysis we did looking at the peaking factors and so far the projection we came up with is this one here. You can see the plant was designed for 1.6 design flow. In about 2003 the plant will be overloaded from a flow standpoint and something needs to be done. The best way to explain that is- if you have a two gallon bucket, it's impossible to put five gallons in it. It's the same way with the treatment plant. It has so much it can hold in volume, so if you can reach more than you can put in, you have to do something about it.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: I do have a question, since you are looking at the design of this plant. I was here in 1979 and we were watching what was going on when we had the plant expansion. At that time it was projected that plant expansion would bring us into full growth and at that time projected growth was around twenty-five thousand. We were assured that the plant would accommodate that and now we're talking that we're not meeting even half of our growth expectations. Is the problem of capacity based on new regulations, or the plant.

Clem Carriea: No, the capacity problem is based on the unit processes you have in a true treatment plant. It has some physical units that are hydraulic limited and I will be explaining that later. So, if they cannot take peak flow, there is a peak flow condition. They will not be able to hold that.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: Have peoples' capacities increased since 1979, are we using more water than average?

Mr Galloway: I don't think there has been any significant change. I wasn't here in 1979. If folks were looking at a build out in the city of roughly twenty-five thousand population, I just can't imagine why someone would think that 1.6 million gallons per day would take it out all the way. A very rough rule of thumb would be an average usage of somewhere around 100 gallons a day per capita could get you in the ball park.

Clem Carriea: The next graph is probably the most important graph of this presentation and when we were asked to do the study for the city, we had to look at the capacity,(what the plant can take from a flow stand point and a loading stand point) and we also, in the process of this study, looked at the operation of the plant. Is there something wrong with the operation of the plant and the answer to that is no. We found the plant is being operated as it should be so we talked many many times, with many many visits to this site with Mike Sorenson the plant Superintendent and everything they were doing was fine, except they don't have the capacity to treat the loads that are coming into the treatment plant so it becomes very difficult to make the plant meet permit. If you look at the graph, what you see is the original design of the plant back in 1979 as you mentioned, it was about 2700 pounds per day of BOD loading coming to the plant. If you look at it today, it's 3000- actually it's almost 4000 pounds, so you can see the plant is overloaded. There is a lot more coming into the plant than the plant was designed for. If you look at the projection, if nothing is done- (keep in mind that if nothing is done to the industries) this is what is going to happen to the plant. That's the growth you can expect based on the historical loads and flows we looked at. You are going to come close to almost ten thousand pounds of BOD, it's almost five-times what the plant is currently designed for.

Councilor Ripma: I am confused, how are we handling this, how are even able to handle it?

Mike Sorenson: Miracle! It's not easy. It is a trial and error basis.

Councilor Ripma: When did the BOD loading cross the threshold ? How long ago was that?

Mike Sorenson: Three or four years probably (we began seeing it in 92).

Councilor Ripma: That's when we started smelling the stink in this town. Is this the reason?

Clem Carriea: No, BOD has nothing to do with odor and I can't say the odor comes from the treatment plant itself.

Councilor Lloyd: I've heard that for years, and I don't believe that either.

Clem Carriea: No, BOD has nothing to do with that, unless you have a system that is really foul and then you have an odor.

Councilor Lloyd: If we are getting a big load, I mean, beyond what the plant capacity can meet, does this mean we are putting it into our pond untreated or only partially treated?

Clem Carriea: Your pond receives solids.

Councilor Lloyd: But are those solids fully treated?

Clem Carriea: They are stabilized in the digestion complex. That is what you installed a year and a half ago to take care of that. You need to stabilize them so you can dispose of them. If it's agriculture use you don't want to have damage to the crops, so they have to be stabilized. It's a requirement imposed by the EPA and DEQ.

Councilor Lloyd: But to the extent that we are receiving these loads, and we're dumping them in the river?

Clem Carriea: You violated several times for BOD. Yes the answer to your question is yes, sometimes you discharge more than your permit requires.

Councilor Kight: But that's the liquid right?

Clem Carriea: Yes, that's the affluent use that is the liquid stream that I explained to you. What goes in the river is not the solids it's liquid.

Councilor Kight: You've taken care of the solids problem the real problem here for some reason is there is an unbalance in the liquid problem. So whoever did the study and decided they need to take care of the solids and they did that but somehow they didn't take care of the liquids.

Clem Carriea: You always need to look at the entire picture, you can't just look at the solids.

Councilor Kight: Did they do that though when they added the capacity to take care of the solids?

Clem Correia; I don't believe so, I really don't know.

Mike Sorenson: There were aspects of it looked at from loading to the digesters. In other words, how many solids we would generate in a day, how many pounds, and what those digesters would need to be sized at to handle that. As far as looking at the entire hydraulic capacity, no, it wasn't done.

Clem Correia: What happens since you have at some point a hydraulic problem, you supercede what your plant was designed for and also from a loading stand point a BOD stand point. We looked at every single process you have at the treatment plant. Those processes that I pointed out to you on the first projection. The head works, what limits the head works is flow, it's a physical process and it's limited by flow. According to our projections you don't have to do anything to your head works until 2016 so we looked at every single unit process, the limitations they have, what parameters limit those unit processes, that's what we did. The first one was the head works. You don't have to do anything until 2016. Head works is where you remove all the screens of grit and sand and things like that. The second one was the primary clarified. You have a limiting effect there which is over flow rate, again that's the hydraulic concerns. That's flow. Overflow rate is that you have a surface area of the clarifier, and you divide the flow by that surface area. It was the design criteria for that unit process that limits how much you can (over that surface area) how much flow you can have. It's called overflow rate. The third one in influence to the screw pump. There is a screw pump that lifts the waste water at the plant and it is also limited by flow. In 2001, you are going to have to have another screw pump. Now if you look at the next one, the next row which is the secondary system which is a combination of your aeration basin and secondary clarifier. As I explained before, it's the heart of the treatment plant, that's where the problem is. You are already over capacity with that system. Your UV disinfection you have a new facility. Flow is the limiting factor in your UV disinfection and finally your digester complex. Your digester is limited by sludge production. It is how much solids you can send to your digester. Those were the things we looked at to make sure we know when something needs to be done, but I emphasize the secondary system. That is the heart of the plant and if that doesn't work there is no way you can remove the BOD.

Councilor Ripma: The flow on your population chart (MGP) goes to 2003. Wouldn't it be limited by the lowest number on this table that you just showed in the year 2000.

Clem Correia: A specific unit process would. You have to look at each specific unit process. We design a plant for a certain design flow and each unit process has it's own limitations. You don't have to upgrade the entire plant flow wise because some unit processes can take more than others.

Councilor Ripma: This chart, when you say original capacity, original design, it seems like it ought to be limited. I realize it's only three years difference, but these years are coming up fast.

Councilor Burger Kimber: But we upgraded, you are forgetting that, that we upgraded with this new...

Councilor Ripma: I understand, that's a good point. But on this chart he says that even the original design for flow only went all the way to 2003, yet this last chart he just put up has the primary clarified flow to the year 2000. I am more alarmed about that.

Clem Correia: I understand your question and it's a valid question and the answer to that question is, one thing that I want to try to explain to you. We break flow into many many different flow conditions and that is according to the weather; dry weather and wet weather. Each facility has a limitation either by wet weather flow, a dry weather flow, or a peak flow and so you have to look at those conditions. The plant itself was designed for design flow, but each unit process has it's own limitations. The final hand-out is, since you have a substantial growth planned for the City of Troutdale and an overload problem at the treatment plant, what can be done to resolve the problem? There are short term improvements, ones that can be done to resolve the problem in a short term, and what I mean by short term is 2-3 months, the critical months of the summer. That's when the flows are very high, the loads are very light I should say. Long term improvements that need to be done, like the secondary system, quickly to resolve the problem because you don't have the capacity. We identified three short term improvements to get you by as you develop a plan to expand the plant. The plant needs to be expanded, there is no doubt because it is overloaded and that is what I want to point out. There are ways, as you wait to expand the plant, as you develop a plan and you go through the design process, the construction and so forth that you can do, (of course DEQ will be involved in that process) to resolve that problem in the interim. We identified one, that is to reduce the load at the source, in that, ask the industries

enforcing more stringent limitation. Like Jason explained on the industries, the BOD, TSS and the chlorine, that's one way to do it.

Councilor Ripma: How quickly could that be implemented? If we can impose the limits (well it would be the response of the industries...) How much time do you have to give the industries to meet it? A year, two years or months?

Clem Correia: It depends on what they have to do to meet that. If they have to pre-treat the waste water they would have to come up with a process to pre-treat it.

Councilor Ripma: What if we impose those limits that you're suggesting. You know, however it was enforced in other cities. How, if a good faith effort was being made, how quickly could that be brought on line by industries?

Clem Correia: If they really tried to comply...within a year.

Councilor Ripma: That's a year minimum?

Clem Correia: Well, I really can't say because we didn't look at the process for them and we didn't analyze that as part of this study.

Councilor Ripma: I realize that.

Mark Laswell: Lets put it into perspective a little bit. Let's look at the brewery operation. They discharge 5 to 10 thousand gallons a day at a strength of 10, 20, 30 thousand milligrams per liter, parts per million of organics, where as domestics is 200, so they have a low flow but a very varied amount of strengths. You may be able to isolate in their process ways to reduce the strengths of the amounts of loads that they discharge. It's all very operational specific, how they handle their operation, what their facilities are like. Because of the age of that facility for example, it is not a very easy one. All their pipes come into one location and connect at one location. It would be a challenge. I would guess for some of the work we've done with other breweries, it's a low end of 50,000 and high end was over a million dollars.

Mr. Galloway: Those are under the assumption that they choose to pretreat. There may be some other options that might be more desirable by them, for instance trucking that to some other location. Given a range of cost may be addressing something they don't intend to do. It may be more cost effective (if we were imposing those limits on them) to haul that waste somewhere else.

Clem Correia: The second thing that you could do as a short term is reduce the load at the treatment plant. Decrease the BOD, the load into the secondary system that can be done by polymers. It can be done with alum, but it is very expensive. You are talking about $200 per day in chemical cost. That's another solution.

Councilor Kight: What are we spending now on chemicals?

Mike Sorenson: For the next year I budgeted polymers to keep the solids down in the secondary system $11,000. The chemicals I budget, that I am currently budgeting for, don't remove the load as Clem is stating. What this material does that I am looking at, is it takes it on the back end. When it comes in the aerator it settles those solids out in the secondary. Whether they will settle, (they won't settle on their own) basically the treatment is incomplete and they won't settle on their own, so we use chemicals to aid that, then it goes back into the various process, digester and aerator.

Councilor Kight: Do you have a limited time, if you have increased volumes like that, do you have a limited time which those solids can stay in the plant?

Mike Sorenson: Yes, Oh, Yes

Councilor Kight: So the point is that if you can't treat it chemically or whatever, it has to go out.

Mike Sorenson: Yes. As the time span gets shorter, there's less time to do the work that needs to be done. Which happens, it either goes to the river, which is normally the case if you run out of time, you just don't have the time because of the hydraulic load through that system, and it takes time for it all to settle down. I mean you're dealing with solids here that are just slightly, I mean so slightly heavier than the water, so it takes a lot of time for it to settle, without agitation or additional flow. I mean if it is raining really hard it will tend to wash that type of thing out.

Councilor Kight: That new UV system, it's helping, but it isn't keeping up with capacity, is that what you're really saying?

Clem Correia: No, the UV's doing what it was designed for. It's doing what it's supposed to do which is remove the fecal Polyborus from the waste water. That's all it does. It disinfects your affluent. Kills pathogens basically. It does not deal with BOD or TSS, it deals with fecal Polyborus.

Councilor Kight: Are there any health hazards with those materials going into the Sandy River the way they currently are?

Clem Correia: Depends to what? The aquatic life possibly, because if you are sending BOD's, they are an oxygen mask, so if you got a certain level in the river, it depletes the oxygen in the river so the fish die because the oxygen is being destroyed by the organisms. As far as humans I don't know. I don't believe so. The real threat to humans are the pathogens (the fecal Polyborus) but it still creates a load on the river. The third one is short term improvement as well, and that is, since you have a brand new digester complex, you can truck industrial loads to the treatment plant and discharge them to the digester and that way you can knock down all the BOD and treat it. But again it is a short term improvement. Put it in the digester, bypass the secondary process. Again it is short term. DEQ would not allow you to do that all the time.

Councilor Kight: That may work for the short term basis while we figure out what we are going to do. Aren't there peak hours at 2 o'clock in the morning Edgefield isn't dumping...

Clem Correia: Well, I'm glad you brought that up, because we did tests at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning in the secondary system. We were out there, but we noticed we thought at that time because the test would only work to determine how much oxygen was transferred to the aeration basin at low loads. It was the contrary, it was high loads at 3 o'clock in the morning, so somebody was dumping something at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning while we were doing the test. We thought we would get the lowest loads, but is was the opposite when he dumped the chemical in to do the testing, it was consumed in 5 minutes. It was supposed to stay for like a half an hour or 40 minutes in the aeration basin. Okay, then comes the long term improvements. One thing is to upgrade the plant at the existing site and bring it to full compliance or move it to another site. There are some costs involved definitely. Cost can be quite diverse depending on which alternative you look at, from the level of our study we just looked at a solution for the problem, but not the optimum solution because there are several alternatives you can look at and make a fair comparison. We did not have the levels of this study to really do that. We can tell you that if you stay at the existing site, it will cost you anywhere from 6-8 million dollars to upgrade your plant. If you decide to move the plant, the picture changes quite a bit. You are talking about anywhere from 15 to 18 million dollars. If you decide to stay at the existing site, you can approach it in a different way because it is so difficult to find funding these days. Many municipalities are going with a phased approach which is to design the plant to meet the requirements up to 10 years plus and then in 10 years plus, you upgrade again for the next 10 years. In that way it decreases the amount of money you have to spend up front. Many municipalities are doing that, Woodburn & Stayton are doing that.

Mayor Thalhofer: We intend to do a feasibility study on relocating the plant . It is my opinion it is not a matter of moving the plant, it is when. Our existing plant is in a prime commercial location and say it costs 15,16 to move it? The land it sits on, and perhaps the environment that it creates in the surrounding land is, (if you move the sewer treatment plant), you are going to have reclaimed land that is worth a considerable amount of money and that would be included in the feasibility study of course. We do plan to do that and we need to get the funds in which to do that and we are currently pursuing that with the Corp of Engineers.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: When did we start pursuing this?

Mr. Galloway: That was an item on the monthly report that I provided to you at the last council meeting and we didn't get the chance to discuss it because it was a long meeting, It was based on comments by a number of councilors raised as to whether that's a feasible alternative or not. We did try on rather short notice back in the later part of December, that there was an opportunity, that the Corp of Engineers had a 50-50 cost sharing proposition to do certain feasibility studies included among them were basically environmentally oriented studies and one of those was waste water. I did go ahead and submit an application as I mentioned in the monthly report and if it doesn't meet the desires of the council I can withdraw that if that's not what you wanted me to do. It will take a look at the feasibility of relocation of the plant versus an upgrade of the plant I think. I guess my thoughts are at this point that if that's what the council wants to seriously consider that maybe we should see if the application with the Corp is going to get approved. That does save us some dollars up front as far as conducting the study. Certainly if that is not something you want to consider, then I'll certainly get that application withdrawn and go on in a different direction.

Councilor Kight: Would you hire an independent company to do the study?

Mr. Galloway: The study would be done by the Corp.

Councilor Kight: Would they look at land acquisition, what's available, different options?

Mr. Galloway: I am trying to think of what we had asked them to do and one of the things that we asked them to do was consider the feasibility of moving versus remaining in place, and upgrading in place. We had asked them to because of one of the issues involved in conducting a study under this program was look at the ideas of privatization of the operations of the plant. I don't think that has real benefits to us, but that is one of the things that they would look at. They would also look at potential revenue sources, is there any kind of a grant or low interest loan program out there that we're not aware of that might be available to us. I think that the other tasks that we suggested be asked in this study was the willingness to pay by the rate payers. Obviously, they can come back and say moving the plant is a great idea, but if the rates that are going to have to be paid by the rate payers and SDC's that are going to have to paid by prospective developers was so high that no one would want to do that, maybe it's not worth pursuing. Those are the tasks we asked them to look at. If they approve the application, then we go into the negotiation process to talk about the dollars, what's our share going to be, what's the federal share going to be and more narrowly define the scope of work. I think the things that I just mentioned and even though they were in our application asking for consideration, doesn't necessarily mean that they would agree to study all of those or that we might have some other particular ideas, now that this study has been concluded of things that we like to look at. Does that answer your question?

Councilor Kight: Yes, thank you. Clem I have a question for you. Let's go worst-case scenario. Let's say the plant for whatever reason, because of money or the plan isn't available, we can't move it. Instead of having these open lagoons, I know other cities have done it, where they have actually put a concrete lid over it. Have you looked at any of the costs of doing that? Question #1 and question #2 is, do we have the physical capacity or room to expand for the lagoons? Is there enough property down there for that?

Clem Correia: When you say expand with lagoons, is that to resolve the problem with the plant, the secondary system?

Councilor Kight: No, I am looking further down the road, the next 10,15-20 years.

Clem Correia: There are many things that you can do at the treatment plant to resolve the problem and that is what that range is all about 6-8 million. The high end you see here is a solution that we looked at. We wanted to give some rough estimates and go to the high ceiling of the estimates in terms of what you can do at the treatment plant- at the existing treatment plant. There is well, two huge basins called aeration basins, much, much bigger than the one you have now that will absorb that load the BOD loading, again we looked at if the industries did not take care of the loading at all. Keep that in mind, we are seeing those high loads coming in so to take care of those loads we would have to implement these huge basins at the plant and some upgrades of the clarifiers and add some new clarifiers and some things like that. This cost that you are seeing here is a full blown expansion of the treatment plant to take care of the problems, the BOD and everything else.

Mr. Galloway: I think the answer to your question (because we asked this in our meeting with them yesterday) is yes, there would be physically enough space at the existing treatment plant to do the proposed improvements that they recommend. An additional lagoon is not one of those.

Councilor Kight: So you don't need an additional lagoon until build out.

Clem Correia: No.

Councilor Kight: How do we get rid of the odor? You know, you go to the factory outlet stores and you just about gag some days.

Clem Correia: Jim has asked me about the odor, how can we measure the odor at the treatment plant. The answer was, I had spoke about professional sniffers and there are professional sniffers with an instrument that measures the odors at the treatment plant and sources around the treatment plant. In this case, someone would go at the edge the fence line between the treatment plant and Waste Water Management and see if there are odors coming from Waste Water Management, but it is a very cumbersome process. They take samples and send to a group of people who are in this room and analyze and sniff these samples and do a statistical analysis to see where the sources come from depending from where the samples were collected. It is very complex. We have done it in many treatment plants, but it is not an inexpensive way to do it.

Councilor Kight: What if we just threw a lid over anything that's open, whether it be Waste Water Management lagoons or whatever, seal up everything?

Clem Correia: You could cover your units, yes. If you look at Marine Park in Vancouver, all the facilities are covered, everyone of them.

Councilor Kight: It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the odors are either coming from Waste Water Management or the treatment plant or all of the above.

Clem Correia: But you also need to remember that when you cover the facility, you will need to purge the air so you will have to put some odor control systems in there too. It's not just putting a lid on the system. So it's a mitigation issue that you have at hand so, yes, it can be done.

Councilor Kight: So, let's say we have a current odor now. Would it be cut by 20%, 30%, 90%, 95%, do you think by putting lids on it?

Clem Correia: You can cover the clarifies. The clarifies can be a source. Most of the BOC's are organic compounds, but it's not an odor problem. The head works can be a problem because of the hydrogen sulfide that comes in. So you would definitely enclose that and put an odor control system attached to the building or whatever enclosure you put over the head works.

Councilor Kight: What if you covered the whole works? Seal it all off and vented it as you were talking about. Do you think you could get rid of the majority of odor?

Clem Correia; If the treatment plant is the source of these odors, you should be able to take care of that.

Councilor Kight: And Waste Water Management.

Clem Correia: And Waste Water Management. You should be able to, yes- if you take all the precautions in terms of process and odor control system that you should be able to.

Councilor Ripma: Your feeling is that it isn't the plant?

Clem Correia: It's hard to say if it's the plant or not because I haven't been around for a long time, but it can be other sources and I really don't think that it is only the treatment plant.

Mr. Galloway: I know the day that Mayor Thalhofer and I responded to a complaint from someone at the mall about odors and we went down and looked, it didn't appear to be. I certainly don't want to say that's the way it is every day, every time, but I think we sniffed around quite a bit with our own human noses anyway...

Clem Correia: I am not saying that treatment does not emit some odors. I'm saying that I don't think it is the only source. You can't just point out the treatment plant.

Councilor Ripma: I agree

Mayor Thalhofer: It's not the only source.

Councilor Kight: Well Clem, what settled it for me was when we took the tour of Waste Water Management and they have this huge concrete basin and it is open to the air and it's drying sewage sludge.

Clem Correia: Well, they receive septic sludge. That is definitely a source of odors if they don't take care of it.

Councilor Kight: I mean just standing next to it just about knocked you over.

Councilor Ripma: Are you going to be providing a break down of the industrial sources?

Clem Correia: There are six memos that we prepared along with this study so there will be a report with all these memos compiled, and an executive summary on top of it. So you will have all this information.

Councilor Ripma: My suggestion is for us tonight that you get those to us. I would like to look at those. This thing is very important. We've got a lot of money...we rarely, as a council, are going to have something so important to consider. I recommend that we get those reports and have another meeting. Maybe without you folks necessarily, just our own staff, and then call you back another time...That's the way I am inclined right now.

Mr. Galloway: If it is the desire of the council, when would you have those final reports ready?

Clem Correia: We are still finalizing them, waiting for your comments on 5 and 6. I still have to write the executive summary and summarize the reports.

Mr. Galloway: If we got these back to you in a week?

Clem Correia: I would say no later than the end of the month I would have the report.

Councilor Ripma: Sounds good to me.

Mr. Galloway: Originally what we had set up was to have this as a more informal meeting with a lot more, give and take questions and answers, and then have a more summarized version at the regular council meeting next week. Given the fact that it sounds like some of the councilors want to see the reports and have a chance to read through them, do I understand correctly that you prefer to defer that session for next weeks council meeting until a later date after you've had a chance to look at the reports?

Mayor Thalhofer: I think that would be a good idea. Maybe the following council meeting.

Councilor Lloyd: You know this chart that shows the BOD loading at the current column is way over the design. Have you tracked that back? How many years have we been over design?

Clem Correia: I think we answered that question-2 or 3 years.

Mike Sorenson: We started seeing the increased levels show up in '92.

Councilor Lloyd: Okay then, I guess the question for us is how come on all these planning applications for new subdivisions and things, it always says "no problem handling this in our plant?" We have more coming in here everyday. Are we going to continue to process these things and say no problem?

Councilor Ripma: I think that is a question we ought to ask staff, and maybe come back at the next meeting that we have.

Mr. Galloway: I think a short answer, (if we want to get into more detail and there's probably some policy implications behind it) is that it isn't the domestic waste stream that is really accounting for the greater problem. Now once you hit capacity anything that takes you over that contributes to the problem. When you have a few businesses that are putting out the two-thirds of the BOD loading that the city has, certainly the residential subdivision portion is very minute.

Councilor Ripma: Well, I have several questions for staff that have come to mind that will take a little research.

Mayor Thalhofer: Well now, let's talk about that. You want to have another whole work session on this?

Councilor Ripma: yes.

Mayor Thalhofer: Or do you want to ask staff on your own, the questions and let staff respond.

Councilor Ripma: Well, I haven't thought about doing it that way, but a couple of good questions have been raised, including yours about what was reported in 1979 at the time the plant was built.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: Well, in '92 is when we did the expansion.

Councilor Ripma: It raises questions that I think maybe we all ought to hear, but I will ask them myself if we don't have another work session. I personally think that this is so important and such a lot of money and such a hard decision, and this is not going to be easy so we need another work session and probably fairly soon.

Mayor Thalhofer: As I understand it, we've got a report coming is that correct? That report I would hope answers some of these questions that are being raised.

Clem Correia: It's a combination of all the reports and memos that we've done.

Mayor Thalhofer: Why don't we get that report and see if it answers your questions and if it doesn't we'll schedule another work session and go into this in more detail in another work session before we put it on the formal council agenda because we do want to pursue this as rapidly as possible. We are pursuing the relocation feasibility study which I know I have been in favor of for sometime, and I hope the rest of the council is in favor of pursuing that application for the Corp. of Engineers to share the cost of that. Is anyone opposed to that?

Councilor Ripma: Oh no, I am all for it.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: The only comment I have to make is that this is a very important issue and it's a very important issue to me. I've been down to the treatment plant touring it. I am going to be out of the country for three weeks and I would beg the council to allow me to be back in town if we have a work session on it which I would like to see. I will be gone from the 26th of this month through February 15th and so I would like to request the Mayor and the council if you could possibly defer another work session to after I come back. That would give us time to review the report and ask staff questions and maybe optimize our work session time. I would really like to be there.

Mayor Thalhofer: That's no problem. The question is does anyone have an objection to pursuing the request that Mr. Galloway has made of the Corp of Engineers to see if they will share costs for a feasibility study for relocating that sewer.

Councilor Kight: Can we find out what our costs are going to be as far as our part?

Mr. Galloway: I can tell you what I said in the application and getting much finer than that, is going a little bit further into the process. What I told them was I thought we were looking at probably $75,000 and the criteria is a 50-50 cost sharing. However, our share, the local share, as identified as in-kind services and we will probably have to negotiate on exactly on what that might mean.

Councilor Kight: So no out of pocket?

Mr. Galloway: Well, I'm not sure what that means. That means certainly staff time that we put into it would count . Certainly if there's some element of it for instance, if there was a requirement to do appraisals of property and we were to take on that particular sub task that would probably count. Whether or not some of the effort that has been put into this particular study that Clem has just talked about could be counted or not, is something I would want to discuss with them. Right now the figure is $75,000, split 50-50. What kinds of good things can we use to show that we have met our 50% I think are some things that we can negotiate with them if we get our application approved.

Mayor Thalhofer: Okay, then there's no objection I take it?

Mr. Galloway: I'll leave the application in and will pursue that avenue with the Corp.

Mayor Thalhofer: Okay, then we will have your final report to us, and then we will have another work session on this and we'll pursue your final report and if we still have a lot of questions, we'll have another work session and we'll wait until all councilors are available to pursue that report before we decide to schedule another work session. Then after the next work session, we will bring it to the council at a regular council meeting.

Mayor Thalhofer: We are going to take a 5 minute break at this time. Hopefully we can wrap this baby up in 10 minutes.

Mr. Galloway: The second item on the agenda, Mr. Mayor, has to do with the Stark Street improvements. A high priority on the County's capital improvement plan is to upgrade Stark Street between 257th and Troutdale Road. Their tentative schedule is to try to do the extension of Beaver Creek late this year and probably to the actual project in '96 or '97 according to the last information that I have. I'm not sure, both get the design done and the funds together to do that project. They sent a letter to us and I put that in the packet, basically explaining the scope of the project and asking for our concurrence. Basically they are looking at a standard five lane arterial highway configuration, two lanes in each direction, center turn lane, bike lanes and sidewalks. We had discussed this about a year and half ago. Councilor Ripma may remember better than any of us, and there was some discussion the council sent a letter to the county, basically to just ask them to look at alternatives to a standard five lane design. I think that at the time of our discussion, Councilor Ripma was advocating something less than five lanes, perhaps three lanes might suffice. Others on the council were saying that we may have to go with the full width that the county wanted, but maybe there could be some mitigating efforts, like median strip or landscaping or those kinds of things. Our basic request to the county was take a look and see what could be done and mentioned that the college campus bordered on one side and there's a rather good view of Mt. Hood and so on, and there were some aesthetic reasons as well as highway design factors that should be taken into account. So that's one issue, what design parameters that the county should march forward with and right now their marching to a fairly standard five lane design. The second is a question of under grounding on Stark. We were initially told that was something that we would want because of our ordinance and policy on it. However, if you take a look at that and the utility lines on Stark and the area on the south side of Stark which puts them in the City of Gresham for about two-thirds of the distance there. Our city boundary is just west of Beaver Creek at that area, so 257th to almost Beaver Creek is in Gresham and then from there to Troutdale Road is the City of Troutdale. We have asked the county to approach Gresham to see if they were interested in undergrounding and I think what it gets down to is if Gresham says no, it kind of becomes, what do you think looks best I guess, as opposed to any real technical question as whether to leave it as it is now, or have the transition of poles to no poles occurring part-way between there and somewhere near Beaver Creek. As of a few days ago when I talked to both the county and the transportation manager at Gresham, Gresham had not come to grips with the question and was not prepared to state an answer at this time. Other than their downtown area where they have done something similar to what we're doing in our downtown. I don't believe the City of Gresham has undergone a conversion from overheads to underground utility lines. I think that kind of sets the two issues; one, what the cross section of the road would look like and two, the undergrounding issue. I also submitted and perhaps didn't make it quite as clear, a conversation I had with Councilor Kight, but I did put in there a proposed letter back to the county that said basically, "Yes we concur in the cross section five lanes, bicycle lanes, sidewalks as you proposed and number two, we are not prepared to give you an answer on the undergrounding until we hear what we get for an answer from Gresham. That would be my recommendation to you, but certainly because I know there could be some controversy about this and also because it is a fairly important arterial roadway in the city, I certainly wanted your concurrence before I represented that as the city's position. That's kind of where we are now.

Mayor Thalhofer: What did the county say in regards to the median idea?

Mr. Galloway: Quite frankly, I have not been able to find out if our letter that asked them to study that got into the hands of the design engineers. I think that particular effort, if it is one we want to pursue, needs to be reinvigorated.

Councilor Ripma: I spoke with Mr. Kirby who's the design engineer at the county about 3 months ago. I have been following this for years as this is kind of a pet thing with me. I would like to see that road built in something other than the standard five lane arterial that Stark Street has been built on all the way up to there. Mr. Kirby indicated just what Jim said. I got the impression that if we want them to consider a median or some other design, we need to ask and now is the time to do it. He hasn't started designing the road, but I don't believe they really did consider anything other than a standard five lane arterial up 'till now. I made copies of our letter that we sent. Jim sent it at the direction of the City Council July 28th 1993 and I'll pass that out to everybody. Plus it has a picture inside it...and has a couple of other things that once you get them (the

pictures). It's a good example that the county I think will respond if we ask, I really do. They don't like to, they like to build it their ususal way, but they will respond if we ask. Mr. Kirby, the guy who is designing it is the one who designed the road through downtown, the Old Columbia River Highway, so he's good and he's sensitive and he will do a good job and we're fortunate to have him. Let me explain, on this letter I just handed out. Number two is the request that was made in '93, kind of asking the county to consider something other than the standard. Then the next page is taken from the Colleges' own traffic study indicating they would like the north entrance to the college, which is the one on Stark Street, to be moved slightly west but nothing too bizarre about it or expensive about it. Then the next two drawings are mine and believe me, I even put in blue highlighting because my medians didn't look very good, it was a bit of a mess. But what I wanted to have was something to show the council kind of what I thought were two alternatives. The one with the blue highlighting...has a median with trees something like on 257th hill and a separate pedestrian bicycle-type path, separated from the roadway, on the college side and probably a regular sidewalk on the other side where there is less room. The very final sheet is another alternative I would still like the college or the county to study whether they need to do two traffic lanes in each direction. I don't think they ever did study it actually having learned this at tonights meeting. I think it was in just a private conversation. The county isn't even widening Halsey to five lanes. Halsey (through Fairview) is only going to remain three lanes. I sort of question if Stark needs to go to five lanes or even four lanes but be that as it may, I would like to see this council reiterate our request of number two in that letter that is on the top of the packet that I just gave you or be more specific and say we would like a median or four lanes designed with a median. Let me also say, today I spoke with Richard Ross from Gresham. I have discussed this casually with the Mayor of Gresham, but I talked today with Richard Ross about this and Gresham is currently engaged in a 20-20 visioning process on road design with the county that is attempting to have the county build tree-lined boulevards in Gresham. Richard Ross said this was exactly the thing that Gresham would strongly favor on a new road like this. Since part of this does lie in Gresham, I believe we should make the request at this time that they study it and then make sure a joint request is made between Troutdale and Gresham to the county.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: Did you talk to the college?

Councilor Ripma: Yes, I made an appearance before the college board about a year and a half ago.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: I am aware of that meeting, but have you met with them recently?

Councilor Ripma: I haven't talked to anyone at the college other than informally with Pam Shear. I have kept in touch with her and I have mentioned it to Dr. Crider every time I see him, but you know, Jim talked to somebody today.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: I am going to have to drive by the campus at the college, but it seems to me that all of their power lines are all underground.

Councilor Kight: On the campus itself?

Councilor Burger-Kimber: On the Campus itself.

Mr. Galloway: I think you're right, I don't recall any above ground.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: I don't either and it has a certain aesthetic appeal and there was a certain end of mission statement that was involved in the design of that campus that I think we might use it as a viable argument for tying that roadway and the undergrounding into the campus and there might be an opportunity or leverage that if the college were willing to buy into this process and county needed to have additional property, that there might be some kind of design criteria to use as leverage.

Mr. Galloway: I think as far as the right-of-way as the land goes, I think the county is okay there. I did speak

with Jan and she put me in touch with? (I have to check my files to see who) but I believe a director of facilities or physical planner or some such title to a position. I was trying to see where the college stood on the undergrounding issue on Stark and their response was basically "yeah, sounds like a great idea and as long as it doesn't cost the college anything, we support you", so that's kind of where that issue stands.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: I am just thinking that might be above all the other arguments that might be, you know, a continuity of design issue might be a strong argument.

Mr. Galloway: I think as far as Councilor Ripma's idea about something less than the five lanes, I guess only for your consideration I would point out that more than likely, if we're going to a median, you are basically doing away with the center turn lane, is that correct?

Councilor Ripma: I envisioned a median between two traffic lanes going in each direction, just like 257th...

Mr Galloway: So there would be no center turn lane.

Councilor Ripma: Except at the college entrance and one reason why this stretch of Stark is so ideal for this is that it doesn't have a whole lot of entrances or driveways. It's just the college entrance and one property that is just behind the Skyline Pub. That is likely to be developments and there is going to have to be a break for a turn lane somehow there but other than that, there are no other turns. We ought to get them to do it here, this is the perfect place to do it.

Mr. Galloway: The other thing I mentioned is if we were to make that request and they were to review it, I think and probably Pam is closer to this in her discussions with community development and facilities maintenance, but I think we've been a little less than fully satisfied with the maintenance effort on the median on 257th. I think that taking care of trees, plants and shrubs is something probably the county highway department is not real proficient at and that has been a bit of a problem and in fact I think we're trying to work on something.

Pam Christian: That will be in the budget request this year..you'll see it, the city will contract with the county to do the maintenance on the medians.

Councilor Kight: They will pay us to do it?

Pam Christian: Exactly. We will set our own standards.

Councilor Kight: Well David kind of got me onboard. You see he lobbied, but he didn't have to lobby very hard as we all know, that anytime there is a street improvement to the magnitude of putting in five lanes, it lasts a very long period of time. To that end, I also talked to Richard Ross and they have this book that actually David asked for, and I picked it up today. It's called "Boulevard's- A Street Tree Master Plan". This entire document (I have only looked at it briefly because I only just got it tonight) outlines the different types of trees and the designs that you can use and they've really got this thing down. I am really quite amazed...in fact they have done it with different streets. They show two lanes and here you see like a ten foot median strip and they have like a tulip tree in the middle. They have several examples of different median strips, on the outboard and median itself and so forth. This document would be very helpful and Gresham wants this to happen as far as a median strip with trees or some type of landscape.

Mr. Galloway: Richard Ross does?

Councilor Kight: Yes, he made that very clear.

Mr. Galloway: I want to make sure...I don't know if he necessarily speaks for the City of Gresham on this

particular...

Councilor Ripma: I do believe he does.

Mr. Galloway: I do believe he does, I am not questioning that, I just want to make sure that it was a formal position taken by the city.

Councilor Kight: And to that end, I don't think they would have gone to this type of documentation relative to doing an entire book just on boulevards if that wasn't their policy...

Mr. Galloway: I know the City of Gresham is interested in pursuing kind of an Eastman Parkway as a prototype of what they would like to see. I just don't know as a fact that they have addressed that as far as Stark goes.

Councilor Kight: I went over to the college and I asked Dr. Gretchen Shudy. The only thing they asked (they like the idea of the median strip) relative to a request is that they have enough room to stack at least 6-8 automobiles in that turning lane for the westbound traffic on Stark so they can turn into the college. Other than that, we would love to have a median strip or some type of landscaping.

Mr. Galloway: So that's 6-8 vehicle stacking westbound on Stark for those making a left turn into the college?

Councilor Kight: Other than that she is in total support.

Mayor Thalhofer: Now what is the procedure at this point? There is feeling on the council that we should do this median-type situation.

Mr. Galloway: I think the word is the county, because they knew one member of the council wasn't happy with the five lane standard design and sent us a letter and in effect said, here's what we are going to do, it is Okay, if you've got some issues and items, let us know. So I think that the ball is in our court and my recommendation would be that we respond to the county if we know what we want, identify it, or if we think there's a need for a meeting with the parties and sit down and hash it out, suggest they come to a meeting.

Mayor Thalhofer: What would be the cost over-run on something like this, additional cost to do it this way, trees and median?

Mr. Galloway: I haven't run the cost so I can't give you a very good answer. My best guess would be if it's being done in lieu of a center turn lane, probably somewhat of a wash. You are putting in probably some curbing and some landscaping materials and vegetation that you wouldn't normally, but you are deleting the requirement of paving one lane of highway so that's a savings. My guess cost wise, it would be a relative minor impact plus or minus.

Mayor Thalhofer: What is the consensus of the council? I am in favor of doing this with the median with the trees. Who else is in favor. Everyone in favor...

Councilor Lloyd: I think we have always been in favor.

Councilor Burger-Kimber: The only thing is, I don't know that there is consensus on, I agree with the median, but I don't think I agree with Councilor Ripma with regard to the two or three lane. I still want to see two lanes on either side of the median.

Councilor Ripma: I know that Bruce feels that way, and I'm probably fighting a losing battle on that. I will tell you what, I think I can drop that and have Jim respond with a letter that maybe says a few words like he

did in the letter in '93 about the uniqueness of the site, but then say what we would like to see, is a center median with trees and separated pedestrian path on the college side if possible. You know whatever words convey my beautiful drawing.

Mayor Thalhofer: I thought you were proposing that there be two lanes in each direction.

Councilor Ripma: Well in my heart I would rather see a three lane highway from the college west, and five lanes up to the college. But you know, having polled my fellow councilors at least some time over the last two years except maybe Pat, I am the only one, so I'll drop that.

Pam Christian: I just want to raise an issue and that issue is just exactly what you pointed out about the one piece of vacant land that is actually between the old cemetery, the old pioneer cemetery and Beaver Creek. There is a potential of conflict because that property isn't developed yet and so I mean, I'm not trying to change anybody's mind, I am just trying to put up a flag and say there may be some conflict in terms of how that becomes developed, and entrance and exits onto Stark.

Councilor Kight: I thought there were berry fields there?

Pam Christian: On top of the hill there is an old pioneer cemetery, very historic.

Councilor Ripma: That' why the widening can only take place on the college side.

Councilor Kight; How do they get there now?

Mr. Galloway: There's a little roadway that goes kind of between the Texaco station and roadway there is a driveway that goes back in there.

Pam Christian: It is retained as easement.

Councilor Smith: If you walk, you'll find it, if you drive you won't. It's kind of hidden in there.

Councilor Ripma: It's a pretty little drive actually back in there.

Pam Christian: The county is responsible for maintaining it.

Councilor Ripma: The cemetery is beautiful.

Pam Christian: But my point is, there is a piece of land between the cemetery and Beaver Creek that is yet to be developed so you all may face a problem when that develops.

Mayor Thalhofer: I think there is a consensus to have a proposal such as Councilor Ripma made, and that it will be two lanes each direction on either side of the median.

Mr. Galloway: Let me repeat what I've heard and if I am wrong someone correct me. Now we would like the county to make those improvements, two traffic lanes in each direction between 257th and Troutdale Road, a center median that has landscaping with trees. You want turn lanes, you didn't discuss this but I presume you want turn lanes at 257th and Troutdale Road, as well as the college. I think there are some signal upgrades that go along with it which I think we want to have happen as the left turn lane goes in there. Bike paths and sidewalks along Stark- I guess here is really a question I want to make sure I understand- You talked about a separate bike path or separate pedestrian road?

Councilor Ripma: I called it a separate pedestrian path. I am advocating that on the college side (on the south

side) it be separated from the roadway because there's land there. It's a nice walk and it's tree lined. One of my main objections to the standard arterial five lane county design is that all up and down Stark Street is 50 per mile traffic. There's a little curb and a little sidewalk right next to it. In this site, I would like our request to include a separated pedestrian path. I tried calling it a bike path once to the county and they said " Oh bike path raises all kinds of"... so just call it a pedestrian path.

Mr. Galloway: To make sure I understand. Are you looking for a sidewalk kind of facility?

Councilor Ripma: Yes, but a concrete sidewalk, not bark dust, not a jogging trail or something.

Councilor Kight: They have done our work for us. If you'll look at this drawing that they have besides the median strip they have the 10 foot extended sidewalk with the trees in there.

Councilor Ripma: I tell you what, can we photocopy that and send it along to them as a concept, you know...

Mr. Galloway: My second question is, is there a consensus in the rank on my recommendation for the under grounding, in other words, wait until we hear what Gresham wants to do and if Gresham doesn't want to, then maybe we need to take a second look at how we want...

Mayor Thalhofer: Anything more on this subject?

Councilor Ripma: I move we adjourn.

Councilor Kight: Second

Meeting Adjourned.

Unapproved Minutes
Prepared by Temporary Employee - December 2000