CANBY CITY COUNCIL

SPECIAL MEETING

SEPTEMBER 22, 1980

Mayor Robert E. Rapp presiding. Councilmembers present: Beryl Brown, Beauford Knight, Richard Nichols, William Pulver, Robert Westcott and Robert Swayze.

Also present: Administrator Harold Wyman, City Planner Stephan Lashbrook, Public Works Director Ken Ferguson, Utility Board Manager Fred Egger, Utility Board Members Howard Giger, Richard Garvey and Dennis Nolder, Montgomery Engineers representatives Bob Ramesey and Dennis Eckhardt, Pay Maynard, David Bury and Lee Funrue.

Mayor Rapp called the Special Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., followed by the flag salute and roll call of Council.

BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE COUNCIL: Administrator Wyman read a letter from Mr. Robert Christiansen, Principal of Canby Union High School, requesting permission to borrow five bleachers from Maple Street Park for use during the football season, and they will accept full responsibility. Mayor Rapp explained this letter was read so the Council would be aware that we had loaned the bleachers.

Mayor Rapp called for a recess to go into a workshop with the Canby Utility Board and several matters. The Special Meeting was reconvened at 10:20 p.m. and immediately adjourned.

Robt E. Rapp
Robert E. Rapp, Mayor

Harold A. Wyman
Harold A. Wyman, Administrator/Recorder

HIGHLIGHTS OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM MEETING WITH CUB AND CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1980, MONDAY.

BOB RAMSEY - Gave a short synopsis of the scope of the study that James Montgomery Engineers did, including results and recommendations. The focus was for either ONSHORE or OFFSHORE Galleries.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. No additional expenditures be made on the existing gallery system.

2. Existing gallery used as an interim gallery water supply source until a new gallery can be constructed.

3. A new gallery be constructed along the Molalla River.
   ALTERNATIVE "A" - OFFSHORE - under the river.
   ALTERNATIVE "B" - ONSHORE - paralell to the river.

OFFSHORE - ALTERNATIVE "A"

Knight - How deep under the river?

ANSWER - Roughly 8 to 10 feet.

WYMAN - Could you call that a form of " Raney-well" system and when the water is at its lowest ebb would it be drawing a lot of minerals out into the system? Have you checked the river for minerals?

ANSWER - We have collected water samples during the lowest period of flow, and the water quality is of very good chemical quality. It ranges 65 parts per million of total disolved soluables which is a very high quality.

WYMAN - Most "Raney-wells" create that kind of problem and I'm sure that this is similar to it.

ANSWER - The "Raney -well" collector is similar in concept, it has a series of infiltration pipes underground and the water flows in and is pumped out. This is much closer to the surface than a Rainey-well which is quite far down. The Raney -well doesn't allow you to devise this filtration system. This method (offshore) has a system of back-flusing, at least once a year, to lift all of the suspended material out.

BURY - Will it cover the width of the river?

ANSWER - About half of the width of the river, and not very long in length.

WYMAN - When the Molalla is much shallower and you must go deeper to suck out the water, plus the minerals, that would create a problem--still thinking of the minerals.

ANSWER - This system is designed so it is not drawing ground water per se. That is why you must go out into the river, also to get your 6 million gallons a day. The study of the past 60 years shows that on the lowest flow per day shown, 24 cubic feet per second which is roughly 11,000 gallons a minute. The average flow in the summer months, according to the study, was 60 cubic feet per second, which is 27,000 gallons per minute of flow.

SWAYZE - Does this work within our water rights?

ANSWER - (Egger) We have 5½ million that we actually have the rights on and another 5 million that we have a permit on, which in October we will extend the permit as they have to actually show they are using it before the rights are granted. A total of 10½ million. And a few odd gallons of rights from the McMaugh property.

SWAYZE - On the lowest months we'll be using 40% of the water going by the bridge.

ANSWER - If you get into a dry period, everyone will have to conserve water, although you will have the rights and facilities to take that much out. If you were in a 2 or 3 year drought period and the water went below the average, there is a water resource requirement that 60 cubic feet per second be flowing across the upper recording station. If a cut-back becomes necessary, you will be limited on your rights depending upon when you received the rights, and who was ahead of you.

SWAYZE - How new are our rights?

ANSWER - Our rights have not been substantiated yet. The ½ million goes back 20 to 37 years, and the other 5 million to 1973. For a definite answer, you'd have to check the back records for dates of water rights of many others, including farmers that go back several years. It is a situation that could develop that the city would have to cut back on its supply.

WESTCOTT - Questioned if 16 cubic feet was necessary for the fish and game.

ANSWER - This was very controversial as to what really needed to come across for fish and wildlife consideration.

SWAYZE - Who do we go to to get permission to dig the river up?

ANSWER - The permit process is through the Division of State Lands, and there is still some question whether a permit will be required by the Corp of Engineers. Because it is a municipal matter and a small stream, his information was that a permit from the Corp of Engineers was not needed. The only need for a permit is when more than 50 cubic feet of excavation is done. The Fish and Wildlife's concern is that construction be from July 15 to September 15, when there is a period of very little spawning and that period is when the river is at a low river flow.

RAPP - Is the Molalla River still considered by the Corp of Engineers as a navigable stream to the bridge? (Rapp noted that you would have to get permits from the Corp.)

ANSWER - He talked to two fellows from the Crop and they said this particular project did not require permits.

RAPP - Start digging and see what they say!

ONSHORE SYSTEM - ALTERNATIVE "B"

(A question was probably asked, the tape was blank for a short time.)

ANSWER - The two systems induce infiltration of the river water, they rely directly on the river. If the river course were to change then the yield would decrease. These systems are designed specifically to take inflow from the river, therefore the Utiliby Board would have to consider that the river course must be maintained

as it is. Unless we have some major flooding, he didn't anticipate the course of the river changing very much.

BURY - Are both "A" and "B" alternatives for 6 million gallons?

ANSWER - We analyzed it has 9, or 6, 8 and 10 million gallons a day for both of these alternatives.

COST ESTIMATE - ALTERNATIVE "A"

For the 6 MGD (million gallons per day) + or - (rounded off) = $647,000

COST ESTIMATE - ALTERNATIVE "B"

Is about $140,000 higher, at $775,000.

QUESTION - Why?

ANSWER - The cost difference---the pumping transmission facilities are the same on both, $417,000. The added cost for "B" is for excavation, because its very difficult to excavate the 20 foot trench.

ALTERNATIVE "A" for 8 MGD, $845,000. Alternative "B" for 8 MGD, 1.2 million

ALTERNATIVE "A" for 10 MGD, $943,000 and ALTERNATIVE "B" for 10 MGD, 1.6 million.

KNIGHT - What is the difference between 6 and 10 MGD, pipes or more of them?

ANSWER - Additional area of excavation and additional materials on some, makes the difference of the costs.

PROS AND CONS FOR ALTERNATIVE "A"

ADVANTAGES - lower cost, high yield

DISADVANTAGES - annual maintenance of river course; back-flusing; and it has possible flood damage and during high turbidity in river, can't really evaluate this.

QUESTION - What is turbidity?

ANSWER - Turbidity is the cloudiness or coloration of the water.

PROS AND CONS FOR ALTERNATIVE "B"

ADVANTAGES - lower maintenance, low turbidity.

DISADVANTAGES - higher costs, very difficult construction and possible flood damage.

PULVER - Questioned the maintenance.

ANSWER - In the Offshore, every year you'd remove the silt, "beef-up" the shores and backflush the filter.

PULVER - For the Onshore system would we have to be sure of the river course?

ANSWER - You'd have the annual maintenance on both.

SWAYZE - This is all based on the Molalla River, wouldn't it be about four times as cheap to put 2 or 3 more pumps down there?

ANSWER - You've got high treatment cost and maintenance cost on pumping systems.

ANSWER - There is still the existing facility of taking directly from the river, farther down toward the bridge and what would the cost be to basically put a new system on what we have for a 4 MGD facility--$475,000.

WESTCOTT - If they went to 4 MGD would that escalate as rapidly if they went from 4 MGD to 10 MGD, i.e., if we keep what we have now would the cost escalate as rapidly if we change to a 10 MGD system?

ANSWER - If you consider just the pump station I'm not sure it would. But we're committed to a treatment plant expansion to give you more--to 6--which is 50% faster. To get to 10, there is no way you could get by with the existing plant.

WESTCOTT - We talked about a 20 year source, and the treatment plant would be expanded mid-term, but the source would be a 20 year source. Using the the half million dollors for.....

ANSWER - The half million would give you about--starting at 6 up to 10---- (unable to hear on tape part of the answer.) We can't really say for certain until its built and what the performance is....this by definition in not a certain source.

WESTCOTT - With 4 MGD under the current plan, if you use a surface source over an infiltration source, would it raise your annual cost $50,000 for treatment?

ANSWER - I'd like to think of that in cost for millions of gallons treated.

MAYNARD - He noted that in a surface source, rather than a ground source, a man would be needed 24 hours a day at the plant.

WYMAN - The man will be there anyway, when you get that many gallons per day he'd be required to be there.

MAYNARD - We shouldn't have to do it that way, we should be able to do it the way we are with------

WESTCOTT - This plant in 73, they said that we wouldnt need any men either------ and that's not the way it worked out.

MAYNARD - I'm just talking about the night time.

WESTCOTT - We didn't need an operator----it was so automatic we just needed to check it every day to see if it was still running-----

PULVER - "A" & "B" are designed to pump 6 MGD, and our plant is designed to process 4 million, what you're saying with the type of the project that you have here, that the 4 million gallon plant will handle that because it doesn't need processing so thoroughly.

ANSWER - That plant is designed for 4 million and it has a capacity to exceed that by a certain factor---I'd like to let Dennis answer that...

ANSWER - The filtration capacity, after expansion, is based on average turbidity and average operation, etc., but there is very few exceptions with our clients that couldn't go 50% above that. If you go beyond 6, however, you're talking more treatment.

PULVER - If you go beyond 6, there isn't any question that we'll have to get a larger treatment facility?

ANSWER - There are some cost offsets for continuing expansion vs. keeping that the way it is and starting over.

(Several voices inaudible)

KNIGHT - With either "A" or "B" will the springs be maintained?

ANSWER - The springs will be maintained, but we recommend that you use the existing gallery and springs only as a back-up, they wouldn't be used with this new system because those together only provide 700 gallons per minute or 1 MGD and the cost to construct 6 MGD or 8 MGD is not that much different----we recommend that you leave that as a back-up or emergency source because you'll have to construct a new facility to get 6 MGD and the cost differential between constructing for 5 MGD and counting 1 MGD out of the existing plant or constructing a new plant that will give 6 MGD--there is very little--and in terms of maintenance you would then have to maintain two separate systems, which would cost more and give more "headaches", plus the fact that the existing gallery is getting old, we don't know how much longer the life of that existing gallery is. We feel its more cost effective if you go to a new facility.

QUESTION - Do you have any figures on the estimated gallons you use each year by the year 2000.

ANSWER - The reason 6 MGD was used as a starting point was that the year 2000 flow rate was based on the population projections we had at the time and the assumption that only the real light, dry type industries that we have now would still be here---and then following that assumption, after we were already working, the Comp Plan discussed the plan of adding industrial capabilities which we now don't have, which will add to the need (end of tape some not recorded)

LASHBROOK - He explained how he arrived at his assumed figures of 8 million gallons per day for future use, this also takes into consideration for industrial use. He also discussed "wet campass" industry with up to 10,000 gallons per day per acre for use.

WESTCOTT - I'm wondering about the million dollar figure with Willamette River water----He was concerned about our water rights.

KNIGHT - Along the same line, have the engineers considered any ponds? Perhaps in the area from Goods Bridge to the City Park. This would be water storage.

ANSWER - Using the Willamette and treating at the present location was better than twice as espensive as the proposed project.

WESTCOTT - So you're saying where we budgeted a million, may have escalated in two years to two million?

ANSWER - No, it wouldn't have gone up to two million on the one item.....

WESTCOTT - We spent about $50,000 down below trying to find out what sources were available, we said back then what if we determine we can't get anymore there and we have to go to the Willamette, what will it cost us? Mongomery came back with a million dollar figure. The CUB originally requested 2 million dollar bond and we added one more million to that as a million for a budget figure for the worse case, and the worse case would be going to the Willamette, something to back-up what we already have for sources.

ANSWER - The million, that once upon a time was to be reserved for the Willamette, based upon what I understand, is the same as this (evidently pointed to a chart)

KNIGHT - That million was for an additional source, not particularly the Willamette.

WESTCOTT - It was for the worse case, and we could go to the Willamette.

ANSWER - If we have the right we could get up into the 10 MGD for industrial use-age. And if we went to the Willamette, I'm not suggesting it, but we're looking at it merely as an extreme, 1.4 million dollars.

ANSWER - Dennis suggested alternatives for heavy water use for industries, such as they might have a direct pipe from the river if they are located nearby.

ANSWER - If we rebuild the exisiting pump station that is there now, for approximately $475,000, if we use the Offshore system, "A", to get your 10 MGD you're looking at roughly $950,000.

NICHOLS - What do you do for reserve, for example if you shut down for repairs?

ANSWER - They system would be designed with a series of valves, that you could close off and pump from one-half of the system. It's designed with enough safety factors that for a short period of time you could pump the full amount from half of the system, it is however, not recommended for a very long period.

GIGER- What's the tank capacity for storage?

ANSWER - Part of the capacity you build into your reservoir is for the emergency shut down, no specific capacity has been designated.

WESTCOTT - Questioned about the water rights, as his concern.

EGGER - He explained that we ½ million gallons and we picked up 10 million, which only 5 is now in use and the other 5 we renew each year until we put it to use for the actual rights.

ANSWER - In talking with the Department of Water Resources, they felt that there was no problem in acquiring more rights on the Molalla, at that time I was not aware that you already had rights up to 10 MGD.---

ANSWER - That's cubic feet, which is a little over 6 MGD. Looking at an 8 MGD system then you'll have to apply for an additional 2 MGD, which is roughly 4 cubic feet per second. That will be a new right. According to the Deptartment of Water Resources there is no problem in getting that right on the river, however, in time of low water, we'd be the first to be cut off with the additional grant. They'd not cut off the entire supply, but perhaps restrict it along with everyone else.

WESTCOTT - The ½ million gallons per day, is it cubic feet per second?

EGGER - Yes, and that ½ cubic feet is on the springs not the river.

It was noted that due to the Fish and Wildlife Commission, a decision should be made soon so construction can begin.