

ARCH CAPE DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT MINUTES

20 July 2018

A quorum was present.

Water Board: Ron Schiffman, Vice-President
 Debra Birkby, Treasurer
 Linda Murray

Excused Absent: Virginia Birkby, President
 Dan Seifer

Sanitary Board: Darr Tindall (non-voting)

Public: Richard Gibson, President – Cannon View Park
 Ben Dair, Sustainable Northwest
 David and Jeannie Stockton

Staff: Phil Chick, District Manager
 Steve Hill, Secretary

Mr. Ron Schiffman opened the meeting at 6:00pm.

Public Comments: None.

Agenda: Hear from Richard Gibson first. Ms. Debra Birkby moved acceptance of the agenda as modified which was seconded by Ms. Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

Election of Officers: Ms. Debra Birkby nominated Mr. Ron Schiffman as President which was seconded by Ms. Linda Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Ron Schiffman nominated Ms. Debra Birkby as Vice-President and Treasurer which was seconded by Ms. Linda Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

Ms. Debra Birkby nominated Mr. Steve Hill as secretary which was seconded by Ms. Linda Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

Terms of office are for two consecutive fiscal year terms as provided for by the board in July of 2017 and therefore run until July of 2020.

Consent Agenda: Ms. Debra Birkby moved adoption of the consent agenda which was seconded by Ms. Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

Old Business:

Cannon View Park (CVP) – Arch Cape Water District System Connection: Mr. Richard Gibson addressed the board with a request that the board be open to CVP pursuing cost estimates to establish a fixed connection between Cannon View Park and the water district. He said CVP was interested in potentially having a fixed connection to Arch Cape’s water district. He pointed out that in the past such a connection in emergency conditions would have taken place using a fire hose which presented possible contamination issues.

Mr. Chick said that CMI had prepared an estimate some years ago, which was approximately 10K. However, in recent conversations with CMI, it was determined that a slight change to the plans with the addition of a pressure reducing valve in the vault at the intertie would be suitable for this type of connection, taking into account the two water system’s pressure differences.

Consensus was reached for CVP to move forward with acquiring a new engineering/cost plan for future review.

Watershed Update:

Forest Legacy Grant Status: (Information) It was reported that we did not receive funding for our application for the Forest Legacy Grant last year but were told it was difficult to make it on the first attempt. Our plan going forward is to emphasize the special ‘coastal edge’ story with our rare and endemic species and unique environment needing protection. Mr. Chick suggested that contact be made with a Mr. Alan Front) for development and or review of our next application up for consideration on August 8th in Salem.

EFM Non-Disclosure Agreement: (Information) This is still being worked on.

Silvia Terra Timber Cruise Contract: (Information) The timber cruise is still being worked on by Silva Terra and will be brought to us the following week.

Outreach Coordinator Position RFP: (Information) Mr. Dair said that we had three (3) responses so far for this position and the phone interviews will begin next week.

Drinking Water Source Protection Grant: (Information) We have had no contact yet on this grant request. We should know by our next meeting but due to timing this project will be going to 2019.

Water District Master Plan Insert: (Information) Curran-McLeod (CMI) was reported to have developed a memo insert for the Master Plan. If we were to do a full scale Master Plan it was estimated to cost from between \$30K to \$70K but Mr. McLeod indicated this would not be necessary where an update by CMI would cost approximately \$10 – 15K. Mr. Chick recommended that a full scale update not be undertaken and that CMI’s memo would suffice as an insert to the Master Plan – with reference to the District’s Water Management and Conservation Plan, Long Range Financial Plan, and current SDC.

Fire Suppression Line : 31955 W Ocean Lane: (Information) Mr. Chick reported that he had spoken to counsel regarding fire line responsibility. The customer is not responsible beyond their property line at the meter. Mr. Chick has asked for two 2" inch metered lines and recommends no SDC or ongoing charge to the customer. He added that it was in the districts interest to monitor water use at all served properties and the district should have a fire suppression ordinance or resolution on file.

Risk Management Assessment: (Information) SDIS has made recommendations to the district for treating roof moss at the waste water treatment plant and water treatment plant and for submission of a loss control program to address issues such as potential hazards, safety training and accident investigations.

Asbury Creek Water Right Certification: (Action) The creek can provide .3 cfs (cubic feet per second) of which we have a right to .2 cfs and have an interest in certifying that right. CMI can provide a water right certification for Asbury Creek for \$3K to \$3.5K.

Ms. Debra Birkby moved to have CMI certify our water right on Asbury Creek which was seconded by Ms. Murray. All in favor. Motion carried.

New Business: None.

Reports:

Accounts Receivable: Water district receivables were reported to be in good condition.

District Managers Report: (attached) Mr. Chick said that the flow meter had been verified, and there was continuing work on brush cutting and meter maintenance.

Treasurer's Report: Columbia Bank checking account at \$116,321 and the LGIP account with the Oregon State Treasurer at \$51,422. All accounts were reported to be balanced.

Board of Directors' Comments and Reports: None.

August Agenda Items: (Information) CVP, non-disclosure agreement, timber cruise, outreach coordinator position, road repair, fire suppression ordinance and Asbury Creek water right.

Public Comment: Mr. Stockton referenced 30% of water being unaccounted for in Seaside and wondered what it was for our district. Mr. Chick responded by reporting a 13 – 18% loss. He also asked if Cannon View Park has a long term plan followed by thanking the board for its work.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Ron Schiffman at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Hill

Attest



Mr. Ron Schiffman, President

MEMORANDUM


**CURRAN-McLEOD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS**

6655 S.W. HAMPTON STREET, SUITE 210
PORTLAND, OREGON 97223

DATE: July 11, 2018

TO: Mr. Phil Chick, Manager
Arch Cape Water District
Arch Cape Sanitary District

FROM: Curt McLeod, PE
CURRAN-McLEOD, INC



RE: WATER & WASTEWATER MASTER PLANNING

We have discussed updating the water and wastewater master plans several times over the past year, so I wanted to provide you an overview of what would benefit by an update.

The State requirements are that you have current plans, although, that requirement is generally for facility planning in anticipation of a construction project. One of the primary purposes of master planning is to define alternatives and recommend sustainable infrastructure choices to operate efficiently over the life of the improvements. Although the regulations say plans need to be current, neither OHA nor DEQ mandate the preparation of updates in the absence of planned facility improvements.

Once a master plan has been completed, as yours were in 2005 and 2006, the regulatory agencies generally just require an 'engineering planning document' be prepared before undertaking any construction projects that would require regulatory approval. A large part of a master plan is identification and evaluation of alternatives for the most cost effective and efficient operations before undertaking major improvements. The ACWD and ACSD both have made commitments on the technology employed at the water and wastewater facilities. As a result, the identification and evaluation of alternatives would not be a component of a master plan update for your Districts.

Prior to any construction, the District would need a planning document. An engineering planning document can be a master plan, facility plan, or just a feasibility or pre-design report. These documents would provide more specific detail about the proposed construction project, and with less general information about the District in whole.

Of course, the other benefit of a current master plan is to have good current numbers on growth, demands and capacities in order to plan for the future. You are very familiar with this information, so the plan would not provide any revelations, but would provide good documentation.

WATER SYSTEM PLANNING:

The Water System Master Plan was prepared in 2005, prior to construction of the more recent membrane water treatment facility and distribution system improvements. The District also prepared the Water Management & Conservation Plan in 2015, which provides a solid foundation for future growth.

An update to the 2005 Water System Master Plan would generally reuse section **I. Introduction**, with modifications to include the improvements completed since 2005. The service area has not changed and the service area characteristics would be the same.

II. Planning Criteria would be modified to acknowledge the reduced buildout numbers permitted by Clatsop County. The criteria might also take a more detailed look at incorporating Cannon View Park in a long-term plan. Growth projections and demands were based on buildout of 700 connections in the Master Plan, so if anything, the demand projections would be reduced just to look ahead 20 years. This information is also contained in the Water Management & Conservation Plan you prepared recently.

III. Regulatory Requirements would remain relatively unchanged in a plan update.

IV. Facilities Evaluation would be updated to include the revised demand projections and an evaluation of all current water system components with the revised demands.

V. Water System Improvements. This is an evaluation of alternative improvements for each component of the system. The 2005 Plan included an analysis of alternative treatment processes and recommended improvements. That effort for treatment alternatives would not be included in any updated documents. Redundant source development would remain important, as it was in the 2005 Plan.

VI. Capital Improvements is simply a summary of recommended improvements generated by the alternative evaluations. Source development remains as it was identified in 2005, with a need for redundancy. Treatment, storage, and distribution capital improvements are essentially complete. Long range storage in the south end remains in the discussion, but is still likely outside of the 20 year planning window.

VII. Project Funding will be determined by the magnitude of needed Capital Improvements. The discussion of available funding sources remains relatively unchanged from the 2005 Plan. User rates could be re-evaluated to assure the District is operating in the black, with an updated Capital Improvement Plan.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendation would include any deficiencies identified in the update. We would anticipate this would be a relatively small Capital Improvement Plan and should correlate with the SDC capital improvements. The existing Water System Master Plan did not have an executive summary, which would be added new.

WASTEWATER SYSTEM PLANNING

The Wastewater Facilities Plan was prepared in 2006 and similarly to the water system, the major of the improvements identified in the plan have been completed with construction of the membrane treatment plant, Sally's Alley Pump Station and I/I repairs on much of the collection system.

I. Executive Summary would be updated depending upon the results of the plan update.

An update would reuse most of the information in the **II. Introduction** and **III. Study Area Characteristics**, with minor updates to reflect any current revisions.

IV. Existing Facilities would have new summaries of the membrane treatment facility, and document the improvements to Sally's Alley and Webb Avenue Pump Stations along with generally the same information from 2006 for the remaining system components.

V. Wastewater Characteristics would be updated to use more current flow and loadings information to generate loading projections, including generating new data for ADWF, AWWF, Rainfall vs. Flow, Ammonia, BOD, TSS, DO and Bacteria.

VI. Basis of Planning. The projected loadings in the Facilities Plan were based on 750 connections at buildout. The pre-design report prepared in September 2006, immediately prior to the plant construction, reduced the projected buildout number to 485 connections. An update to the Facilities Plan would result in reducing the projected loading requirements. The treatment goals for BOD, TSS, Ammonia, DO, temperature, Chlorine residuals, Turbidity and in-stream dilution are still applicable from the 2006 Plan.

VII. Development and Evaluation of Alternatives is the most significant section of the 2006 Plan. This section would not be needed in any update since the District has implemented the membrane treatment technology. A smaller-scoped alternative analysis may be needed for any other capital improvement needs identified in an update.

VIII. Rate Study update could be beneficial for the District to better define the operating costs, current debt service and revenues. The summary of revenue sources would remain essentially unchanged from the 2006 Plan.

Mr. Phil Chick
July 11, 2018
Page 4

IX. Recommended Plan would reflect any new projects identified in the update evaluation. This listing should be compatible with the SDC capital improvements, or the SDC should be updated concurrently.

The last section of the 2006 Plan, **X. Environmental Effects**, could be unchanged from the 2006 Plan; however, this would be a good format to demonstrate the treatment effectiveness of the membrane system.

SUMMARY:

There is no mandate to update either the 2005 Water System Master Plan or the 2006 Wastewater Facilities Plan unless the District is anticipating a substantial capital improvement requiring funding agency assistance. Both plans were based on a larger buildout population than Clatsop County currently permits, so the projected loadings at buildout in each plan would be reduced.

The fact that both the ACWD and ACSD have minimal improvements needed makes updating the planning documents provide less of a benefit. There is a subjective benefit to having plans current, with all cost figures updated and the capital project lists current, but there is no agency that would be looking for that information in the foreseeable future.

Cost to update each document is relatively modest versus development of new plans. Each document is estimated to cost \$10,000 to \$15,000 to update and republish. This effort would require your input to evaluate the performance of each of your systems with our staff.

Manager Report July 20, 2018

WATER:

Water usage for May totaled 1,048,000 Gallons. We received 1.98” of rainfall.

The stream flow gage in Asbury Creek has been installed for the season. Despite the dry weather, we are still ahead of where we were in the 2015 drought, in terms of stream flow capacity. Things could drop off abruptly if the weather remains dry for an extended time. We will continue keeping a close eye on the flow.

Staff replaced the seals in the leaking Booster Pump at the Water Plant.

Brush cutting and meter maintenance continues. I have been in contact with two customers in regard to excessively high water consumptions and their charges.

We recently received plans for a small development planned for East Marshall Rd. They have been reviewed by CMI Engineering. I do not know a date yet when work will begin.

MONTHLY LOG : ARCH CAPE WATER & SANITARY DISTRICTS

June 2018

Total Hours	336.00	132.50	203.50
Percentage Split		39%	61%
Total Accounts	631	290	341
Percentage Split		46%	54%