

Clean Water Services

Clean Water Advisory Commission

Meeting Notes

March 14, 2018

Attendance

The Commission meeting was attended by Chair Tony Weller (Builder-Developer), Vice Chair Mike McKillip (District 3/Rogers), and members Molly Brown (District 2/Malinowski), Lori Hennings (Environmental), John Jackson (Agriculture), Art Larrance (At-Large/Duyck), Judy Olsen (Agriculture), David Waffle (Cities/non-voting), and Bill Gaffi (Clean Water Services District General Manager/non-voting).

Commission members Stu Peterson (Builder-Developer), Erin Poor (District 1/Schouten), Matt Wellner (Builder-Developer), Kevin Wolfe (Business), and Richard Vial (District 4/Terry), did not attend.

Present from Clean Water Services were Nora Curtis (Conveyance Systems Department Director), Karen DeBaker (Communications Supervisor), Shannon Huggins (Public Involvement Coordinator), Mark Jockers (Government and Public Affairs Manager), Jerry Linder (General Counsel), Anne MacDonald (Senior Water Resources Program Manager), Damon Reische (Systems Planning and Development Services Division Manager), Ryan Sandhu (Field Operations Division Manager), Diane Taniguchi-Dennis (District Deputy General Manager), Bryan Thistle (SWM Facility Supervisor), and James Vitko (Line Maintenance Supervisor).

1. Call to Order

Following an opportunity for Commission members to view leaf collection equipment and talk with field staff, Mr. Weller brought the meeting to order at 6:39 PM in the Tualatin Room at the Clean Water Services Administrative Building Complex in Hillsboro, OR.

2. Previous Meeting Notes

Mr. Weller noted a typographical error in the meeting notes from January 10, 2018. In Section 3, "Election of Chair and Vice Chair," the first sentence in the second paragraph should reflect that the motion to re-elect Mr. Weller and Mr. McKillip was made by Mr. Wellner, not Mr. Weller.

3. Design & Construction Standards Update Report

Mr. Reische and Ms. MacDonald reported on outreach efforts and on the data and tools being used to draft updates to the D&Cs (Design & Construction Standards) in response to new hydromodification-related requirements in the Clean Water Services NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit (*presentation attached*).

Mr. Reische said there appears to be high interest in the updates and there will be numerous meetings with a variety of stakeholder groups during the next couple of months. For example, a recent meeting hosted by the Tualatin River Watershed Council drew about 30 people, reflecting interest and insights from environmental, development, and natural resources perspectives as well as from city governments and DEQ (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality). Information to these and other stakeholder groups will be similar to what has already been presented to Commission members: explaining hydromodification and the related NPDES permit requirements, clarifying that the permit requires hydromodification-related updates to the D&Cs to focus on water quality rather than flooding, using North Bethany as an example of varied approaches, recognizing differences between greenfield and infill areas, and talking about what kind of data is needed and how best to use it.

Mr. Reische said that portions of the D&Cs updates will be released for review as they are drafted throughout the summer, with the complete draft available this fall for a formal public review and comment period.

Mr. Reische also shared that Clean Water Services wants to develop a strategy to address hydromodification that will not only meet NPDES permit requirements but also dovetail with other regulations, as well as fit into broader Clean Water Services and community goals. Other objectives include developing a suite of tools and options that are defensible from economic, legal, and regulatory perspectives that can be implemented on a regional scale, and that can be adapted and expanded as part of a phased implementation. Mr. Reische emphasized that while the NPDES permit requires a hydromodification strategy to be in place by April, 2019, Clean Water Services will continue to identify, develop, and improve practices to address hydromodification beyond that point.

Ms. MacDonald noted that the hydromodification strategy objectives reviewed by Mr. Reische all relate to the functionality of a stream. The NPDES permit requires hydromodification assessments, which will inform the requirements developed for the D&Cs. Ms. MacDonald described a pyramid of stream function levels, from landscape scale to biological. Different approaches to hydromodification can affect different levels of stream function. Several types of assessment maps are being developed, which will help to identify healthy streams which need to be protected as well as degraded streams which might present opportunities for enhancement. Assessments will include condition of streams, vegetated corridors, floodplains, and uplands as well as soils, drainage, and biological indicators such as invertebrate surveys. Location and scale of development, infrastructure, and other projects, including natural events such as beaver activity, will also be tracked and mapped to help identify enhancement opportunities. All of the various maps can be compared, overlaid and combined with other information to create a “development-requirements” map for an area and to indicate which approaches for which hydromodification would be most appropriate at a given site.

Ms. MacDonald mentioned several other calculation/modeling tools being used by other organizations and municipalities that might be cost-effectively adapted to meet Clean

Water Services' needs. The current stakeholder outreach process should help define the key issues and indicate which tools will be most useful.

Using the North Bethany area as an example, Ms. MacDonald discussed how the maps and other information would be applied if development there was just beginning. She added that D&C standards addressing hydromodification will reflect two geographic approaches—recognizing differences between greenfields and infill projects—and will be responsive to size—recognizing differences between, for example, a two-lot partition and a 250-lot subdivision, for example. She noted that the longer-term hope is to develop approaches for infill that are similar to those for greenfields. She also said the LIDA (low impact development approaches) concept will continue to be an important component of the D&Cs; more LIDA facilities are being designed to fit aesthetically into sites, and there are ongoing educational efforts and an awards program to further encourage improved performance and acceptance of LIDA facilities.

Questions and comments related to the Design & Construction Standards Update agenda item are listed in Appendix A.

4. Leaf Program Evaluation

Mr. Sandhu acknowledged Mr. Vitko and Mr. Thistle for their work on the leaf program as well as their year-round commitment to all aspects of Field Operations. Along with other staff members, they were available to provide details and answer questions about the program, procedures, and equipment just prior to this meeting.

Mr. Sandhu reviewed the history and current status of the leaf collection program and the challenges to continuing it as is. Detailed information was presented at two previous Commission meetings in anticipation of a charge from the Clean Water Services Board of Directors to assist in identifying alternatives, developing evaluation criteria, evaluating alternatives, and providing recommendation(s) to the Board (***handouts and presentation attached***). That charge has now been formally issued to the Commission.

The leaf collection program is for direct customers of Clean Water Services and is not necessarily the same as what is done by partner cities to meet the stormwater requirements of the NPDES permit. The program began in 1994 as a pro-active way to reduce service calls in certain unincorporated residential areas where there were many street trees but either no storm sewer or a storm sewer that routinely became clogged, resulting in flooding as stormwater backed up behind accumulated leaves. Leaf pick-up is now provided to about 10,000 tax lots, or about 14% of Clean Water Services District direct customers. The leaf collection program also now includes at least two leaf drop-off days, with customers encouraged to bring food bank donations along with their leaves. Last year, more than 700 pounds of food and \$100-\$200 in cash were donated. In addition, Clean Water Services provides educational materials to customers to encourage keeping storm sewer grates clear.

There is high interest in the leaf pick-up aspect of the program and every year there are a number of calls from homeowners who would like to be included. What began as a

maintenance practice seems to now be seen by many homeowners as more of a landscape service, with more and more backyard leaves, or even in a few cases leaves brought in by others who live in a different area, turning up to be collected with the street tree leaves.

The leaf collection program costs about \$350,000 and involves about 6,000 cubic yards of leaves. The pick-up portion accounts for about two-thirds of the cost, but also accounts for more than two-thirds of the leaves collected. All the leaves are hauled to West Union Gardens and then spread over farmland after some decomposition time. It could become difficult to dispose of the leaves if/when that arrangement ever ends. Mr. Sandhu noted that these are operational challenges, but policy challenges, such as the difference in approaches from Clean Water Services to a city to another city, may be the bigger issue for the leaf program.

Mr. Sandhu referred to the handout, which includes a draft list of criteria for evaluating possible alternatives to the current leaf collection program, as well as explanations for each of the criteria. He asked for feedback on the list of criteria and the definitions. Several Commission members noted that they live in leaf pick-up neighborhoods. Mr. Sandhu shared a proposed timeline for getting recommendations to the Board by late summer or early fall. Mr. Jockers added that even if changes are recommended, none would be made before Fall, 2019. Mr. Sandhu and Mr. Jockers will work on refining the evaluation criteria and scheduling future discussions.

Questions and comments about the Leaf Program agenda item are listed in Appendix B.

5. Announcements

Mr. Jockers clarified that the Clean Water Services Budget Committee, which includes several Commission members, will meet May 11.

Mr. Jockers noted that the Clean Water Services Board of Directors has reappointed Ms. Brown, Mr. Larrance, Ms. Poor, and Mr. Wellner as Commission members.

Mr. Jockers said that Commission members will soon get an email newsletter with information and updates about the Tualatin Basin Dam Safety and Water Supply Joint Project.

Mr. Gaffi expressed concern and good wishes for Bob Terry, Washington County Commissioner and member of the Clean Water Services Board of Directors, who is recovering at home after an auto accident this morning.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was declared adjourned by Mr. Weller at 8:28 PM.

(Meeting notes prepared by Sue Baumgartner)

Appendix A
Clean Water Services Advisory Commission Meeting Notes
March 14, 2018

Questions and comments regarding Design & Construction Standards Update:

1. Have you considered tree/canopy removal in the uplands assessments; does removal of trees from an area before it is annexed have an effect?
 - 1.1. This hasn't been considered at stream level but might be at site level.
 - 1.2. The maps are intended as a screening tool, to give a developer a basic sense of what might be required. We would also look to a developer, who might have more information or greater understanding of a site, to help us update the map.
2. What are the "jurisdictional issues" in creating a greenfield's "development readiness score?"
 - 2.1. For example, maybe City A can't move forward with their full concept until they get some infrastructure from City B, but City B has said they aren't yet ready. In other places, transportation infrastructure might not be in place.
 - 2.2. The "traffic light" diagram shown in the slide is for illustration/example only. It's not an actual tool, but it shows how such a tool could be used.
3. When a fee-in-lieu is paid, does it stay in that specific development?
 - 3.1. Sometimes, but other times it doesn't make sense based on the size of the development, incremental benefit, etc. if that same amount could contribute to a larger impact elsewhere.
 - 3.2. We can borrow ideas from a number of other municipalities here in Oregon and all around the country that are required to address hydromodification are using stream corridor enhancement as a stormwater management tool: Chesapeake Bay (MD, PA and VA), Georgia, Kansas, many places in California, and Pierce County (WA). San Diego's program probably closest to CWS program. Pierce County (WA) uses stream corridor enhancement to address a sediment TMDL.
4. Does this influence the valley's aquifer(s) (i.e., is there less water percolating down into groundwater because there is so much more impervious area)?
 - 4.1. Much development activity actually has more of a surface effect. However, if we could get more infiltration into groundwater it could help with low summer base flow.
 - 4.2. A stream with severe incision does mean that more groundwater will drain into it faster.
5. When expansion areas are zoned for higher density that is counter to protecting trees, which is why the corridors are more important. You cannot save all the trees and still have high density, especially with infill projects.
 - 5.1. Making one thing more difficult may make other aspects easier.

5.2. Infrastructure actually used to go around trees, but there are fewer, if any, trees in the developments of today.

Appendix B
Clean Water Services Advisory Commission Meeting Notes
March 14, 2018

Questions and comments regarding Leaf Program and Alternative Evaluation Criteria:

1. Besides the stormwater/flooding aspect, accumulated leaves in the street are also a safety issue as they become slippery to drive on and kids may play in the piles.
2. Should we add “safety” to the list of evaluation criteria and if so, how would we define it? (appeared to be general agreement to add; no discussion of definition)
3. Instead of adding criteria, we should be narrowing this down to fewer criteria. Some in the draft list seem redundant, which means we would be inadvertently weighting some aspects of the evaluation. (appeared to be general agreement with the idea of fewer criteria)
4. The “cost to run,” “impact on O&M,” and “long term sustainability” criteria could all be lumped together.
5. “Capital” should be included in the “cost” category—how much of existing investment can be recouped, or how much new investment would be required for the various alternatives? Clean Water Services has some money invested in equipment that isn’t very old—you want to get a return on that capital. If you cut the program you might be able to sell the equipment at maybe 10% but that isn’t a very good return on investment.
6. Leave the “water quality” criterion in and make it part of an “environment” category, which might also include fuel consumption, etc.
7. There is also a goodwill aspect to a leaf collection program.
8. The “comparison to other jurisdictions” is not an actual criterion as much as it should be informational when looking at alternatives.
 - 8.1. That could be part of equity—what does City A do compared to what City B does compared to what Clean Water Services does.
9. Compared to all the stormwater money being collected, the \$350,000 is relatively small but the area being served is also relatively small—how does that fit into equity?
 - 9.1. Another part of that is whether it is meeting a District need effectively; if so, it may well be worth doing.
10. We haven’t done a lot of analysis from the “social equity” perspective, but with census data and GIS, we could. (appeared to be general agreement with this idea)
 - 10.1. You could also use that data to look at who you ARE serving, and to think

about the drop-off program as well.

11. What is the value of “long term sustainability” as a criterion?
 - 11.1. If it’s a one-off deal it won’t make your list of alternatives anyway.
 - 11.2. It seems like that could go into the “cost” category.
12. How would you evaluate where are the trees; how would you evaluate an alternative based on need?
 - 12.1. Part of the evaluation process would be finding out what data the Commission needs in order to see how an alternative meets the criteria.
13. It sounds like we want to center our criteria around cost, maybe ease of implementation—possibly including consideration of public acceptance and acknowledging that some alternatives might take longer to put into place—and effectiveness.
14. Do we really want to use a numeric rating system for evaluating leaf program alternatives? That’s a lot of assumptions to try to apply numbers to.
15. What is Clean Water Services really trying to accomplish with the leaf pickup part of the program—yes, it reduces flooding, but does it actually help water quality? Would it be cheaper to just go clear catch basins in the middle of the night?
 - 15.1. Water quality is not a direct driver.
 - 15.2. There are a couple of papers out that discuss the water quality benefit of picking up leaves.
 - 15.3. A leaf program is in the Performance Standards which is a part of the (NPDES) permit by reference—that’s one reason to do it.
16. What does it cost to clean basins/grates in the areas where you are picking up leaves—can you measure that against calls received?
 - 16.1. It’s not a high cost if/when we are already out in the area.
 - 16.2. Maybe 20% of the 600-700 calls we get annually are leaf-oriented. Our break-even would probably be about 1,300 calls.
17. How is the program cost covered?
 - 17.1. The cost of the leaf collection program comes from the “local program” portion of the rates. In the cities, it’s the amount charged and kept by the city to cover what they do. In unincorporated areas, Clean Water Services is the “local” entity.
18. If the \$350,000 went away, how would that change the equivalent service unit?
 - 18.1. If you spread the cost to the entire rate base it is about 42 cents; if it is just to those receiving the service it is about \$1.42.
19. We should try to get funding from other buckets.
 - 19.1. Maybe there is public safety funding bucket that could share in the cost of

a leaf program.

20. Does this have to be “all or nothing?” Is it possible to have different types/levels of service based on the needs of different areas?
21. Could neighborhoods pay extra and opt in to a leaf pick-up program?
 - 21.1. We would not want to use a voluntary house-by-house model, as was tried in Portland.
 - 21.2. Homeowners associations would be easy contact points.
 - 21.3. Some older neighborhoods would not have homeowners associations.
 - 21.4. Some homeowners associations might prefer to run their own landscape service and would not need/want Clean Water Services to provide leaf pick-up.
22. Do you know where the leaves come from on drop-off days?
 - 22.1. Not exactly; we don’t check ID but we see some of the same people every year.
 - 22.2. We collect ZIP code information on feedback cards, but not specific addresses.
23. As jurisdictions around us have changed their programs, we have seen a change in our leaf drop-off days. For instance, Beaverton has increased the number of drop-off days. We want to be sure to review those influences.
24. What does everyone else do with flower bed trimmings, lawn clippings, etc. and would that work for leaves?
 - 24.1. Trimmings and clippings go into the yard debris cart; can save leaves in bags and transfer them to yard debris cart over time, but that takes weeks.

CLEAN WATER SERVICES LEAF PROGRAM

March 14, 2018
 Nora Corde and Ryan Sandhu / Conveyance Department
 Bryan Tibbels and James Vitko / Field Operations Division

LEAF PROGRAM

- Current Program
- Challenges
- Next Steps

LEAF PROGRAM – CURRENT PROGRAM

- Preventive Maintenance Focus
 - Drop off
 - Curbside
 - Customer Education (#rakethegrate)

Clean Water Services - Field Operations

Approximately 10,100 tax lots receive curbside leaf pick up service which is 14% of the District's directly maintained customer accounts.

LEAF PROGRAM – CHALLENGES

- Cost
 - Equipment and Labor
- Forecasting Mother Nature
 - Heavy rains and leaf fall
- What to do with all those leaves?

LEAF PROGRAM – CHALLENGES

- Differential Service
 - Differences between Cities' and CWS' Programs
 - Curbside not offered everywhere
- Property Owner Expectations
- Implementation of Changes

DISCUSSION

- Minor program changes won't address primary issues

- Comprehensive program review to be done by CWAC with recommendations to the Board



CHARGE TO CWAC

- The Board charges CWAC with reviewing, discussing, and providing a recommendation to the Board of Directors and staff on issues related to the Leaf Program including:
 - Review of current program;
 - Development of criteria to evaluate program alternatives;
 - Development of program alternatives and review against criteria; and
 - Providing recommendations to Board.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

- March CWAC Meeting
 - Review charge and discuss rating criteria
- April CWAC Meeting
 - Discuss program alternatives
- May CWAC Meeting
 - Score alternatives and discuss results
- June CWAC Meeting
 - Discuss recommendations to Board
- Late Summer/Early Fall Board Work Session
 - Staff take recommendations to the Board

RATING CRITERIA DISCUSSION

NEXT STEPS...

Leaf Program Evaluation - Rating Criteria

CWAC 3-14-2018

Alternatives	Rating Criteria									
	Cost to Run Program	Social Equity	Implementation/Phase in Concerns	Agency Risk	Service Impact/Flooding	Impact to O&M	Water Quality	Long Term Sustainability	Public Acceptance	Compliarison to Other Jurisdictions
Weight	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
1. TBD										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										

Notes:
 1 = Minimal impact 3 = Med. Impact 5 = Large Impact

CWAC 5-9-2018 Proposed Leaf Program Alternatives

INTRODUCTION

The six alternatives listed below are presented to generate comments and discussion. Many of the alternatives can be combined with other alternatives or have one or more options that could be included. For the May CWAC meeting, staff respectfully requests input on the following:

1. Are there other alternatives or options that should be included in the evaluation?
2. What information or data would be helpful to determine whether an alternative is worth considering or is needed to evaluate it against the criteria previously discussed?
3. Should any of the alternatives be removed from consideration?

Staff would like to discuss the alternatives listed below with you at the May CWAC meeting. The intention is to focus on description of the alternative and the information Staff needs to gather and present at a future meeting to fully evaluate the alternatives.

SIX ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 - Status Quo with options

Alternative 2 - Serve the entire CWS-maintained service area with expanded leaf drop days and locations

Alternative 3 - Serve the entire CWS-maintained service area with curbside pick-up

Alternative 4 - Work with County Solid Waste to turn leaf collection over to franchise garbage haulers

Alternative 5 - Work with a non-profit to serve a larger area (e.g. partner with Boy Scouts to help collect leaves)

Alternative 6 - Discontinue Field Components of the Leaf Program

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION

Alternative 1 - Status Quo with options

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to include keeping the existing program generally “as is”. The existing program is fairly well known in terms of costs, hours, level of service etc.
- Options:
 - Vary the start date for curbside pick-up based on season specific leaf fall.
 - Adjust the frequency of curbside pick-up from three pick-ups to one or two with an associated expansion in area served without a net increase in resources.
 - Optimize the current program by evaluating curbside leaf pick-up boundaries and equipment.

Alternative 2 - Serve the entire CWS-maintained service area with expanded leaf drop days and locations

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to look at the costs and level of service of providing additional leaf drop days.
- Options:
 - This alternative could be implemented with or without the curbside portion of the existing program.
 - This alternative could be combined with Alternative 4 as well.

Alternative 3 - Serve the entire CWS-maintained service area with curbside pick-up

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to evaluate the level of effort to provide the curbside program to the entire CWS maintained service area.
- Option:
 - This alternative could include a Local Improvement District like process where a neighborhood votes to opt in to the program for a service fee.

Alternative 4 - Work with County Solid Waste to turn leaf collection over to franchise garbage haulers

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to take advantage of the services already provided by the franchise garbage haulers.
- Option:
 - This alternative could be combined with other alternatives as one element of the program.

Alternative 5 - Work with a non-profit to serve a larger area (e.g. partner with Boy Scouts to help collect leaves).

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to consider how partnerships could increase the level of service without additional CWS resources.

Alternative 6 - Discontinue Field Components of the Leaf Program

- Discussion: This alternative is presented to evaluate the impact of discontinuing the leaf drop days and curbside pickup.
- Option:
 - In order to meet the MS4 permit referenced Leaf Program Performance Standard, this alternative needs to include promoting and educating customers on the availability of existing curbside yard debris pick up by franchise garbage haulers.

CWAC 5-9-2018 Proposed Leaf Program Rating Criteria

The three criteria listed below have been revised based on input from CWAC at the March 14, 2018 meeting. The original criteria presented at the March meeting is included for reference on page 2.

Criteria 1

- Meets Program Purpose/Effectiveness

Included in this criteria is an estimate of the proposed alternative's impact on localized flooding, leaf related services requests, receiving stream water quality, and the environment (i.e. carbon footprint).

Criteria 2

- Cost

Included in this criteria is an evaluation of the proposed alternative's cost to administer and operate the program (labor, materials, equipment), impact on the District's current conveyance systems O&M programs, sustainability over the next 10-20 years, risk to the District, ability to leverage non-District funding sources, and return on investment of previous capital expenditures.

Criteria 3

- Ease of Implementation

Included in this criteria is an evaluation of the proposed alternative's ease or difficulty of implementation, ability to be phased into annual operations, anticipated customer acceptance, equitability, and convenience to the ratepayer.

CWAC 3-14-2018

Proposed Leaf Program Rating Criteria Definitions

- **Cost to Run Program**
 - This rating criteria includes the overall cost to administer and operate the program (labor, materials, equipment). The costs to run the current program are fairly well known. Depending on alternatives, some costs will be estimates.
- **Social Equity**
 - This rating criteria includes analyzing census data to determine if any group receives more or less benefit from the service.
- **Implementation/Phase In Concerns**
 - This rating criteria is based on how easy or difficult it would be to implement the proposed alternative.
- **Agency Risk**
 - This rating criteria is an evaluation of the risk to the District posed by specific alternative.
- **Service Impact/Flooding**
 - This rating criteria includes an estimate of the alternative's impact on localized flooding and an estimate of whether the number of requests for service increases or decreases.
- **Impact to Operations and Maintenance (O&M)**
 - This rating criteria takes into account the impact on District's current O&M programs. Does the alternative require additional labor hours or the use of temps? Does the alternative free up staff to work on other tasks?
- **Water Quality**
 - This rating criteria evaluates the alternative's impact on water quality.
- **Long Term Sustainability**
 - This rating criteria is used to estimate the alternative's sustainability over the next 10-20 years.
- **Public Acceptance**
 - This rating criteria is used to evaluate the customer's acceptance of the alternative. It is expected that this will vary considerably depending on where a customer lives.
- **Comparison to Other Jurisdictions**
 - This rating criteria evaluates the proposed alternative compared to programs in surrounding jurisdictions and other similar jurisdictions throughout the state.