Clean Water Services
Clean Water Advisory Commission
Meeting Notes

September 12, 2018

Attendance
The meeting was attended by Commission Chair Tony Weller (Builder-Developer), Commission 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), Stu Peterson (Builder-Developer), and David Waffle (Cities/non-voting), along with Diane Taniguchi-Dennis (Clean Water Services District General Manager/non-voting).

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

Attending from Clean Water Services were Nora Curtis (Conveyance Systems Department Director), Karen DeBaker (Communications Supervisor), Shannon Huggins (Public Involvement Coordinator), Ryan Sandhu (Field Operations Division Manager), Bryan Thistle (SWM Facility Supervisor), and James Vitko (Line Maintenance Supervisor).

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Mr. Weller at 6:35 PM in the Tualatin Room at the Clean Water Services Administrative Building Complex in Hillsboro, OR.

2. Previous Meeting Notes
There were no comments regarding the meeting notes from May 9, 2018.

3. Leaf Program: Review Draft Program Alternatives and Requested Data

Mr. Sandhu ***(presentation attached)*** reviewed for Commission members the charge from the Clean Water Services Board of Directors to review, identify alternatives for, and eventually make a recommendation regarding the Leaf Program. The Leaf Program was established to reduce localized flooding, although water quality is a secondary consideration that has since emerged. Mr. Sandhu, Mr. Thistle, and Mr. Vitko presented additional information as requested by Commission members at the May meeting. Mr. Sandhu outlined possible Leaf Program alternatives as revised after discussion at the May meeting. He and Ms. Curtis conducted an informal survey to test the evaluation criteria, rating system, and electronic "voting" process for use at future meetings. Commission members provided input on alternatives and requested further information about several items.

Commission members had asked in May for more data about the effect of leaf collection programs on water quality. Mr. Sandhu shared information from the City of Madison, WI and the City of Portland, OR. In Madison, a 2012-2016 study found that leaf collection can reduce phosphorus and nitrogen in stormwater runoff, but the study authors acknowledged their intensely focused efforts were probably more than any municipality would realistically be able to sustain. In Portland, four years of leaf compost data showed a heavy metals profile very similar to that of the fine materials collected through Clean Water Services street sweeping program. The only real difference was that the Portland leaf compost was significantly higher in lead content, although lead measurements from both sources were far below allowable levels. The metals profiles were consistent from year to year. This would indicate that like street sweeping, leaf removal could be an effective tool in preventing heavy metals in stormwater runoff, yet metals residue in any leaf compost produced would still be low enough for certain uses.

Commission members had also requested more information about specific Leaf Program service area characteristics. Mr. Thistle and Mr. Vitko set up and briefly discussed map boards depicting tree cover (as of 2012) inside and outside leaf pick-up areas, stormwater system "density" (number of catch basins compared to linear feet of street) throughout the unincorporated areas of Washington County served directly by Clean Water Services, and locations of storm/flooding calls over the past five years. Mr. Sandhu said staff members were surprised by some of their findings as they compiled and analyzed the map data. For instance:

1) Street tree cover is not necessarily greater inside leaf pick-up areas than outside, despite high leaf volume in those areas
2) There are not necessarily more storm/flooding calls in areas without leaf pick-up, or in areas with older, lower-density stormwater systems
3) Even some of the newer developed areas may show significant storm/flooding calls
4) Some older developed areas have stormwater system density which would meet current standards
5) Many of the storm/flooding calls in certain areas were related to the property being alongside a creek, rather than leaf accumulation

Mr. Sandhu outlined the revised working list of possible Leaf Program alternatives and discussed a handout ***(attached)*** with additional details about costs and other considerations:

A. Status Quo
B. Expand Pick-up to all (unincorporated) customers; continue leaf drop days as is
C. Expand Leaf Drop Days with 16 drop-off opportunities; discontinue all curbside pick-up
D. Promote Green Bins; discontinue curbside pick-up, discontinue leaf drop days
E. Upgrade Storm Sewer Infrastructure; discontinue curbside pick-up, discontinue leaf drop days

He noted that Alternative E was added to the list and two previously-discussed alternatives were tabled as a result of input from Commission members at the May meeting. The two tabled alternatives were 1) Elimination—No Leaf Program (some type of program is required to meet the performance standard in the NPDES—National Pollution Discharge Elimination System—permit), and 2) Partnering with Nonprofit Group(s) (significant liability and logistics issues).

Mr. Sandhu shared a handout with explanations of the three evaluation criteria discussed previously:

1. Meets Program Purpose/Effectiveness
2. Cost
3. Ease of Implementation

Commission members did an informal evaluation of alternatives against the criteria. Mr. Sandhu and Ms. Curtis emphasized that the list of alternatives is still open to revision, but pointed out that this exercise could help to see if a direction or preference is emerging, determine what additional information might be needed for future discussions and decisions, and try out a new electronic scoring system.

Alternative C was scored highest and Alternative E was scored lowest for all criteria. The top three alternatives were C, A, and D. Commission members commented that Alternative C was attractive because it seemed fair—leaf drops could be done in a variety of locations according to need and a customer would still have the option to use yard debris cart(s).

Given the relatively clear preliminary preferences, Ms. Curtis proposed for efficiency that the group focus for now on the top three alternatives and what additional information would be needed to fully evaluate them, noting that the other two alternatives could be brought back to the table later. There were no objections when Mr. Weller checked for consensus.

Commission members and staff identified several areas of interest:

1) Sort service calls by month to see if there is actually an increase in certain areas during leaf season (September-January)
2) Analyze monthly/seasonal service calls by proximity to catch basins, by leaf pick-up boundary, and slope/topography to evaluate effectiveness of current pick-ups
3) Review past call narratives and staff reports to categorize monthly/seasonal service calls by cause (blockage, overflow, flooding, etc.)—consider indicating cause in future
4) Find out (from haulers) how many direct customers of Clean Water Services are using yard debris carts, and how many are using two (or more) carts
5) Invite representatives from the various haulers and/or county staff to a Commission meeting to discuss green bin options/logistics

Mr. Sandhu said the next meeting will include review of the requested data and some discussion of the public involvement component of the process, as well as any patterns gleaned from this evening's evaluation exercise. He does not expect the group to finalize a recommendation for the Board in October as noted in the original schedule. The point is to do a careful review of the Leaf Program and if changes are recommended, there is no urgency to implement them by next fall. Ms. Curtis clarified that a public engagement process would occur after the Board has reviewed the Commission's recommendation, if the recommendation was anything other than continuing the program as is.

Questions and comments related to the Leaf Program are listed in the Appendix.

4. Announcements

The next meeting will be Wednesday, October 10.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Weller at 7:57 PM with thanks expressed to all for their participation.

(Meeting notes compiled by Sue Baumgartner)

Appendix

Clean Water Services Advisory Commission Meeting Notes
September 12, 2018

Questions and comments regarding the Leaf Program:

1. We expected that metal levels in the street sweeping fine debris material be a lot higher than in the leaf compost.
   1.1. We'd really like to look at that further to find out why they are so similar
   1.2. Could the higher lead levels in the Portland samples be due to the city being more industrial?
   1.3. Or maybe because Portland also has a street sweeping program, there isn't as much left to build up on the leaves?

2. It's interesting that one of the newer developments had significant service calls—why would there be more calls in an area that has a more modern, higher-density stormwater system?
   2.1. We didn't try to categorize calls by cause, but that is data we could pull out
   2.2. It's possible that inadequate facilities downstream could cause problems in a newer development

3. Even with this information, what you don't know is what would happen to calls if you didn't have the Leaf Program.

4. Metro has more recent LIDAR data reflecting tree cover.

5. You could consider dissecting calls to see cause, proximity to catch basin, and other factors.

6. Would Alternative B (Expand Pick-up) lower calls and would there be a cost saving?
   6.1. Yes, we believe this would lower the number of calls but not sure by how much.
   6.2. We just looked at maps/data that did not show a strong correlation between higher numbers of calls coming from areas without pick-up service (adjacent to those areas with pick-up service); you know it will likely benefit some, but will it benefit enough to make it worth the cost?
      6.2.1. Yes, we can try to quantify it better.
   6.3. If there isn't a cost savings, why do it?
   6.4. Were the calls on the map just leaf season calls?
      6.4.1. he map showed all calls from the past five years, but we could refine that by month or season.

7. An equity issue that shows up with Alternative B is that while all customers are paying more, some people are still going to be paying for something that they aren't getting if their area does not need that service.

8. I would toss out Alternative B—it is already hard enough to get rate increases and increasing it this much for this program does not sound feasible.

9. For Alternative C (Expand Drop-off), how did you arrive at 16?
   9.1. We simply used the cost of the current program and calculated how many drops would be supported by that amount. It could be eight different locations on two different days, four locations on four days, etc.
      9.1.1. Currently we offer four opportunities: two different locations on two different days.
   9.2. This does not reflect any specific need, just an exploration of what we could offer if we spent the same money in a different way.

10. A key consideration that should be listed for Alternative D (Promote Green Bins) is the use of all that plastic.
    10.1. It seems like that could be addressed in the evaluation process

11. Related to Alternative E (Upgrade Infrastructure), how do you retrofit stormwater facilities in an existing area?
    11.1. That is a problem for our small works program. With a budget of $50,000-$70,000 per project, it is hard to find work that meets the criteria. There were constant projects 1995-2005; that really dwindled 2005-2015, we didn't do a small works project last year and we have only budgeted for one this year because it is so hard to find something feasible.

12. Alternative E doesn't provide enough money to do anything significant/feasible
    12.1. Medium-sized projects can easily/quickly become large projects ($1 million or more)
    12.2. We wanted to look at this in terms of what could you get for that amount; the implementation being a separate issue.

13. If we recommend something more expensive than the current program, how would Clean Water Services fund that?
    13.1. Your recommendation will go to the Board; they will decide how to act on the recommendation and how to proceed from there.
    13.2. And we would want to involve the public in deliberations/discussions at some point.

14. Wasn't there another alternative that we talked about before, kind of a combination of A and B?
    14.1. Yes, as the group develops a recommendation you may want to combine certain aspects of more than one alternative or even suggest new ones. We just wanted to have very distinct choices for a test exercise at this point.

15. Is there anything else we should consider besides just the calls for flooding issues? For instance, maybe part of the solution is to start doing more to fix the overall system so everyone has proper drainage.
    15.1. That can't be done within the current funding.
    15.2. True, but the point is that we should be looking at this holistically.

16. What is the goal? It seems like a lot of the calls you are getting are likely related to topography (some areas just get a lot of water); leaves may not be the culprit.
    16.1. We can go back thru individual call information and winnow out details like that.
    16.2. You could eliminate those calls that are from the same place regardless of season.
    16.3. You still have the problem of what happens if you change an existing program that people have gotten used to.
    16.4. The primary goal of the leaf program is to minimize localized flooding.

17. Clean Water Services should not get involved in providing yard debris carts—that should be done by customers through the county and their haulers because there is so much variation in hauler franchise agreements around the county.

18. It doesn't sound like this is an incendiary issue with the public
    18.1. The review was sparked by some folks just outside the pick-up boundary who vocally wanted to be inside the boundary.

19. If you're going for public input you will need solid science.
    19.1. You should be able to point to leaf pick-up boundaries that are based on actual need.

20. There might be a number of hybrid options that will come to light as we delve into the data next time.