The following questions have been posed by Commissioners prior to the scheduled Board Meeting on March 5, 2024. Staff responses are included below and are sorted by Agenda topic.

State of the Watershed Annual Report (KELLEY/MASTERS/FRICKE)

Overall I really appreciate what has been done in the past year but I don't see anything about the 52nd Street IP Berm; is that being studied? Also on pages 18 & 20, it states that E. coli and Chloroform levels, however slight, are showing up on samplings very near our intake and it looks as they are from the Springfield storm water system. What is being done to investigate the sources?

RESPONSE: *The McKenzie River is pushing westward towards the 42nd Street Levee just upstream of the intake. Staff are tracking updates from the City of Springfield on structural improvement/modernization efforts to help mitigate potential levee failure. Although a levee failure would potentially be catastrophic for City of Springfield residents and infrastructure immediately downgradient of the release point, water quality impacts to Hayden Bridge directly would likely be minimal as water would get pulled West into Springfield. When the Levee upgrade occurs, staff are interested in the replacement of the Irving Slough headgate/culvert that allows 42nd stormwater to pass into Irving Slough through a pipe in the levee during summer months. A replacement may allow for year-round diversion of 42nd which would be a benefit to water quality as there would be no discharge from 42nd into the McKenzie just upstream of Hayden Bridge.*

Staff are tracking improvements that IP is planning on their property that could impact Keizer Slough and the 48th/52nd stormwater discharge. IP is looking at decommissioning, by 2025, their non-contact cooling water ponds that currently discharge into Keizer Slough as part of their water efficiency improvements. EWEB staff are coordinating with IP, SUB, Rainbow, McKenzie Watershed Council, and the Urban Waters and Wildlife Partnership on a potential restoration project that would develop and enhance wetland function in the area and could address stormwater runoff from both the 42nd and 48th/52nd stormwater channels.

Regarding the elevated E. coli (and TKN) results observed in several urban stormwater channels in 2023, Source Protection staff plan to ramp up monitoring efforts in 2024 to identify potential bacteria sources in East Springfield. This will include monthly bacteria and TKN sampling in 5 stormwater channels and in Keizer Slough. In March 2024, we will increase baseline monitoring to monthly (currently we just sample quarterly), with continued storm sampling to determine peak concentrations. Staff have reached out to City of Springfield to coordinate potential upstream monitoring locations in the different stormwater systems. Staff will also be collecting fecal biomarker samples for qPCR analysis to determine potential E. coli sources. Biomarkers for human, canine, avian, and ruminant/cattle fecal sources are available for analysis. If bacterial sources are confirmed, staff will coordinate with City of Springfield to address potential system failures (cross-connections) and/or illicit discharges or pet waste outreach opportunities for local property owners. Springfield will also work on education and outreach to impacted areas of town. EWEB and the City of Springfield partnered on a similar effort back in 2015/2016. In addition, City of Springfield staff are planning to conduct dry-screening stormwater assessments in the 42nd and 48th/52nd stormwater channels to identify potential fecal sources. Although we continuously use treatment to inactivate microorganisms, including bacteria, in drinking water, elevated fecal levels can be a potential proxy for other contaminants entering the stormwater systems.

Lastly, with respect to the low-level chloroform hits, staff are planning increased monthly monitoring in 2024 to determine the extent of chloroform in Keizer Slough and upstream in the 42nd and 48th/52nd stormwater channels. Staff would like to assess whether or not the chloroform concentrations are associated with surface runoff from upstream sources, baseflow/groundwater sources, or perhaps nearby industrial outfalls. Staff will reach out to City of Springfield staff with all monitoring results to determine next steps if a potential chloroform source is identified.

Consent Calendar

CONTRACTS

Historical Research Associates, Inc. - for Cultural Resource Studies and Technical Support for the Carmen-Smith Hydroelectric Project (KELLEY/KRENTZ)

The contract shows EWEB has already spent $469,000 on the cultural resource studies for Carmen over the past four years. Now the Board is being asked to approve another $400,000. Please explain what else needs to be done and what this would study.

RESPONSE: *The Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) requires EWEB to preserve and protect all cultural and historic resources within the Carmen-Smith FERC Boundary from potential adverse effects of hydro operations. EWEB is required to contract with qualified cultural and historic preservation professionals to work with EWEB staff to complete the required tasks of the HPMP. Tasks to be completed over the term of this proposed contract is all new work and includes:*

- *Survey of the new FERC boundary and the expanded transmission corridor including the Cogswell Creek portion of the Leaburg Forest.*
- *Evaluations of archeological sites identified during the three river reach area surveys completed in 2022 (11 sites from Carmen Diversion, Smith, and Trail Bridge-Deer Creek).*
- *Surveys and project monitoring at key project work sites (Lakes End, Smith Boat Ramp, Smith Spillway, Load Bank, Fish Passage, etc.).*
- *Surveys of private conservation easements.*
- *Surveys and reports for additional potential impacts not included in the original license (additional staging areas, expanded projects, disturbed archeological sites)*
- *Historic reviews for remaining projects (Smith Spillway, modifications on Smith Dam, modifications to Trail Bridge Dam, and associated protected resources).*
- *Scheduled, required periodic monitoring of identified archeological sites.*
- *Preparation of annual reports.*
- *Assistance in evaluating new projects and in developing mitigation measures and agreements for any project work that results in unavoidable negative effects to cultural or archeological resources.*

Why is there such a large difference between the original estimate of $60,000 and the bid $400,000? Did the scope change?

RESPONSE: *The 2024 Capital Budget developed early in 2023 included $60k per year from 2024-2026 anticipating a smaller workload having completed a significant portion of the required work in the previous 5-year period. Since then, we have identified additional projects and the need to respond to emergent projects over the next 3-5 years. For example, recently identified archeological sites will require full surveys and reports. Surveys will also be required for areas in Leaburg forest and on private land now included in the Project boundary. Initial surveys have been completed for planned infrastructure at Carmen-Smith and in some cases will require additional site evaluation as the design progresses and impacts to cultural sites need to be addressed. Similarly, new ground disturbing projects such as staging areas and dam safety required projects require cultural and historic evaluation. This contract will shift to a combination of Capital and O&M activity by 2027, however the proportion is highly dependent on the capital project deployment progress.*

RiverBend Construction, Inc. - for the construction of Phase 1 of the ROC Expansion/Bertelsen Annex Project (KELLEY/MILOVICH) Can we please get more of a picture of the work to be performed at the ROC? Was this part of the plan to move from HQ or is this new expansion work? I would love to see a map outlining the areas the development will take place.

RESPONSE: *The Bertelsen Development is new expansion work and not directly related to the move from HQ.*

The preliminary development plan for the Bertelsen property was shared with the Board in a memo dated June 7, 2022 (PDF), link provided for your reference. This memo contains a summary of the project, it's history, drivers

and a set of drawings which have been utilized for planning approval with the City of Eugene, wetlands permitting and mitigation, cost estimating and subsequent budgeting. The key points of that memo are still valid.

Bertelsen Development Significant Events/Key Details to date

Completed work:

- *Property purchase/close – May 2021*
- *Purchase price $1.6M*
- *Property size – 15.8 acres, with 2.9 acres being identified as wetland*
- *Project approach – Master Plan with phased construction*
- *Project requirements – ROC expansion (laydown yard), secondary access road (Bertelsen Rd.), NW Natural Hydrogen (currently on hold with NW Natural), mitigation and/or infill of 2.9 acres wetland, flexibility for future use(s)*
- *Project cost Phase 1 (estimate) – ~$5M*
    - *Targeted construction cost $4M (OH included)*
    - *Design/Engineering $470k*
    - *Wetland Consulting and Permitting $45k*
    - *Wetland mitigation credit purchase $257k*
- *Stakeholder design considerations and input – June thru August 2021*
- *Wetland mitigation consultation contract issued – October 2021*
- *Project development and design contract issued – February 2022*
- *Wetland alternatives analysis and conceptual master plan completed – August 2022*
- *Wetland Joint Permit Application filed – September 2022*
- *Site master plan design work, development of construction documents, and solicitation materials – September 2022 to January 2024*
- *Wetland Joint Permit Application issued to EWEB – October 2023*
- *Construction contract solicitation – January 2024*
- *Open Bids – February 2024*

Upcoming Work

- *Submit Phase 1 Construction for potential Board approval – March 2024*
- *Construction start – May/June 2023*

Scelzi Enterprises, Inc. – for as-needed purchases for Specialized/Custom Truck Service Bodies thru March 2029 (KELLEY/MILOVICH) How many trucks will the contract cover? Are there new truck providers that sell trucks standard with these configurations that we could switch to instead so we don't have to pay for customization work on every new truck purchased? What do the upgrades change?

RESPONSE: *Most utilities use a three-truck setup consisting of a full-size bucket truck, a digger derrick, and a crew leader vehicle. EWEB generally utilizes a two-truck approach which includes a full-size bucket truck and a foreman flatbed fitted with the specialized body in this contract. There is an operational efficiency of only using two vehicles versus the three vehicles that other utilities use, but it does require specialized equipment.*

These trucks are purpose built for EWEB's approach to line work. This configuration of the foreman flatbed has been in use at EWEB since 2014 and the specifications have not changed, thus it is an EWEB standard. The current design was developed with our crews and is proven to work in the field. EWEB foreman flatbeds are equipped with a hydraulic system which operates a front bumper capstan winch, and a heavy enough body subframe to support hauling poles and transformers along with a 2K lb. crane for lifting and moving materials. Having a standardized vehicle is also a benefit to EWEB's crews for safety and efficiency as the equipment is familiar to them as soon as it goes into service. One of the long-term advantages of working directly with a manufacture like Scelzi to standardize our design is that we are still able to get components for truck bodies built over the lifespan of this design. This can mean the difference between days or weeks to source a part when something needs to be replaced which puts the vehicle back in service in a shorter time frame. A contracting advantage is that they are a one-stop operation where they build and paint the body, mount it on

our chassis, and install the other components (hydraulic system, capstan winch, and crane). This is not the case with other body manufacturers as they typically only provide the body, which would then need to be finished with the additional components by a third party up-fitter. This would require us to move the vehicle around to various up-fitting locations adding both time and cost to the build along with complicating warranty considerations. For these reasons we prefer to continue to utilize this vehicle design.

Based on our vehicle lifecycle assessments we estimate that we will need up to six (6) new foreman flatbeds with the specialized service bodies over the next five years.