

# Metropolitan Wastewater MANAGEMENT COMMISSION



*partners in wastewater management*

## MWMC MEETING AGENDA

Friday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021 7:30 AM – 9:30 AM (PDT)

Due to the Coronavirus Pandemic and Oregon Executive Order 20-16, the MWMC Meeting will be held remotely via computer or phone.

To join the meeting by phone dial: **877-853-5247**; Access Code: **816 9790 9466** Passcode: **288817**

- 7:30 – 7:35     **I.     ROLL CALL**
- 7:35 – 7:40     **II.     CONSENT CALENDAR**  
a. MWMC 10/15/21 Minutes  
**Action Requested:** By motion, approve the Consent Calendar
- 7:40 – 7:45     **III.     PUBLIC COMMENT:** Public comment can be submitted by email to [jbrennan@springfield-or.gov](mailto:jbrennan@springfield-or.gov) or by phone 541-726-3694 by 5 PM November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021 or made at the meeting. All public comments need to include your full name, address, if you are representing yourself or an organization (name of organization), and topic.
- 7:45 – 8:35     **IV.     2021 (CMOM) Update**.....  
.....Brian Conlon, Rachel Vaicunas, Jennah Maier & Adam May  
**Action Requested:** Informational and Discussion
- 8:35 – 9:05     **V.     RNG Project Update P80095**.....Mark Van Eeckhout  
**Action Requested:** Informational and Discussion
- 9:05 – 9:20     **VI.     BUSINESS FROM COMMISSION, GENERAL MANAGER, & WASTEWATER DIRECTOR**
- 9:20             **VII.     ADJOURNMENT**

**THE FULL PACKET IS POSTED ON THE WEBSITE**

[www.mwmcpartners.org](http://www.mwmcpartners.org)

# Metropolitan Wastewater MANAGEMENT COMMISSION



partners in wastewater management

## MWMC MEETING MINUTES

Friday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 7:30 a.m.

The MWMC Meeting was held remotely via computer, phone, and in-person.  
Meeting was video recorded.

Commissioner Yeh opened the meeting at 7:30 a.m. Roll call was taken by Josi Brennan.

### **ROLL CALL**

*Commissioners Present Remotely:* Pat Farr, Bill Inge, Doug Keeler, Joe Pishioneri, Peter Ruffier, Jennifer Yeh

*Commissioner Absent:* Walt Meyer

*Staff Present Remotely:* Lou Allocco, Meg Allocco, Katherine Bishop, Dave Breitenstein, Josi Brennan, Carrie Holmes, Shawn Krueger, Troy McAllister, James McClendon, April Miller, Todd Miller, Michelle Miranda, Brooke Mossefin, Bryan Robinson, Harry Sanger, Loralyn Spiro, Matt Stouder, Mark Van Eeckhout, Valerie Warner, and Greg Watkins

*Legal Counsel Present Remotely:* Kristin Denmark (Thorp, Purdy, Jewett, Urness, & Wilkinson, PC)

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

a. MWMC 09/10/21 Minutes

MOTION: IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER **PISHIONERI** WITH A SECOND BY COMMISSIONER **KEELER** TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR. THE **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY** 6/0, WITH COMMISSIONER **MEYER** EXCUSED

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

### **FY2020-21 ANNUAL FINANCIAL SUMMARY, BUDGET RECONCILIATION**

Valerie Warner, MWMC Accountant presented the results of the FY 2020-21 Operating and Capital budgets from two perspectives: (1) a comparison between actual results and the FY 2020-21 budget, and (2) a comparison of actual results and the FY 2020-21 year-end estimates used during the FY 2021-22 budget and rate development process.

Budget to actual is evaluated to ensure the legally authorized expenditure levels are not exceeded. This also evaluates how well staff budgets and predicts the user fees, the interest revenue, and the SDC. The Budget to actual operating revenues fell short of budget by \$240,971 or 0.68%, within the \$35 million

budget driven by shortfalls in the monthly user fee (\$236,000 or 0.69%) and shortfalls in the internal engineering fees (\$178,000). This was also offset by three pieces of unbudgeted revenue such as the FEMA ice storm (\$126,000), miscellaneous (\$150,000), and COVID-19 relief funds (\$30,000). Miscellaneous revenues are passed to Springfield from Eugene at the end of the year in October.

Operating expenses came in under budget by \$2.4 million or 7.3% for Eugene and Springfield combined. Springfield had a savings of \$551,299 that consisted of 29% in personal services, and 71% in materials and services. The most significant areas of savings for the materials and services were for attorney and litigation fees (\$80,000), small home SDC (\$51,000), and contractual services (\$81,000). Personnel costs were under budget by \$165,000 that included one full FTE Design and Construction Engineer position, and a few other positions.

Eugene did not experience a high need for overtime in FY21 and had a total savings of \$1,864,237. Their personal services costs were \$1.1 million, or 11.3% less than budgeted. Items for materials and services included indirect charges under budget (\$626,826 or 11.9%), lower spending in utility costs, additional money (\$200,000) budgeted in anticipation of the RNG system startup, significant savings on training and related travel, and less spending on tools and equipment. In addition, the Eugene Capital outlay was under budget by \$108,000.

The operating estimated actual comparison was thoroughly discussed in September. The operating funds had an additional \$2.3 million and was added to the FY22 budget beginning cash and operating reserves. There were two increases to the budget from small home SDC and Eugene Capital outlay, and a large carry over on Capital projects of \$2.9 million. The Eugene Capital included equipment replacement and major rehab (\$2.7 million), SDC revenues were above estimate (\$1.5 million), and interest income were below estimate (\$900,000). Staff carried forward \$2.7 million in Capital projects, \$1.4 million in equipment replacement, and had \$1.2 million to increase the ending Capital reserve side.

*DISCUSSION:* Commissioner **Ruffier** asked, what is the current balance in the operating reserves? Ms. **Warner** said at the end of August, the operating reserve was \$4,725,349. Commissioner **Ruffier** asked if our policy is two months. Ms. **Warner** said yes, it is two months of operating costs. The target was created when the budget was put together, and sometimes the budget will slightly change afterwards. The target was \$4,129,000 so we are floating a little above it right now. Commissioner **Ruffier** stated the \$2.3 million change to operating reserve, with this SB1, does not double or increase it by a half or what the policy says correct? Ms. **Warner** said no, the \$4.7 million is an actual number from the end of August and the \$2.3 million number increases the budget. Commissioner **Ruffier** said of the money in the operating reserve, it is only accessed by special request correct? Ms. **Warner** said yes, other than using it every month to pay Eugene and staff salaries, if we made an extra appropriation from the operating reserve, we would do it through a supplemental budget.

Commissioner **Ruffier** inquired about the spaghetti chart and said he understood the difference between the budget and the reserve, but this shows an operating reserve of \$5.3 million. Did you say that technically a two-month reserve would be \$4 million? Ms. **Warner** said \$4.1 million was calculated when the FY22 budget was put together. Commissioner **Ruffier** asked if it is possible for the Commission to consider during next year's budget development, using operating reserve money over and above the two-month limit, to offset requests for operating funds, for the fiscal year? Ms. **Warner** said absolutely. Mr. **Stouder** asked Ms. Warner when an appropriate time is to have that conversation, in order to give

staff time to prepare that information. Would it be during the budget presentation in March? Or it can be earlier, if that is easier for staff. Ms. **Warner** said the sooner we can anticipate these things, the easier the budget preparation will be. Mr. **Stouder** said he will work with staff offline to explore this, and then remind the Commission later if it is something they desire to discuss. We can have that conversation ahead of time, rather than waiting until March when the budget is being presented.

Commissioner **Keeler** inquired on the spaghetti chart, particularly the magenta-colored block to the left for sources of revenue. Should we add more things to that like loan proceeds or grants received? Or is that covered under the "other" category? Ms. **Warner** said whoever created the chart was trying to be granular enough to be accurate, and not so granular that it made the chart gigantic. In a year that we have loan or grant proceeds, it would be a good idea, especially if it was a significant amount.

### **RENAMING RESULTS/NEXT STEPS**

Loralyn Spiro, Lead Communications Coordinator and April Miller, Communications Coordinator presented the results of the exploratory work. Earlier this year, the Commission asked staff to provide an outline for exploratory work for a possible renaming of the Water Pollution Control Facility. This request came after considering the 2019/2020 market research results and information provided during the September 2020 Commission meeting on the 2021 MWMC Communications Plan, including outcomes from Phase 2 Strategic Communications Planning.

April Miller gave a background on this exploratory work and said periodically the MWMC conducts market research to measure the community's awareness of the MWMC. Results from the first two rounds of market research in 2014 and 2015 along with 2019 and 2020, showed the community's initial awareness of MWMC by name is low (17.5%). After this information was presented to the Commission, they requested staff create an outline for potentially renaming the Water Pollution Control Facility, also known as the Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant. The exploratory work included a staff survey, staff focus group, and social media polling.

Loralyn Spiro delivered the staff survey results and said their goal was to set the tone and ask questions on how they think about wastewater and describe it. These responses set the tone for the communications team to proceed to the next set of questions

- *Define what you do for work?* Cleaning wastewater, treating wastewater and clean water.
- *How do you talk with family and friends about what you do and where you work?* Environmental work, environmental protection, and environmental responsibility.
- *How do you describe what is happening at the treatment plant with Community Members?* Similar themes in the responses emerged, as well as reliability, renewable and protecting the Klamath River.

The next step was to ask staff for feedback on the official name of the Water Pollution Control Facility.

- *Does it tell community members what type of infrastructure is located there?* Around 80% said no and maybe, giving a clear indication the name does not tell community members what infrastructure is located there. Staff provided comments such as it is too broad, vague, it is an industry term, and is mistaken for drinking water.
- *In the official name, does it tell Community Members what services are being provided?* The answers provided suggest the name is not clear to the general public. Staff gave comments such as, yes, it is water pollution control, but it does not mention wastewater and is confusing.
- *Does the name tell Community members what area is being served?* The answer was a clear no.

Then staff was asked for feedback on the unofficial name of "Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant."

- *Does the name indicate the type of infrastructure located there?* More staff said yes because the words "treatment plant" and "wastewater" are in the name.
- *Does the name tell Community Members what services are provided?* Staff feedback implies it does not cover all services and programs.
- *Does the name tell Community Members what area is being served?* The comments suggest the name does not tell community members what area is being served.

Next staff were asked to consider potential names, with 1 as the first choice, and 8 as the last choice. The below list was created by considering the MWMC mission, vision, and value statements. After seeing the selected names, the team analyzed the terminology separation. Staff thought of better ways to communicate to Community Members about what is happening at the location.

1. Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Treatment Facility (or Plant)
2. Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Facility (or Plant)
3. Eugene-Springfield Water Pollution Control Facility (or Plant)
4. Eugene-Springfield Clean-Water Facility (or Plant)
5. Eugene-Springfield Water Recycling Facility (or Plant)
6. Eugene-Springfield Water Resource Recovery Facility (or Plant)
7. Eugene-Springfield Water Cleaning Facility (or Plant)
8. Eugene-Springfield Water Reclamation Facility (or Plant)

To parse out between facility, plant or other, the communications team asked staff which type of infrastructure description is preferred. "Facility" came in as the most popular, at almost 60%. Staff were also provided the opportunity to give the below renaming ideas, suggestions, and potential names.

- Eugene-Springfield Regional Clean Water Partnership
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Stewardship Center
- Eugene-Springfield Clean Water Plant
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Restoration and Recovery Works
- Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Treatment Facility
- Eugene-Springfield Water Renewal Facilities
- Other suggestions – included Willamette River or Southern Willamette in name.

Additional comments from staff included:

- Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission is confusing and not clear as well, will changing or modifying the overall name be considered? (This was mentioned multiple times in some form).
- Keep the name simple and not wordy.
- Thank you for including staff in this discussion.
- Renaming is a great step in communicating better and more clearly to the community and partners what we do.
- What will happen to the name if we start providing services outside the Eugene-Springfield area?
- Thank you for doing this work!

After the survey results were recorded, the communication team synthesized all the information and created a staff focus group outline. The well-rounded group consisted of nine members from all levels within the organization of both Eugene and Springfield.

### Focus Group Results:

- *What names should be forwarded to the Commission for consideration?*  
Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Greater Eugene-Springfield Advanced Wastewater Treatment  
Twin Rivers Advanced Wastewater Treatment  
Greater Eugene-Springfield Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Pollution Control & Reclamation Facility
- *Should the official name of Water Pollution Control Facility be changed?*  
Yes – The focus group was *unanimous* in this decision based on the results of the staff survey and their discussion.
- *What other information is recommended for the Commission to consider first before making a name change?*  
Keep it the words simple and understandable for community members.  
“Greater” was included in most of the potential names being forwarded with consideration to services provided outside the Eugene-Springfield area, and for potential future growth of the service area.  
Consider how the name change will fit with the MWMC’s overall branding and names of other MWMC assets.  
Consider changing the overall name of the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission as part of this work.

Ms. Miller proceeded with the presentation and said in addition to the focus group and survey, staff also received feedback from Community members on social media. The team advertised two sets of posts across the MWMC social media platforms and asked for input, and 16 people provided comments.

### Social media results from community members

- 3 votes – Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Treatment Plant
- 2 votes – Greater Eugene-Springfield Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant
- 9 votes – Twin Rivers Advanced Wastewater Treatment
- 2 votes – Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Pollution Control & Reclamation Facility

### Community member comments

- “It’s good to keep it simple in my opinion.”
- “The word ‘facility’ sounds more welcoming than going to a ‘plant’.”
- “(Greater Eugene-Springfield Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant), it unites both cities, Greater - proud of our cities, Advancement says that you are always looking for better ways to process.”
- “Greater Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Pollution Control & Reclamation Facility better describes what the company does.”
- “I would prefer emerald valley than twin rivers, but I think twin rivers sounds nice too. I like the use of advanced here as well.”

Ms. Spiro said after considering the staff survey, staff focus group, and results from social media it was consistently recommended to keep the name simple and easy to understand. The name "Eugene-Springfield Wastewater-Treatment Facility" was the most popular recommendation. When this guidance was made, staff considered how it would allow for future naming and rebranding possibilities of other facilities and programs. This led staff to further recommend to the Commission to deliberate on an overall name change from the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission to Eugene-Springfield Wastewater.

Eugene-Springfield Wastewater would allow for future renaming/rebranding possibilities for other facilities and programs.

- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater – Biocycle Farm
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater – Biosolids Management Facility
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater – Renewable Natural Gas
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater – Recycled Water
- Eugene-Springfield Wastewater – Commission

"Facility" was selected based on the survey results and for consistency with other MWMC infrastructure locations. "Eugene-Springfield Wastewater" could stand on its own to describe all facilities and programs the partnership provides in the service area. "Commission" could be used as needed to further explain the partnership or specifically reference the Commission. "Eugene-Springfield Wastewater" would allow for easier and higher community awareness, name recognition, and understanding among ratepayers about who the MWMC is, the services provided, and the area served.

Ms. Miller stated the next steps are to capture the Commission's discussion and direction during the meeting, provide that information to staff, and then act on that direction, provided as necessary.

*DISCUSSION:* Commissioner **Farr** said this is similar to a renaming process he went through for an agency in Lane County called HACSA. The team looked for a word people would understand. The name HACSA (Housing and Community Services Agency) was changed to Homes for Good. The community liked this change and understood it was about homes. "Eugene-Springfield" is used a lot in the area, and what we are doing is treating water for the Willamette River system. The name "Upper Willamette" is nice because it captures all the water in the upper Willamette system, including the McKenzie river and everything downstream. Commissioner Farr liked "Upper Willamette Water Treatment," or "Upper Willamette Water Treatment Center."

Commissioner **Pishioneri** said "Eugene-Springfield" is very popular, but what about "Springfield-Eugene?" Springfield seems to be unrepresented and the underdog. Commissioner Pishioneri liked the word "facility" over "plant" and liked the name "Springfield-Eugene Waste Treatment Facility." Whatever captures the most attention from the public and gives them the best understanding, is fine with me. "Eugene-Springfield Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility" is a bit of a mouthful.

Mr. **Stouder** said in considering the name, partnerships of Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County are important to us. Staff do not want Lane County to feel marginalized in the name change and are figuring out how to incorporate that. Regarding the service area, there are Lane County residents with Eugene addresses, for the most part. The MWMC also provides septage service and other services outside the service area. Primarily with the treatment facilities, the focus is serving inside the service area. The word

“greater” was discussed to accommodate future plans. Staff and the community on social media recommended to keep the name simple, and “Eugene-Springfield Wastewater” was as simple as it got. The name says what we do and helps to connect people.

Commissioner **Inge** recognized the work that went into this process but was hoping for something more creative and wanted to go back to the drawing board. If we can dig deeper and come up with a more creative name, that would be better. Any one of those names he could live with but recommended more creativity. This process is hard, and oftentimes takes longer than what we anticipate because there are so many stakeholders.

Commissioner **Ruffier** thanked the team for their hard work but agreed with Commissioner Inge’s comments. Even though “Eugene-Springfield Wastewater Treatment Facility” is an accurate representation, it seems a little old school and does not have an aspirational element. It talks about wastewater treatment but does not get to what our job is. Something along the lines of “Clean Water Restoration” would allow us to expand it and talk about water reclamation, and other services we offer. If we went with “Springfield-Eugene Water Enhancement Region,” we could use the acronym “sewer” and be in good shape.

Commissioner **Yeh** recognized the hard work and said it is a long time coming. It is not easy to change your name, but it is time. Clear and concise is not boring, but people should not have to think about what the name pertains to, or what work they do. For example, EWEB. The community knows exactly what services they do and do not offer. The name does not need to be fancy because we are not selling anything and are an essential service. The recommendation by staff makes a lot of sense because it is versatile, and we can use it for different parts of our organization. Either “Eugene-Springfield” or “Springfield-Eugene” sounds great, and both would work.

Commissioner **Keeler** agreed with the survey and thought it was very well done and comprehensive but thought the size of the sample could be larger. Since Commissioner Keeler agreed with the recommendations, he was okay with the sample size being on the smaller side. The renaming process happened about 10 years ago, but the team did not get far with it and did not bring it to fruition. Picking it back up again does take a while, and it is a difficult thing to rebrand yourself. The values of this rebranding are simplicity, clarity, and the benefit of being expandable to other lines of current and future business we have. “Eugene-Springfield Wastewater” to replace the MWMC sounds okay. When we get there, it will be nice to learn the rollout plan because it is an opportunity to get better known.

Commissioner **Yeh** volunteered to take this topic to the community when she has the opportunity to speak to the public in meetings. It could be conveyed as, we are doing this process and if people want to engage, they can find us on Facebook, or something to that effect.

Commissioner **Farr** requested to not throw out “Willamette River” in the name, because we are really all about the river. The name “Upper Willamette River” or “Upper Willamette Basin” is nice, as opposed to “Eugene-Springfield” because that is hackneyed.

Mr. **Stouder** said as requested by the Commission, the task was to come up with a potential name change for the Water Pollution Control Facility. Staff hoped the survey and recommendations would lead to a conversation about the MWMC, and whether or not the name should be changed. Ms. Spiro

and Ms. Miller did great at weaving that into the presentation and knew further work would be needed, to take it to the next level. After hearing strong support in “Eugene-Springfield Wastewater” and other ideas, it would be smart to take a broader look. Instead of making a name change to Wastewater Pollution Control Facility, then performing work on the name, maybe we pause and focus on the higher level of the MWMC. Ms. **Spiro** said she was not surprised because everybody has their opinion and there is lots of different options. After hearing this discussion, taking a step back and looking at the whole rebranding would be a good idea. There is currently a tagline, “we clean water,” and there is a way within our branding to weave in more about the Willamette River and what we do. We should pause and look at the entire branding package for the MWMC going forward and expand on just changing the Water Pollution Control Facility. The survey results and discussion show that is the direction we need to take. At a higher level the team will revisit the entire rebranding, which as Commissioner Keeler stated, was started 10 years ago. Communication staff can put together serene branding options based around this conversation and a rollout plan, then present it to the Commission. At that time, we can have more discussion and make changes as needed, based on feedback.

Commissioner **Inge** said he was happy to hear “we clean water,” is weaved into the branding. Are there other Wastewater Treatment Facilities and do they have names? Have we looked at those names to get an idea of the creative names being used? When we answer the phone, if somebody calls the facility, how do staff answer the phone and what do they say? Ms. **Spiro** said she needs to ask staff and was not sure if they use Water Pollution Control Facility, the full name, or Eugene Wastewater Division. Staff did look at the names of other Wastewater Treatment Facilities, and it came down to what is easiest for community members to understand. Staff kept hearing throughout the entire survey, focus group, and comments on social media to keep it simple and easy to understand. Results from different surveys conclude when we say, “Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission,” the word that community member latch onto is “wastewater.” The public then knows what we do but are not sure what area we service.

Mr. **Breitenstein** said when staff answer the phone at the plant, there is no consistency in what they say. One of the good things that will come out of this process, is a consistent name in the phone greeting.

Mr. **Stouder** said we definitely have enough clarity to move forward, do some additional work, and then come back to the Commission.

#### **KEY OUTCOME 4 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Greg Watkins, Maintenance Manager, discussed performance indicators for Key Outcome 4. In January 2021, the Commission requested that staff look at potentially new or updated performance indicators for the five key outcomes. Key Outcome 4 deals with asset management and more specifically, maximizing reliability and useful life of regional assets and infrastructure. One of the four pillars of the MWMC’s 2020 Strategic Plan is to provide reliable and resilient Infrastructure.

#### **Goals associated with Key Outcome 4**

- Employ best practices in asset management
- Develop and implement resiliency planning policies
- Sound governance of infrastructure development through Capital planning that meets existing and future community needs

The existing performance indicators for this outcome are the most appropriate and do use common metrics. A production facility has different indicators, but for the work MWMC does, the current indicators are the most applicable. Preventive maintenance completed on time is standard and shows the team is doing what is recommended by manufacturers. To uphold the best reliability of assets and best practices benchmark, the target is set at 90%. Preventative maintenance refers to changing the oil, air filter, to prolong the life of an asset. Corrective maintenance is reactive and would be analogous to changing a tire. Emergency maintenance best practice is less than 2% of labor hours and is above and beyond corrective maintenance. With a higher sense of urgency to respond, emergency maintenance is at 2% of labor hours or less. The asset management process provides bi-annual updates and the initial presentation and development of the asset management plan. Rather than providing the indicator as an update of the plan, an option is to be more specific and focus on one recommendation and work on that for the year. This is not an ongoing long-term metric but does show what staff is focused on from an asset management standpoint, for that fiscal year. The MWMC resiliency plan is a good metric because it shows how focused the team is and keeps resiliency in everyone's mindset.

Staff had previously developed the plan, implemented the plan, and followed up with recommendations as the indicators. Mr. Watkins recommended the team be more specific and call out which indicator is being worked on. The Resiliency Report identifies during a Cascadia event, the conveyance pipeline may stay intact but will settle different than the pump station structure. The structure could have a break in the conveyance to pump station structure, but everything else would be fine. Having repair kits for that transition portion of the conveyance system is a good idea and shows the focus of what staff is working on, for that reporting period.

An option for the Commission to consider is a list of a strategic project that is multi-year, not long term. For example, completing a pipe condition assessment at the plant. Pipes at the plant are 40 years and older and can last 50-100 years, but a plan needs to be developed on how to identify their condition. The first year of this process would be developing a strategy on how to perform the condition assessment by prioritizing the pipes, and the next year that plan can be implemented. This kind of project is forecasted to be 2-3 years long, but not ongoing. After one project phases out, another one would take its place.

*DISCUSSION:* Commissioner **Farr** said this a fascinating report and really appreciates the work.

Commissioner **Ruffier** said he supports the proposed modifications to this key indicator and thought it made a lot of sense. There is a lot that goes on behind each of these metrics, for instance, the preventive maintenance piece depends on the maintenance management system and how its applied. In your opinion, do these metrics represent the appropriate use of those techniques? Does staff actually work towards a metric by modifying their practices for maintenance management? Mr. **Watkins** said he believes our maintenance management system is set up to support and facilitate the documentation of all these metrics. These metrics are not currently being presented to our staff. That could be unfavorable because staff do not have the longer-term goal the Commission's looking for and might be looking at just their day-to-day tasks. It could be favorable because staff would not recategorize coding their time or use it as a preventive and corrective maintenance, instead of an emergency. The current focus is to keep the plant running in good condition, not violating a permit, and distributing clean water, no matter what.

Commissioner **Ruffier** had a question pertaining to the Emergency Maintenance Indicator. Is critical fault analysis standard practice when we have an emergency failure that needs to be addressed? Do we go back and look at critical faults and modify our practices to prevent that from happening in the future? Mr. **Watkins** said when it is possible, yes, we do. There is not a written policy but whenever there is a critical failure or something that results in a type of emergency maintenance activities, it is followed up with the cause and if something different could have been done. Staff evaluates if inspection frequencies need to increase or decrease and do look at maintenance records. If a particular maintenance is performed monthly and every month the report comes back perfect, staff will look at it every two months or extend it to three months. The team intends to evaluate the frequency of preventative maintenance activities, as well as assessments.

Commissioner **Keeler** said in a sense, you have it a bit easier than folks who lead the other four key outcomes, because as you noted, the first three are industry standards. It is a good idea to display goals on the wall, track them, discuss that information at staff meetings to get everybody aligned, and go beyond the basics with your strategic project category. Concerning the goal setting for the asset management processes, do you need to look at that twice a year? It seems like an annual plan and that following the plan would be frequent enough. Mr. **Watkins** said the bi-annual plan is how often the entire plant gets updated and suggested having a specific recommendation identified. This would include the latest version of the plan and show how staff are following the plan to improve the Asset Management System. Staff would continue providing updates to the plan every other year as they develop, but instead of using that as a metric, it would show how staff are following the plan's recommendations.

Commissioner **Ruffier** said part of asset management is financial, and there is not an explicit financial indicator here. A lot of these have inherent financial elements, and it may be worth giving some thought to a financial indicator related to asset management. It is a struggle to determine between repairing, replacing, or removing without having some conceptual element in the indicators for finance. We may end up drifting towards replacing things, which could be the costliest element, rather than repairing things. Having an indicator that reflects that balance in the management practices would be a good idea. Mr. **Watkins** said that is a good point. While researching these, staff tried to find if there was a financial element. Most of the time it was related to production facility, fines and fees, or percentage of overall operating budget. Concerning percent of our budget, that would not change much. We would just be presenting a number that never changes which is not as meaningful. Asset management has proved the methodology on how we determine useful life and that might help with some of the replace, versus repair decisions.

Commissioner **Ruffier** commended on the evaluation of key outcomes. Previously we talked about Key Outcome 1, and there were comments about developing fact sheets related to each of the key outcomes and having them available to the public. This would explain the key outcomes and what our objectives are, but it has gotten lost along the way. It would be appreciated if staff gave further consideration to that. Mr. **Stouder** said he recalled that conversation. Staff could do a fact sheet or an executive summary of each outcome, describing the intent of what is being done. We will take what is been presented today and then come back in January for the initial budget presentation. At that time, we can discuss the Key Outcome concerning the changes made and have the summary sheets completed.

### **BUSINESS FROM COMMISSION**

Commissioner **Farr** said Mr. Stouder attended a presentation on the extension of the wastewater facilities to Goshen, OR, held at the Board of County Commissioners meeting last Tuesday. Goshen has been designated by the state as a regionally significant industrial area and is the largest regionally significant industrial area in the state. The main issue holding this area back from development is wastewater. There will be a discussion coming forward and Mr. Stouder will be carrying it to the board of MWMC regarding the next steps in adding a wastewater facility. The first step will be adding a leachate line from Short Mountain Landfill to the facility in Springfield. The Board of County Commissioners has approved unanimously to move forward with that. This development will save about 9000 gallons of diesel fuel annually and eliminate around 20 trucks a day that transport waste up and down the freeway.

### **BUSINESS GENERAL MANAGER**

Matt Stouder explained staff will work with the County as needed, in regard to the Goshen development.

A short video about the Biochar Demonstration Project at the Poplar Farm, created by the communications team will be sent out to the Commission.

The MWMC received an email from DEQ, and staff are expecting the permit in February or March 2022. There are steps between now and then, yet the key step is preparing to come to the Commission.

*DISCUSSION:* Commissioner **Ruffier** asked if we are doing anything to prepare for public review of the permit? Preparing and giving that some thought to get ahead of time, would be helpful. Mr. **Stouder** said he will follow up with staff on that. There is a communication strategy we have been considering on how to put that information out there. Ashland, OR is currently in their public comment period and staff have been tracking DEQ's permitting process with them, as well as other major permits and being issued.

### **BUSINESS WASTEWATER DIRECTOR**

Dave Breitenstein said he partnered with Wayne Carrillo last month to present at the PNCWA Conference on resiliency work. This presentation will be repeated next week at the Water Environment Federation Conference.

There have been two recent compliance inspections. One was for the air discharge permit with Lane Regional Protection Agency and after completing an extensive inspection of the facility it came out good. DEQ conducted a compliance inspection that took almost two days and included follow up questions. No problems were identified that would indicate noncompliance and staff are waiting for the formal report to come out.

James McClendon has accepted a regular position to be the Finance Manager for the wastewater division. This fills the midlevel manager position that was vacant the past few years and completes the management team.

Mr. Breitenstein intends to retire on November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021 after a great 38-year career. Next month Mr. Breitenstein will share his transition plan.

Commissioner **Yeh** adjourned the meeting at 9:30am

# Metropolitan Wastewater MANAGEMENT COMMISSION



*partners in wastewater management*

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 4, 2021

**TO:** Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC)

**FROM:** Brian Conlon, Springfield Operations Division Director  
Rob Hallett, Eugene PW Sub-Surface Operations Manager  
Adam May, Springfield Operations Division Associate Manager  
Jennah Maier, Eugene Civil Engineer  
Rachael Vaicunas, Eugene Principal Civil Engineer AIC

**SUBJECT:** 2021 Capacity Management, Operations & Maintenance (CMOM) Update

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Informational and Discussion

### **ISSUE**

Over the last several years, the cities of Eugene and Springfield have collaborated to develop and implement local Capacity, Management, Operations and Maintenance (CMOM) plans. At the November 12, 2021 MWMC meeting, staff from the two cities will provide a status update on wastewater collection systems activities and elements contained within their CMOM plans.

### **BACKGROUND**

CMOM is an industry standard asset management tool that guides fundamental program elements that support sustainable and responsible management of the cities' wastewater collection systems. The cities of Eugene and Springfield each own and operate their respective public wastewater collection and conveyance systems. Wastewater from Springfield and Eugene is combined and treated in regional facilities owned and operated by the MWMC in accordance with regulatory requirements described in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit jointly held by the MWMC and the two cities.

In addition to water quality limits and treatment requirements, the NPDES permit contains standard federal permit conditions related to Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) that apply to all portions of the collection system for which the permit holder has ownership and/or operational control. These provisions include establishing "Duty to Mitigate", requirements for proper operation and maintenance of the collection system, noncompliance reporting, and recordkeeping. Collectively, these requirements result in an NPDES permit obligation for each city to:

- Eliminate avoidable Sanitary Sewer Overflows
- Have a program in place to identify and reduce inflow and infiltration (I/I) into the collection system.

The CMOM asset management framework approach has become an industry standard that helps cities set an intentional course for continual process improvement with this critical public infrastructure. Beginning in 2011, staff from Eugene and Springfield implemented their respective CMOM plans as a strategy that each city could use to identify future wastewater collection system rehabilitation and repair projects. In 2014, regional wastewater program staff worked with the Commission to develop a CMOM Framework Document that outlined the Commission's expectations of the essential elements to be addressed in a CMOM program approach. In addition to the framework document, Eugene and Springfield performed CMOM gap analyses using the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) CMOM Checklist as a guidance tool.

Since 2015, Eugene and Springfield have co-presented annually to the MWMC on their respective CMOM programs. The program's outline five core areas to direct program improvement strategies: these include Planning, Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, and System Monitoring and Assessment. Although the cities' CMOM plans differ in outline form, both embrace the adaptive planning approach with the same general objective of achieving effective conveyance management, with an over-arching goal of SSO prevention.

## **DISCUSSION**

Eugene and Springfield Public Works staff have established a strong record of proactive maintenance, operations, and oversight of their wastewater collection systems. Both cities have dedicated substantial and necessary resources to maintain over 900 combined miles of publicly owned sewer pipe. The cities employ key preventive maintenance and rehabilitation strategies that have paid dividends toward mitigating SSO frequency and reduction of pipe I/I.

Strategic operational activities are also implemented, which accurately identify areas within the collection system (manholes, mains, laterals) that have high I/I occurrence for targeted Capital Improvement Projects and in-house isolated rehabilitation. Below are some of the vital work processes that the cities undertake:

### **Pipe Flow Monitoring and Capital Rehabilitation Project Planning**

Pipe flow monitoring is an effective analytical tool to evaluate system performance and hydraulic modeling characteristics. Flow monitors measure the amount of wastewater passing a particular manhole over time. Eugene currently deploys a fleet of 51 flow monitors. Also, Eugene continues to improve a calibrated hydraulic model that was created in 2016 using flow data collected since 2013. Springfield currently deploys a fleet of 14 flow monitors. The data and models are used in multiple ways: tracking down the sources of I/I in the collection system, measuring the effectiveness of rehab projects, and to help quantify the impact of I/I from private laterals.

Developing an effective flow monitoring program is central to finding and reducing system I/I. Paired with rain data from rain gauges throughout the cities, flow data reveals which monitored areas are experiencing the most inflow and infiltration. When a monitored area of the wastewater system shows significant amounts of I/I, it is added to a list of potential rehab projects. This prioritized list is used to select the next rehab project. In this way, Eugene can eliminate the most I/I per dollar spent on rehab. Springfield's program is moving in the same direction and will prioritize their system rehabilitation decisions based on their collection system data and hydraulic modeling. Springfield is actively monitoring a third micro basin as a means to identify potential rehabilitation projects. In addition, Springfield also plans to continue the update to the City's Wastewater Master Plan which was last updated and adopted in 2008.

### Effectiveness of Capital Rehabilitation Projects

In Eugene, the most common methods of rehabilitation are cured-in-place pipe lining, manhole sealing and chemical grouting or lining of laterals. Other methods may also include pipe bursting and reconstruction. In 2021, Eugene rehabilitated approximately 18,700 feet of pipe with cured-in-place pipe lining in the Harlow neighborhood, as well as sealed the manholes. Cleanouts and public lateral lining in the Harlow neighborhood will be completed in 2022.

Springfield's Capital Improvement Program currently utilizes information from the City's asset management program and the Operations Division to identify key locations and basins for system rehabilitation and I/I control. Springfield staff is utilizing the flow monitoring and hydraulic modeling data collected over the last few years to identify and prioritize wastewater collection system pipe rehabilitation projects that target excessive I/I. This methodology was the applied decision criteria to perform a slip-line project on a 27" trunk sewer in the Marcola Rd and 21<sup>st</sup> Street commercial/industrial area, achieving a substantial I/I reduction. Micro-basin flow monitoring continues to pinpoint high priority rehabilitation needs. Capital engineering staff is currently designing pipe rehabilitation projects in conveyance system basin #1, located in the east Thurston residential area. These projects are slated for construction over the next several budget cycles

### Inflow and Infiltration from Private Laterals

Since 2019, the wastewater rehabilitation capital projects designed by the City of Eugene have gathered flow monitoring data for their respective rehabilitation sub-basin both before and after the projects have been constructed. Comparing this flow data before and after construction provides an estimate of how much of the region's inflow and infiltration was coming from the public versus the private system. Four sub-basins (Bailey Hill, City View, Trainsong North, and Trainsong South) have been improved and evaluated in this way thus far between 2019 and 2021. Similar work is planned for the Harlow and Patterson sub-basins.

### Asset Management

Springfield staff has a focused effort to improve asset management through utilization of field tools, specifically improving data collection. The use of mobile devices has allowed city staff to capture real time data, GPS coordinates, and record vital information for the maintenance activities performed on public assets. Data collected through CCTV inspection, flow monitoring, maintenance access point inspections, smoke testing, etc. is a key component in informing future and ongoing rehabilitation and capital improvement decision making. Recently, the City of Springfield Operations and GIS staff worked together to advance the CCTV inspection process by upgrading our data management software to WinCan VX Expert, a cloud-based software, which allows for information and video sharing via the web. Springfield will provide a visual update on CCTV inspection software upgrade at the November 12, 2021 MWMC meeting.

Additionally, Springfield has moved forward with the procurement of a second Vactor combination truck. This new equipment will be used to perform wastewater system repairs by means of hydro excavation, as well as, expanding the city's ability to perform necessary preventative maintenance and emergency response.

### Communication and Outreach

Both cities are more frequently utilizing public communication opportunities to improve public outreach and share program information pertaining to our wastewater programs services. Eugene

continues to update a story map explaining the basics of their wastewater rehabilitation work, while Springfield has created an educational video that shows operational activities related to CMOM. This video, which was shown to the Commission last year, has the overall goal of increasing public awareness of wastewater activities and responsibilities.

### Conclusion

A successful CMOM program is dependent on cities' staff to attain and maintain a thorough understanding of the wastewater collection system. To ensure a responsible management plan is in place for oversight of the collection system, staff is applying CMOM guidance now and into the future. Moreover, staff must invest in continual process improvement strategies that develop, share, work, and revise the plan. The cities are invested in using the CMOM framework to provide planning structure, management insight, and system design and maintenance standards to ensure that core environmental goals and regulatory compliance is met.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Informational and Discussion

# Metropolitan Wastewater MANAGEMENT COMMISSION



*partners in wastewater management*

---

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 4, 2021

**TO:** Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC)

**FROM:** Mark Van Eeckhout, Civil Engineer

**SUBJECT:** Renewable Natural Gas Project Update P80095

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Informational and Discussion

---

### **ISSUE**

Construction associated with the Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) Facilities are nearing completion and the project is working through system startup. This project is innovative in the public utility wastewater industry. Being on the early adoption side of the new RNG system with the use of Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA) gas purification technology is exciting but does present challenges associated with integrating new technology and systems into existing operations. This memo provides a project update; additional information will be shared at the November meeting.

### **BACKGROUND**

With support of MWMC consultants, staff has been working to implement the Commission's goal of the reduction/elimination of gas flaring at the Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF) through the RNG Upgrades Project. The project has been planned, designed, and now constructed over several years and is soon to enter ongoing operations. The project has had two key capital aspects: 1) the construction of the RNG Processing Facility (designed by Kennedy Jenks Consultants and built via DSL Builders), and 2) construction of the Receipt Point Facility (RPF) and piping along River Ave to River Road (designed and constructed by Northwest Natural Gas (NWN)). Both key aspects are constructed and are finalizing startup.

It is exciting to share that the biogas processing equipment have completed the early stages of startup and are in the process of troubleshooting some items to allow the system to be tuned to run consistently and efficiently. Figure #1 below shows the two flares at the WPCF. Note that there is no flame on Waste Gas Burner #2 (WGB) (Dedicated to Digester Gas) and flame on WGB #1 (Dedicated to RNG Off Spec Gas). This shows the project during startup running all the plant's digester gas through the RNG System and back to the flare, since WGB #1 is dedicated to the RNG system.



Figure 1 - Waste Gas Burners During Start Up

Operations staff have been actively involved and have been learning about the system in the process. This is in addition to the contractor/vendor provided training.

### **DISCUSSION**

The RNG construction work is ending, and staff anticipates processing RNG for injection into the NWN gas piping by the end of the year 2021. There are still some remaining issues to be resolved this year as discussed below.

Current key ongoing issues related to the completion of the RNG Upgrades:

#### **1. RNG System Start Up (functional/operational/performance):**

Many of the key components of the gas processing system are functional and operating. The heart of this system is the Greenlane provided Pressure Swing Adsorption System (PSA), with the twelve media beds that remove the majority of contaminants from the digester gas. This system is performing and based on readings from the Gas Chromatograph equipment it meets the NWN interconnection agreement Title 1 Gas Quality Specifications.

However, there are currently a few system control issues between some of the RNG equipment such as Waste Gas Burner and Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO). Staff plans to discuss these issues further at the meeting.

#### **2. Northwest Natural Gas (NWN):**

The NWN Receipt Point Facility (RPF) and interconnecting 4" gas piping to River Road is nearing completion. NWN completed construction and charged the gas system during the week of

September 13, 2021 but discovered a gas leak within their three-way valve that needs to be repaired for WPCF onsite safety. This NWN repair is expected to be completed in November 2021 along with NWN system readiness confirmation.

Staff also received notice that the rate MWMC will receive during the upcoming year for the sale of the "brown gas" to NWN will be revised, as is agreed to in the contract. The new weighted average delivered cost for the upcoming year is anticipated to be \$3.93/Decatherm(Dth), which is an increase from the previous year of \$3.06/Dth. This is helpful given that there are uncertainties around the renewable fuel credits.

### **3. BlueSource:**

Staff has been working with BlueSource as the offtake broker for the environmental attributes associated with the MWMC's renewable natural gas. BlueSource is currently consulting with a process verification engineer to support the registering of the gas credits with the EPA and California Air Resources Board (CARB). The verification engineer supports the regulatory agencies in ensuring that the different RNG facilities across the country are following the rules around the creation and sales of renewable credits. This is done by looking and confirming the process of making RNG does not add feed stock to the system that would change the categorization of the gas, such as adding existing natural gas. BlueSource and their verification engineer are continually working to follow the changing policy, governmental interpretation of policy, and market landscapes as it relates to RNG.

With BlueSource's support, staff will register the gas with the EPA and CARB to receive credits and fees for the renewable attributes. The federal renewable fuels program classifies renewable gases into different categories. Since the inception of this MWMC project, it has been staff's understanding that our RNG would be classified as Cellulosic Biofuel (D3). The other potential classification would be Advanced Biofuel (D5). It is important to note that the value for a D3 credit is roughly double a D5 credit.

Since 2018 planning work, MWMC projections have assumed that our RNG product would be classified as D3. This basis was on the RFS-Pathways-II-Final Rule (07-02-14) which transitioned POTWs/Landfills/and Agricultural Digesters in the federal renewable fuels regulation (40 CFR80-Subpart M) from D5 to D3. Recently, staff learned that other facilities (e.g. Lincoln, NE) are having challenges registering their RNG as D3 due to operating practices around incoming hauled waste related to fats oil and grease (FOG).

With the MWMC's registration in process, staff has examined how much FOG has been received through our hauled waste program to see if this may be an issue for our project. Staff plans to provide any update at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting with project cost payback estimating information.

### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Informational and Discussion