Tualatin Basin Water Supply Project
Policy Steering Committee

Meeting Summary and Minutes
October 30, 2006

Attendance

Policy Steering Committee members:
Tom Brian (Clean Water Services Board Chair), **Jim Doane** (TVWD Commissioner), **Mark Eves** (Lake Oswego Corporation), **Rod Fuiten** (former City of Forest Grove Councilor), **John Godsey** (City of Hillsboro Utilities Commissioner), **Forrest Soth** (former City of Beaverton Councilor), **Ed Truax** (City of Tualatin Council President) **Tom Woodruff** (City of Tigard Councilor)

Partner officials and staff:
Andy Duyck (Clean Water Services Board of Directors) **Todd Heidgerken** (TVWD), **Mike McKillip** (City of Tualatin), **Dave Nelson** (Bureau of Reclamation), **Wally Otto** (TVID), **Derek Robbins** (City of Forest Grove), and **David Winship** (City of Beaverton), **Kevin Hanway** (City of Hillsboro/Joint Water Commission, and **Dennis Koellermeier** (City of Tigard)

Clean Water Services staff:
Bill Gaffi (General Manager), **Mark Jockers** (Public and Government Affairs Manager), **Tom VanderPlaat (**Water Supply Project Manager), and **Jeanna Cernazanu** (Public Involvement Coordinator)

Consultants:
Dan Heagarty (David Evans & Associates) **Eric Glover**, Consultant

Public
John Driscoll, Ron Garst

Meeting Summary (brief minutes)

S-1. Call to Order and Introductions

Policy Steering Committee (PSC) Chairman Tom Brian called the meeting to order at 6:39 pm in the conference room of the Clean Water Services Administration Building near Hillsboro. PSC members and others attending offered self-introductions.

S-2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 29, 2005 meeting were approved.

S-3. Project Status

Washington County, Clean Water Services, cities of Tigard, Beaverton, Tualatin, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, North Plains, Sherwood, Banks, and Cornelius, Tualatin Valley Water District, US Bureau of Reclamation (RECLAMATION), and Tualatin Valley Irrigation District six years ago began working together to study options to meet future water needs. By 2050, an additional 50,000 acre-feet of water will be needed every year for municipal/industrial use (35,000 acre-feet) and to restore stream flow (15,000 acre-feet) in the Tualatin River and its tributaries.

Following several years of study, a Draft Planning Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PR/EIS) is being prepared which will focus on three alternatives: No Action, Dam Raise Option, and Multiple Source Option.

Alternative 1, "No Action," would involve no change in the current system or supply.

Alternative 2, "Dam Raise Option," would raise Scoggins Dam at Henry Hagg Lake by 40 feet and include a raw water pipeline and a pump-back system. The raw water pipeline would be used during the summer to provide raw water to be treated for drinking water and other municipal uses, and to deliver water to increase stream flow in the Tualatin River during dry months. The pump-back system would use the same pipeline to move water from the Tualatin River into Hagg Lake during high winter/spring flows, increasing refill reliability to 90%.

Alternative 3, "Multiple Source Option," would raise Scoggins Dam by 25 feet, include a raw water pipeline and pump-back system as described in Alternative 2, and include a drinking water pipeline from an expanded treatment plant on the Willamette River at Wilsonville. The Willamette pipeline would deliver treated drinking water to Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) facilities for distribution.

S-4. Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Draft PR/EIS

Most of the work during the past year has involved determining and addressing the various issues which must be evaluated in the Draft PR/EIS. A significant issue is the impact on 18 private property owners, involving from 115 to 167 acres of land. Other major issues presented to the PSC included recreation, wetlands, wildlife habitat, water quality, streamflow, and fisheries habitat.

Many other issues, including water rights/economics analysis, social impacts (economic, environmental, justice), air quality (noise, visual effects, hazards), Indian Trust assets (including Sacred Sites), geology/soils/groundwater, public services and utilities, transportation and access, land use regulations and threatened species, must also be evaluated and included in the Draft PR/EIS document. Mitigation for each impact must also be described in the document.

S-5. Project Schedule

The Draft PR/EIS is expected to be ready by spring of 2007. After the document is entered into the Federal Register, there will be a 90-day public comment period. The final PR/EIS should be completed in the spring of 2008. Once an alternative is selected, Congressional authorization is required to proceed. Authorization could be secured between 2008 and 2010, with the design and construction process beginning in 2010.

S-6. Public Involvement Update

In addition to the PSC, key groups involved in the process include the Tualatin River Watershed Council, Clean Water Services Advisory Commission, and Water Managers Group. Individual property owners, natural resource agencies, and others have also been included. There have been numerous meetings and presentations to share information and gather feedback. The Clean Water Services website contains all documents related to the project. Some materials are also available in Spanish. The draft document will be available at public libraries and on the website during the comment period. Any member of the public can request a copy. Paper-reducing strategies, such as providing executive summaries and providing the entire document on CD's, will be used. PSC members will receive advance copies of the draft document and will be briefed before it is released. After the EIS process is finished, then there will be steps for selecting a preferred alternative. The PSC and other key stakeholder groups will be involved again at that time.

S-7. Federal Funding Update

The cost for the Water Supply Project from feasibility study through preparation of the EIS is $6.87 million, of which project partners are providing 55%. The remaining $2.36 million is being requested through Federal appropriations. The project received Federal authorization in 2004, with approval for spending up to $2.9 million. The project received an appropriation of $250,000 in 2005 and another appropriation of $287,000 in 2006. The balance is being requested for 2007. Currently the House and Senate budgets for Energy and Water Appropriations include $280,000 for the project. Project partner representatives will be visiting Washington, DC in December to talk with RECLAMATION and Congressional budget staff there. The partners have also contracted with a government affairs consultant in Washington, DC.

S-8. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

S-9. Adjournment

Chairman Brian adjourned the meeting at 7:58 pm.

Full Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Policy Steering Committee (PSC) Chairman Tom Brian called the meeting to order at 6:39 pm in the conference room of the Clean Water Services Administration Building . PSC members and others attending offered self-introductions.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Forrest Soth moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting, held September 29, 2005. John Godsey seconded the motion. Motion passed.

3. Project Status

Tom VanderPlaat, Clean Water Services Senior Water Resources Project Manager, updated the PSC on progress since the last meeting a year ago. He reviewed the partnership of Washington County, Clean Water Services, cities of Tigard, Beaverton, Tualatin, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, North Plains, Sherwood, Banks, and Cornelius, Tualatin Valley Water District, and Tualatin Valley Irrigation District which six years ago began working together to study options to meet future water needs. By 2050, an additional 50,000 acre-feet of water will be needed every year for municipal/industrial use (35,000 acre-feet) and to restore stream flow (15,000 acre-feet) in the Tualatin River and its tributaries.

Staff has been working with representatives from the federal Bureau of Reclamation (RECLAMATION) as supply options have become focused on raising Scoggins Dam at Henry Hagg Lake. A Draft Planning Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PR/EIS) is being prepared. It will focus on three alternatives: No Action, Dam Raise Option, and Multiple Source Option.

Alternative 1, “No Action,” would involve no change in the current system or supply.

Alternative 2, "Dam Raise Option," would raise Scoggins Dam by 40 feet and include a raw water pipeline and a pump-back system. The 96-inch diameter raw water pipeline would run 7.5 miles from Hagg Lake to the Joint Water Commission (JWC) Water Treatment Plant. It would be used during the summer to provide raw water to be treated for drinking water and other municipal uses. The pipeline could also deliver water to increase stream flow in the Tualatin River during dry months. The pump-back system would use the same pipeline to move water from the Tualatin River into Hagg Lake during high winter/spring flows. The water would be pumped from the Springhill Pump Station just downriver from where Gales Creek empties into the Tualatin. The pump station facility is shared by the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District (TVID) and the JWC. A 40-foot dam raise would increase the capacity of Hagg Lake, but whether enough water could be collected from the surrounding watershed to fill it every year would depend on rainfall and other factors. The pump-back system would increase refill reliability to 90%.

Alternative 3, "Multiple Source Option," would raise Scoggins Dam by 25 feet, include a raw water pipeline and pump-back system as described in Alternative 2, and include a drinking water pipeline from an expanded treatment plant on the Willamette River at Wilsonville. The Wilsonville pipeline would be 60-72 inches in diameter and run about 22 miles through Tigard, Tualatin, and Beaverton to Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) facilities. It would carry 75-100 million gallons per day (mgd).

4. Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation for Draft PR/EIS

Mr. VanderPlaat said most of the work during the past year has involved determining and addressing the various issues which must be evaluated in the Draft PR/EIS. These include impact on private property owners as well as the effect on water quality, hydrology, wetlands, wildlife, fish habitat, and recreational use. Social, cultural, and other factors must also be analyzed. He highlighted several of these issues during his presentation.

Private Property: Mr. VanderPlaat stressed the importance of working with private property owners in the area and keeping them informed. He mentioned his most recent meeting, held October 19th at Washington County's maintenance facility near Hagg Lake and attended by about 25 property owners. He and others have also met individually with 15 of the 18 owners of property bordering the lake, to share new maps and updated information.

Alternatives 2 and 3 both involve raising Scoggins Dam at Hagg Lake and would thus result in higher water levels. The 40-foot dam raise under Alternative 2 would require an additional 347 acres to accommodate the increased water level and the 300-foot expanded boundary beyond it that is recommended by RECLAMATION. Slightly less than half (167 acres) of the land that would be affected is in private ownership. Under Alternative 3, a 25-foot dam raise would require 235 acres, 115 of which is privately owned. In either case, construction of two new bridges and four to five miles of new road would be required.

Mr. VanderPlaat showed maps illustrating current recreation area boundaries compared to the boundaries as they would be under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. He noted that when the

recreation area was originally developed, the boundary lines were surveyed to the nearest quarter section corner. However, the new boundary would be the outer edge of the expanded boundary, which would follow the contours of the water line. There are three main areas where private property owners are most affected.

In the Nelson Road area, either option will affect the well and septic drain field of one property owner. However, these property owners are even more concerned about the effect on elk and other wildlife habitat. Mr. VanderPlaat has told landowners that each case will be handled on an individual basis. In some situations, easements may be granted for wells and septic fields; other circumstances may require drilling a new well or installing a new septic tank and/or developing a new septic field. Habitat mitigation on the property may be possible in some cases and not in others.

The most severe impact on private property owners is in the Tanner Creek area, where either alternative would require one landowner's home and entire parcel of almost 20 acres. The landowner would have to relocate altogether. The property owner has refused to meet with Mr. VanderPlaat but has met with RECLAMATION staff. Another property owner whose home would be affected has suggested that the nearby road be raised rather than relocated in order to maintain access. Mr. VanderPlaat does not know if this is feasible but it will be considered in response to the homeowner's concern.

There would also be a big impact on private property in the Scoggins Creek area. Land would primarily be needed to relocate a small recreation area. One property owner's land use opportunity would be affected, but this issue would need to be addressed as part of the process. However, the property is for sale and a new owner might not be able to build a home on the land after the recreation area boundary is established if the resulting parcel is less than 160 acres. At least two other property owners in this area are families which were also affected by the original Scoggins Dam/Hagg Lake project development.

Four or five landowners in the Sain Creek area would be affected, but no one's home would be lost and none would have to be relocated. There is not much difference in the effect of a 40-foot dam raise compared to a 25-foot dam raise on property in this area. Mr. VanderPlaat told of visiting one landowner who recalled that his land was first surveyed for the original Scoggins Dam/Hagg Lake project in the 1940's, but was not actually purchased until 1972. "So I'm not holding my breath on this one!" he told Mr. VanderPlaat, who said he has shared this story with many of the neighbors to reassure them that this isn't all going to happen tomorrow…though he does hope it will take less than 30 years.

Mr. VanderPlaat listed a variety of concerns expressed by Hagg Lake neighbors:

1. Continuing uncertainty about what will be done, what the actual effects will be, and when it will actually happen
2. Appraisal and compensation process--how will it work and will it be fair (Mr. VanderPlaat noted that when landowners were compensated in the development of the original project, their land was appraised at its existing value, then an appraisal amount was developed based on the value of the remaining land once the lake was established--

on the assumption that proximity to the lake would increase the value of surrounding property--and the compensation amount was decreased by the amount of the increased value, which many property owners at the time felt was unfair and is not the current policy)

3. Protection of wildlife habitat and corridors
4. Protection of the remaining parcel of land--don't leave landowners with property that they cannot actually use
5. Land management issues, such as whether trees can be harvested from affected land and when that should occur
6. Impacts to wells and septic systems
7. Road relocation issues such as noise, privacy, and visual (cars in sight, headlights shining through windows)
8. Access during project construction--how will people get to their homes once the top 13 feet of the dam is removed in preparation for raising it, how will Lee's Road be affected, etc.
9. Scoggins Creek streamflow--reduction in flow during construction will have implications for Stimson mill downstream from the dam.

There will also be major impacts on land and facilities within the existing recreation area boundaries. The existing boat ramps, picnic areas, and other facilities would be relocated so that Washington County could continue to realize some revenue from its management of the recreation area. Facilities have been inventoried and new locations nearby are being identified. The A-Ramp and C-Ramp boat ramps and day-use areas, the Sain Creek day-use area, and the Elks' day-use area would all be affected. An additional issue is whether the existing facilities such as boat docks and ramps could be maintained for use when water levels recede rather than being removed.

Chairman Brian asked about what would happen to a recently-built ramp that provides handicapped access to fishing. Mr. VanderPlaat said building a fishing pier at the Elks area is part of the current proposal, but it is quite a challenge to design something that will float up and down with fluctuating water levels and still remain a gentle enough slope to allow wheelchair use.

Andy Duyck, Washington County Commissioner, asked if the same parking accommodations will be available. Mr. VanderPlaat said there will be the same number of spaces, but some additional land may need to be purchased to allow for the amount of space that is currently available for special events in the recreation area. This is an additional issue that is unresolved.

Wetlands:

Mr. VanderPlaat said that the 40-foot dam raise under Alternative 2 would affect 33.4 acres of wetlands in the Hagg Lake area and the raw water pipeline will affect about 20 acres of wetlands, primarily in agricultural areas. The 25-foot dam raise under Alternative 3 would affect 27.4 acres near the lake. The Willamette Transmission Pipeline would affect 9 acres. The raw water pipeline effect would be the same 20 acres as with Alternative 2.

Mitigation, or construction of new wetlands to offset the loss caused by the project, would be required. Depending on the ratio used to determine how much mitigation is required, 20-27 acres near the base of the dam would be used for mitigation. An additional 13 acres of wetlands would be constructed at Jackson Bottom Wetlands under Alternative 2. Under Alternative 3, 7 additional acres would be constructed at Jackson Bottom. Mitigation or restoration for the 20 acres for the raw water pipeline and the 9 acres related to the Willamette Pipeline would be done at or near the specific land affected.

Wildlife Habitat: Alternative 2 would affect 370 acres of forest lands in the Hagg Lake area, along with some agricultural land along the raw water pipeline. Alternative 3 would affect 235 acres of forested land, some agricultural land along the raw water pipeline, and some rural and some urban land along the Willamette Transmission Pipeline. A major component of wildlife habitat mitigation is elk meadows. Under Alternative 2, 98.6 acres would be needed, while Alternative 3 would require 77.2 acres. In either case, 58.6 acres could be developed within the existing park boundary, and the remainder provided on land owned by the City of Hillsboro in the Sain Creek area. There are existing meadows near the base of the dam. Some other possible areas have been identified north of the lake as well as in the Sain Creek area.

Commissioner Duyck asked what is involved in mitigation. Mr. VanderPlaat clarified that it is primarily creating managed pastureland and maintaining it as such. A mitigation area might actually be plowed up and then replanted with native meadow grasses. There would at least be weed control and a management plan for maintaining the meadow. Mitigation areas should be located away from roads and picnic or other recreation areas.

Water Quality: A United States Geological Survey (USGS) water quality model was used to study water quality issues, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, nitrogen, and several others. Mr. VanderPlaat shared graphs from the temperature model, showing how the existing lake heats up in summer and projections for what would happen with a 40-foot dam raise and a 25-foot dam raise. By late fall, water released from the dam is very warm. Installing a multi-port outlet would allow flexibility in drawing water from the bottom, top, or middle of the lake. Warmer water near the top could be released in the spring, allowing the lake to begin the summer at a cooler temperature. This would also provide a more natural temperature pattern for Scoggins Creek. Mr. VanderPlaat also pointed out that water being sent through the raw water pipeline to be treated for drinking water should leave the lake at the highest quality possible. A multi-port outlet would help ensure this.

Streamflow: Mr. VanderPlaat said that raising Scoggins Dam will reduce the release of water into Scoggins Creek for flood control during winter and spring. The raw water pipeline will carry water that otherwise would be released into the creek during summer and fall, again bringing it closer to natural conditions. The raw water pipeline pumpback will provide 90% fill reliability for the enlarged lake. With the capacity afforded by a 40-foot dam raise, the pumpback would remove about 300 cubic feet per second (cfs) from the Tualatin River. With a 25-foot dam raise, about 200 cfs would be moved through the pumpback. Pumping would occur during high winter flows when there is excess water anyway. Pumping would

likely begin in December, depending on winter precipitation. Streamflow effects become progressively smaller the further downstream they are measured.

Fisheries Habitat: There will be fisheries habitat impacts on about five miles of Scoggins Creek and 25 miles of the Tualatin River. The Tualatin tends to be a simple U-shaped channel with trees alongside. It is not as complex as the Clackamas or the Sandy Rivers, so changing stream flow does not change habitat very much. Even so, a variety of mitigation efforts would be undertaken. An extensive study of flow and habitat found about 1000 feet of Coho salmon spawning gravel at the outlet channel of the dam. Although Coho are not indigenous to Scoggins Creek, resource agencies want to protect the spawning area. In addition to a flow management plan, there will be a gravel management plan to prevent siltation of the spawning beds. Flow will be maintained at 25 cfs.

Chairman Brian asked what would be done if spawning gravel was damaged despite mitigation. Mr. VanderPlaat said one remedy would be to create an artificial flood to flush the system. Another approach would be to augment the area with new gravel.

Other mitigation would include replacing a culvert at an unnamed tributary on Control House access road, building overflow channels within the existing outlet channel to prevent fish being stranded as streamflows fluctuate with water releases, removing the City of Hillsboro‘s no-longer-used dam on Sain Creek to facilitate fish passage, adding screening and fish passage accommodations to the City of Forest Grove‘s Watershed diversion structures, improving culverts on Gales Creek tributaries, and looking for opportunities to coordinate with other restoration activities on Gales Creek, such as woody debris placement currently being done by RECLAMATION with Watershed Council.

PSC member Forrest Soth asked if the culvert replacements on Gales Creek would require new bridges. Mr. VanderPlaat said it would depend on each individual site and there are a variety of ways to address it. For example, the structure could be an arched culvert instead of a bridge. Any approach that provides access to additional habitat for fish could be used.

Mr. VanderPlaat said that improvements and restoration activities would also be done on McKay Creek and the West Fork and East Fork of Dairy Creek, in response to a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) concern that too much of the mitigation efforts were focused on Gales Creek.

Mr. VanderPlaat briefly listed some of the other elements of the EIS which must be evaluated for all three Alternatives, including water rights/economics analysis, social impacts (economic, environmental, justice), air quality (noise, visual effects, hazards), Indian Trust assets (including Sacred Sites), geology/soils/groundwater, public services and utilities, transportation and access, land use regulations and threatened species. Mr. VanderPlaat expects a draft PR/EIS to be submitted to RECLAMATION within a few weeks. RECLAMATION staff will review it and send it back with comments for revisions.

Mr. VanderPlaat also shared information about costs, indexed to 2005-2006 conditions.

Construction costs for Alternative 2 would include $199 million for the 40-foot dam raise, $60 million for the raw water pipeline, and $40 million for the pumpback system, for a total capital cost of $299 million. Alternative 3 would include $166 million for the 25-foot dam raise, $48 million for the raw water pipeline, and $25 million for the pumpback, for a total of $239 million. Mr. VanderPlaat pointed out these are construction costs associated with the dam raise only. Alternative 2 would have additional costs for wholesale contracts with the City of Portland (assuming they would continue) and for expansion of the Joint Water Commission water treatment plant. Alternative 3 would have additional costs for the Willamette River Transmission Pipeline and expansion of the Wilsonville water treatment plant. Based on capital costs alone, Alternative 3 might look more expensive. But if operations and maintenance costs and other factors are included, the overall costs of the two could be nearly even. Another factor in considering total actual costs of the alternatives is the future expandability of each option. A 40-foot dam raise really provides the maximum capacity that could be expected from Hagg Lake--even with the pumpback system, not enough water could be collected from the watershed to fill the lake behind a higher dam. The Willamette River capacity is less limited.

Commissioner Duyck asked if the multi-source option (Alternative 3) were chosen, would or could it be phased in? Mr. VanderPlaat said he thought it probably would have to be a phased project, as different partners have different timelines for their expanded needs. Forest Grove won't need its additional water as soon as Clean Water Services, for example.

5. Project Schedule

Mr. VanderPlaat said he is optimistic that the Draft PR/EIS will be ready by spring of 2007. He pointed out that RECLAMATION actually owns the document, so it must meet their criteria and they must be comfortable with it. After the document is entered into the Federal Register, there will be a 90-day public comment period, then any revisions in response to comments must be made. In addition, adjustments will have to be made for any circumstances that have changed since the time the draft document process began. The final PR/EIS should be completed in the spring of 2008. Once an alternative is actually chosen, the project must have Congressional authorization to proceed. Mr. VanderPlaat hopes that will happen sometime between 2008 and 2010, with the design and construction process beginning in 2010.

Mr. Soth asked if the current climate appears favorable for approval and authorization. Mr. VanderPlaat said it does appear favorable, particularly at the local and regional levels of RECLAMATION. He pointed out that this process is different from the RECLAMATION's usual protocol and that is challenging for everyone. He feels Oregon's Congressional delegation understands the economics and needs and they have been very helpful. This is one of the few projects in Oregon which has had federal funds appropriated for a feasibility study. Results of upcoming elections will have some effect, of course. Any political shifts will bring some advantages and some disadvantages.

Commissioner Duyck asked whether it would be easier to get funding for the project if it

included an irrigation component rather than being entirely a municipal project. Mr. VanderPlaat said he has not seen evidence of that so far. Chairman Brian observed that the important thing would be that the project not interfere with any irrigation projects or needs.

6. Public Involvement Update

Jeanna Cernazanu, Clean Water Services Public Involvement Coordinator, referred to the handout included in the pre-meeting packet. She reiterated that what the group has seen tonight is really a very small part of all the information and activity that has been going on over the past year. She reviewed the key groups involved besides the PSC--The Tualatin River Watershed Council, Clean Water Services Advisory Commission, and the Water Managers Group--and outlined work with individual property owners, natural resource agencies, and others. As detailed in the handout, there were numerous meetings and presentations to share information and gather feedback. She mentioned the Clean Water Services website contains all documents related to the process and added that information is also available in Spanish.

Ms. Cernazanu reviewed the process for publishing the Draft PR/EIS and the intensive 90-day public comment period that will follow. The draft document will be available at public libraries and on the website during the comment period. Any member of the public can request a copy. Ms. Cernazanu said staff will try several paper-reducing strategies such as providing executive summaries and providing the entire document on CD's. After the EIS process is finished, there will be steps for selecting a preferred alternative. The PSC and other key stakeholder groups will be involved again at that time.

Mr. Soth asked if PSC members will get an advance copy of the Draft PR/EIS so they can be prepared in case of questions from citizens. Ms. Cernazanu said everyone will get copies and staff will brief the PSC.

Chairman Brian noted that it is obvious there has been lots of contact and lots of effort by Clean Water Services staff to cover all the bases.

7. Federal Funding Update

Mark Jockers, Clean Water Services Public Affairs Manager, referred to the Congressional Funding Request brochure handed out at the beginning of the meeting. He said the cost for the Water Supply Project from feasibility study through preparation of the EIS is $6.87 million, of which project partners are providing 55%. The remaining $2.36 million is being requested through Federal appropriations. The project received Federal authorization in 2004, with approval for spending up to $2.9 million. With help from Senator Ron Wyden, Senator Gordon Smith, and Representative David Wu, the project received an appropriation of $250,000 in 2005 and another appropriation of $287,000 in 2006. The balance is being requested for 2007. Currently the House and Senate budgets for Energy and Water Appropriations include $280,000 for the project. Once the elections are over and after

Congress resumes in January, there will be nine appropriations bills under consideration. The goal is to get the balance of the funding to do the EIS, then work toward authorization of the actual project once a preferred alternative has been selected. Project partner representatives will be visiting Washington, DC in December to talk with RECLAMATION and Congressional budget staff there. The partners have also contracted with a government affairs consultant in Washington, DC. The consultants will be meeting with project partners in November.

PSC member Rod Fuiten asked for clarification about authorization and funding. Mr. Jockers explained that the authorization in the 2004 Energy and Water Development Act authorized the study to go forward, and authorized funding up to $2.9 million, but did not actually appropriate any funds. The actual funds were appropriated in 2005 and 2006 and some funding is proposed for 2007, but not as much as has been requested. Chairman Brian said the most important part about the authorization was that it allowed RECLAMATION to work with the partners on the study. It is rare for the full amount of a request to be appropriated.

Mr. Jockers said a big plus for this project is its extremely strong local support. Chambers of Commerce and other business associations, individual businesses, and public entities have written letters of support, and all the Congressional delegation staffers are very familiar with this project. Chairman Brian noted that local businesses who have a presence in other states have expressed willingness to use their contacts with those delegations to provide information and build support for the project.

Mr. Jockers invited anyone with questions about the project status or funding to call him or Mr. VanderPlaat at Clean Water Services.

8. Public Comment

Chairman Brian asked for comments from the public, pointing out the designated speaking area and also noting the availability of comment cards for anyone who did not wish to speak. There were no requests to speak and no comment cards were turned in. Chairman Brian observed this might be a reflection of the communication and outreach groundwork that has already been done by staff.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Brian at 7:58 pm.

(Meeting notes prepared by Sue Baumgartner)