

Bond Oversight Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 30, 2018

Table Rock Campus – TRC206, 3:00pm

7800 Pacific Avenue, White City, OR

Attendance

Board of Education: Claudia Sullivan, Pat Ashley, Roger Stokes and Kevin Talbert

Staff: President Kemper-Pelle; Vice Presidents Leo Hirner and Curtis Sommerfeld; Greg McKown, Cheryl Johnson

Guests: Luke Gowey, ZCS Engineering and Wayne Gresh, Carollo Engineers

Meeting called to order at 3:01pm by Curtis Sommerfeld.

Discussion

The purpose of the meeting was to receive a report on the RWC/City Water Connection from ZCS Engineering who provided a progress update on potential pump station locations. Luke Gowey provided the following information:

- RCC is currently in phase one to connect to GP water system. Study showed we lacked sufficient pressure and flow
- Looking at a reduced fire flow and pressure – 4,000 gpm at 20psi
- We are going to use a type 3B construction
- Current need is for 3,000 gpm fire flow, looked for a location for a private fire pump station on campus to meet that demand. In addition, RWC requires a 30gpm domestic flow
- Unable to find a viable site for pump. Current option is 36' too high. No solution found to be viable that ZCS would be willing to stand behind.
- Luke presented two maps with options and asked: What do we want to do moving forward?
 - Map of option 1 – tie into city system: does not work without work by the city, which is not in their immediate future. Private pump station on campus, 2 mile extension to city line. \$1.3M estimated cost. This is NOT a viable option.
 - Map of option 2 – Negated need for pipe, instead has a pump station at lower elevation near the connection point for the city system. RCC would have to purchase a piece of property, and then build a pump to public standards and then pipe two miles back to campus. \$2.8M estimated cost. This would be the best use of the infrastructure.
 - Due to the cost, there is now an option 3 to be considered:
 - Find a viable solution WITH the city
 - Stay on private water system for domestic/fire water needs and do not connect to the city water
 - We are less than the 25% development threshold that would require improvement
 - Connect to the city for the domestic use, and still need to provide fire flow (private fire system: onsite storage tank and pump). Not officially approved by the city, however, we would be connecting to their water system. We need additional information to determine specs needed. \$1.3M estimated cost.
- We have sufficient domestic water flow on campus. One of the options is to have a pond/storage facility on campus. Additional analysis and coordination with the city needs to be approved.
- The city seemed amenable to a private pump station (land acquisition needed) and then annexed to campus. Would require a public line to the campus, and therefore, the pump station has to be public.
 - The city may have softened... it may not become their pump station. The property line would be at the pump station and then the water line would be on campus property (similar to a flagpole lot for access). This does get us closer to option 2, depending on the cost of the property. It may be more of a wetland/swampy area and not something that can be developed.

Discussion of the committee followed:

- Assuming option 2 is adopted, that will lock us in to city and available to be developed. Option 3 is a “band-aid” approach and keeps us from further development. If we can work out all the details of Option 2A (private pump and annex to the city) would be a lesser cost than option 2 where the city owns everything and we bear all the cost of \$2.8M. The difference between a private/public pump is roughly \$1.5M. There are plusses to option 2. If we go with city owns everything, then they are responsible for maintenance/repairs. We would maintain our existing systems and extend the pipe to the new system. Nothing further required on campus. With option 2 or 2A it would be 2,500 gpm.
- What if we wanted to build housing on campus? Would that prohibit adding housing or would we have sufficient supply. Luke: We would have to build to what the water flow would cover, or upgrade. It is possible that current limitations could go away in the future
- We are discussing Option 2. Are option 1 and 3 off the table? Option 1 is off the table, 2, 2A (preferable) and 3 are still on the table. Option 3 would save us \$1M, and limit our growth. There is no cost difference or good reason to go with a public pump vs. a private pump. If public, then the city has to maintain/replace/repair. Other than routine maintenance, probably 20 years service before major maintenance. Other than testing, hoping not to use/need.
- What do you need from us? ZCS was wanting to give us an update. We can do it in parallel with other construction (Science bldg.) or similar. Curt’s preference is to have the water in and dealt with prior to new construction. If going with option 2A, we would not be limited for future construction. The key issue is the piece of property. We need to find out if anyone has any conversation with Horizon Village. Cathy and Pat Ashley will approach Horizon Village to see if viable. If Horizon Village will not consider selling, then we have to go to option 3.
- From engineering standpoint, no other viable options? Nope, nothing – not with the amount of water that is available to us. We have to comply with OR fire code, not city or county.
- Really only two options: Yes: 2 and 2A and the difference in cost.
- Assuming we can get the property... board’s fiduciary responsibility to the community in building a pump. Torn between staying private pump vs. building a public pump and being a contributing member to the community at large.
- Subcommittee in GP that was looking at a cost share. Without the water project, there is no future in developing the west side of GP. There was hope that this was the answer to a bigger problem for affordable housing in GP.
- Is there a possibility of applying for grants? Pre-disaster Mitigation grant: building to seismic standards and using that as a way to get to the water infrastructure. If fire conflagration act is enacted, then water system could fall under seismic and possibly fire. We could have a viable project for a seismic resiliency FEMA grant. There would be two components: Type of pipe and reservoir that would hold water. On the campus itself, we may be able to get some money for it. If able to partner with city as part of the new water treatment plan project. Grant funds up to \$4M, and we would have to do a 25% match. We would have to show compliance for federal regulations. It is available here in the area because of the fires. RCC would have to do a Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- Option 2 of some sort is looking to be most viable. It seems that we need to be looking to the future and not boxing ourselves in with option 3. We have major issues with our automotive building and something has to be done. We can’t build/use bond money until water issue is resolved. The water has to come first.
- Everyone seems to be in support of option 2 or 2A. Cathy and Pat will meet with Horizon Village to test the appetite.
- Can we get further refining on costs? We need to find out if Horizon Village is even willing to consider the option.

At 3:55pm, Claudia Sullivan left the meeting. A quorum no longer existed and the public meeting adjourned.

11.A.b