

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

September 13, 2016

The minutes of the proceedings of a special meeting of the City Council of the City of Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon, held at 2 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 500 Central Avenue, Coos Bay, Oregon.

Those Attending

Those present were Mayor Crystal Shoji and Councilors Fred Brick, Mark Daily, Stephanie Kramer, Thomas Leahy, and Mike Vaughan. Councilor Jennifer Groth was absent. City staff present were City Manager Rodger Craddock, City Attorney Nate McClintock, Finance Director Susanne Baker, Public Works Director Jim Hossley, and Wastewater Project Engineer Jennifer Wirsing.

Flag Salute

Mayor Shoji opened the meeting and led the Council and assembly in the salute to the flag.

Public Comments

None.

Award of Contract for an Engineering Evaluation for Wastewater Treatment Plant No. 2 for a Comparison between Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR) and Membrane Bio-Reactor Treatment

Public Works Director Jim Hossley stated on August 16, 2016, Council directed a Request for Proposals (RFP) be solicited to hire an unbiased third party engineering consultant to conduct a wastewater treatment evaluation for the proposed Plant 2 project. The prepared RFP utilized Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) definition of Best Available Technology (BAT) as one of the evaluation criteria. Mr. Hossley read the scope of work:

An unbiased evaluation and comparison of sequencing batch reactor (SBR) and membrane bio-reactor (MBR) treatment; a recommendation for the City; the consultant would review the completed plans for the Coos Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant 2 SBR design and compare construction and operation of that design to an MBR plant on the same site and operating under the same influent flows, loading, and NPDES permit restrictions.

The consulting services anticipated an engineering review team with personnel proficient in wastewater design and management (particularly with SBR and MBR type treatment). Review of the CH2M design plans for a SBR and associated documentation, including the environmental assessment prepared by SHN, the mutual agreement and order with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and the construction management general contractor (CMGC) not-to-exceed budget for construction of the SBR option. Final written report of the evaluation for each parameter; and recommend whether an SBR or MBR and Class A or Class B biosolids would be the best for the community in terms of cost and water quality. Include two matrix tables, one for each type of treatment and one for the biosolids. The report would include cost estimates for each treatment option including capital and life cycle costs.

City Council Minutes – September 13, 2016

Councilor Vaughan entered the meeting at 2:06 p.m.

Kennedy Jenks, Keller and Associates, and Hemphill Water Engineering submitted proposals. A work session was held on September 9, 2016 to discuss the proposals which included Mayor Shoji and Councilors Daily and Groth. The proposal from Kennedy Jenks was non-responsive because it did not address items required in the RFP and Kennedy Jenks focused their proposal incorrectly on conversion of the proposed SBR plant to an MBR plant.

The remaining proposals evaluated were Keller and Associates, \$46,200, and Hemphill Water Engineering, \$46,419. Both firms were qualified, had appropriate staff and experience, accepted the aggressive timeline, and submitted proposals consistent with the RFP. Of the two firms, only Hemphill Water Engineering proposed analysis and modeling of the impact to water quality in the bay which would provide additional environmental data. Staff recommended including a 15% contingency.

Councilor Brick stated he was worried to spend \$53,000 on an evaluation and in his analysis, the MBR would be far better in the long term. Discussion ensued on wastewater topics other than on the agenda wherein City Attorney Nate McClintock stated the only item to discuss and direct was the item listed on the agenda because nothing else was given public notice. Mayor Shoji presented the score sheets from the work session to the Council for their consideration on the agenda item. Councilor Brick stated he did not want to spend the money and would rather see funds and time spent to solicit a RFP for a similar MBR plant. Councilor Kramer stated it would take time to put together an RFP for a MBR plant and to solicit bids. City Attorney Nate McClintock stated the Council was going beyond the topic publicly noticed and recommended they limit discussion to the agenda item.

Councilor Brick moved to save the \$53,000 and not accept any of the RFP's in lieu of next Tuesday night's meeting and have a different discussion. Councilor Vaughan seconded the motion.

Councilor Vaughan stated he liked the Hemphill proposal and their focus on the water quality of the bay. To move forward he would be happy with that, as it had value. However, at the same time the Council knew how much the SBR plant would cost and didn't know how much a MBR would cost. However the Council was able to get to that point, he would be happy with that.

Councilor Kramer asked Mr. Hossley if the MBR had been discussed in the past wherein Mr. Hossley stated yes, through the facilities plan process two or three firms did a comparison. The initial cost and life cycle cost indicated the MBR would cost more than a SBR. Councilor Vaughan stated at that time the value of the estuary was not considered part of the cost and he had since become aware of different MBR systems. Councilor Vaughan stated he was not concerned with the cost but with the natural resources and water quality.

Councilor Brick stated his only qualm with the Hemphill study was it would use preexisting data in the model and he was not sure if it would be worth the value of which we may already know the result. If the data would be new, it might be interesting.

City Council Minutes – September 13, 2016

City Manager Rodger Craddock stated consideration should be given to not just the initial cost but the life cycle cost of the SBR and MBR as it would impact rates going forward. A MBR plant was estimated to cost 25% more to operate than a SBR plant. This was the Council's initial impetus to ask an independent third party what was the best available technology for the community.

Wastewater Project Engineer Jennifer Wirsing stated the scope of work in the RFP did refer to economic and non-economic impacts to address the water quality concerns. Both of the qualified third party consultants would take that information into consideration when modeling the impact to the bay. The existing DEQ, South Slough Sanctuary, and Coos Watershed data would be placed into their model. Councilor Leahy asked if the Coos Watershed data would be included wherein Ms. Wirsing stated yes; the City did not analyze water quality of the bay, just the water quality of the effluent going into the bay.

A call for the question was made. Councilor Vaughan asked if the Council could later decide to accept one of the RFP's if the proposed motion failed. City Attorney Nate McClintock stated the prevailing voters would be able to make a motion to bring the issue back. Councilor Vaughan stated he saw value in hiring Hemphill and Councilor Brick's point but did not want to lose the right to visit both in the future. City Manager Craddock stated waiting might cause the timeline to be adjusted and results might not be available until the next Council was seated.

A call for the question was made which carried with Mayor Shoji and Councilors Brick, Daily, Kramer, and Vaughan voting aye and Councilor Leahy voting nay. Councilor Groth was absent.

Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Council, Mayor Shoji adjourned the meeting. The next regular Council meeting was scheduled for September 20, 2016 in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Attest:



Susanne Baker, City Recorder



Crystal Shoji, Mayor