

July 20, 2015  
5:15 P.M.  
Newport, Oregon

The City Council of the City of Newport met in a Work Session, on the above date, in the City Council Chambers, of the Newport City Hall. On roll call, Swanson, Engler, Busby, Sawyer, Saelens, and Roumagoux were present. Allen arrived at 5:33 P.M.

Staff attending was as follows: City Manager Nebel, City Recorder Hawker, City Attorney Rich, and Public Works Director Gross.

Also in attendance was Verena Winter from HDR Engineering

Nebel reported that Verena Winter would be making a presentation on the seismic evaluation of the Big Creek Dams.

Winter stated that the first 30 pages of the report contains the summary, with the remainder of the report containing supporting documentation. She made a PowerPoint presentation that included: an overview of the project; verification of the seismic deficiencies of the dams; corrective action alternatives; a project timeline from April 2011 to June 2015; engineering analysis/deficiency verification of both dams; deformation problem rather than a stability problem; alternatives for corrective actions related to storage capacity; five initial options with three remaining viable alternatives; option including raising and modifying the existing dam; a new roller compacted concrete dam; or a new embankment dam. She reviewed the three alternatives and recommended the roller compacted concrete dam. She recommended eliminating the option of raising the modifying the existing dam, and reported that the roller compacted concrete dam would cost approximately \$19,000,000, while the embankment dam, without the spillway, would cost approximately \$17,800,000.

Winter reported that a decision needed to be made on the advantages and disadvantages of both remaining options. She stated that while both dams have deficiencies, it is not economically feasible to save the lower dam. She noted that current and future water storage could be combined at the upper dam if it is enlarged. She added that both remaining options will comply with state earthquake standards.

Winter reported that the roller compacted concrete dam would include a spillway; involve less construction time; a smaller footprint; a better intake structure; less environmental impact; better seismic resiliency; and less maintenance than a new embankment dam.

A discussion ensued regarding next steps. It was noted that next steps include: a definition of the dam failure consequences; identification of appropriate design criteria; geotechnical verification; budgetary cost estimates; the start of the environmental permitting process; and a comprehensive survey.

Swanson asked what would happen if the lower dam was removed. Allen asked about dam resiliency, and what size of earthquake the dams could withstand. Gross noted that sustainability during an earthquake is related to duration of the earthquake. Allen asked

about the difference between annual maintenance costs of the two options. Gross reported that the city is required to maintain the vegetation, on the earthen dam, below a certain height, and control erosion and varmints. Swanson asked about the lifespan of the roller compacted concrete dam, and Winter noted that she would check with the dam safety personnel. Sawyer asked where the city would obtain funding. Gross reported that the actual cost of the dam would probably be closer to 50 million dollars. He noted that he is meeting with federal agencies now, but that there is some money for preliminary design, in this fiscal year, so that grant opportunities can be pursued.

It was noted that Council can do nothing or choose a course of action, but that a decision at this meeting is not a final decision on what will occur, simply direction to move forward and pursue every angle to help plan and fund the project.

Nebel noted that there are two motions for Council consideration at the regular meeting: one is to accept the report; and the other is to provide preliminary direction for staff to begin pursuing alternative two. Gross added that if direction was given to pursue alternative two, the roller compacted concrete dam, the next step would be to draft a scope of work with the consultant which would be brought back to the City Council for approval. Swanson asked Gross which of the two proposals that he preferred, and he noted that the ideal is the roller compacted concrete dam. He added that regardless of which option is chosen, the lower dam will be eliminated, and the upper reservoir will be larger. Swanson asked how long it would be before a report was made available to Council, and Gross reported that it would take at least a year.

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:04 P.M.