

City of Newport
Georgia Pacific Task Force
SUMMARY NOTES
Meeting of February 19, 2009

Meeting Time: 5:30PM

IN ATTENDANCE

Members: Gil Silva, John Clark, Tim Johnson, Roger Hart, Franz Cocenza, Dan McCarthy, George Ragsdale (by phone), Sandy Roumagoux, Charlie Plybon (by phone); City Councilor Lon Brusselback and city staff members Dale Shaddox, Gary Firestone and Lee Ritzman; G-P General Manager Tom Picciano; public present included Dianne Henkels (by phone), Jenny (sp), and Nyla Jevis (sp)

DISCUSSION

Chair Silva opened the meeting at 5:30pm. He announced that he would not be able to attend the next two meetings of the Task Force due to schedule conflicts. John Clark agreed to chair those meetings depending on whether his schedule has no conflict. Otherwise, if neither is present the group will decide on who will chair the meeting.

Chair Silva asked if there are any comments on the Notes from the previous meeting held February 5. Hearing none, he declared the Notes to be acceptable.

It was noted that G-P had submitted the information requested from the last meeting; documents showing the history of pipe repairs and replacements to be discussed later in the meeting.

Public Works Director Lee Ritzman complied with his commitment to furnish information on the physical separation between the G-P effluent pipes and city water lines by briefing the Task Force on map drawings. He showed that the physical separation ranges from about 6ft. to 24ft; the G-P effluent lines are generally at 3.5ft to 4ft in depth; and that the city water lines generally are below the G-P lines where they cross.

The Task Force consented to the addition of a discussion item to the agenda; to discuss the importance of two G-P effluent lines to the City of Newport. The group discussed and noted the following:

- An advantage to a second line is that in the case of a line break the other line could still be in use while repairs are made.
- If there were only one line G-P would need to shut it down in the case of a break, with a diversion to the plant ponds for a maximum of 3 days without shutting down the plant.
- With a second line available G-P is able to shut down one line, leaving the second line in operation, and allowing G-P to schedule the line repair at days/times that would least disrupt the community. This would be most convenient and cost effective in the event of a major repair or replacement project.

- Having two lines in operation results in lower line pressure on each line compared to a single line operating at a higher pressure. The advantage of lower pressure is to minimize the risk of pipe failure.
- If other public entities working in the vicinity accidentally broke a G-P line, it could be immediately shut off to minimize the volume of leakage , allowing the second line to remain in service.
- G-P noted that it has no plans in the near future to replace any lines, and that it has no plans to abandon the north line.

The Task Force then took up discussion of the information that G-P submitted regarding the history of pipe repairs and replacements. Discussion focused on the issues of leak detection, reporting and response protocols, and estimating leakage volumes.

G-P advised that its responses to leaks are on a “as reported/noted” basis and that it has standard operating practices for response including notifying the DEQ, shutting off the leaking pipe for repairs. It was also noted that the plant effluent is essentially ph neutral and therefore not caustic, not the subject of any government regulation as a hazardous substance, and that the protocol for cleanup after human contact is to simply wash off the effluent material with water.

There was a suggestion that the future agreement document between the City and G-P should include an exhibit or appendix defining G-P’s standard operating procedures on leak detection, response, containment, reporting, clean-up and post incident follow-up.

The Task Force then turned its attention to the previously agreed upon format for future meetings, and reconfirmed that the approach to reviewing/considering topics of discussion and the two pipeline column structure agreed upon at the previous meeting would be followed. There was consensus on the notion that both lines should be discussed, but that the Task Force recommendation(s) will not compromise G-P’s easement rights.

The Task Force also agreed that reaching consensus on each topic is probably not achievable, but holds on to the notion that a consensus on the overall work product remains hopefully/maybe achievable. The point of this discussion was that not reaching consensus on any individual topic will not hinder progress of discussion of other topics. Finally, the group is holding on to the notion that it can still accomplish its assigned task within the original 60-90 day period.

The next meeting dates are scheduled as follows, all at 5:30pm, Conference Rm. A at Newport City Hall, except where noted otherwise:

- March 5 (Newport Recreation Center across from City Hall)
- March 19
- April 2
- April 16

Meeting adjourned at 7:40PM