

**Responses of leading Portland City  
Council candidates**

on

**Portland Water Users  
Coalition/Friends of the  
Reservoirs**

**Water Issues Questionnaire**

April 17, 2012

Contact: Kent Craford 503-961-4191

# **Eileen Brady**

# Portland Water Users Coalition and Friends of the Reservoirs

## JOINT CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Portland Water Users Coalition  
2225 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite 208  
Portland, OR 97212  
503.961.4191

### **1. What is your vision for the Portland Water Bureau?**

Commissioner Leonard is retiring, so there will be an obvious opportunity from new leadership at the Water Bureau. Prices have consistently risen for ratepayers, leading Portland to have some of the highest metropolitan water rates in the country. The rise in rates has likely played a role in the loss of businesses and jobs from Portland. We cannot afford to allow good jobs to leave Portland or have businesses resist relocating here due to the cost of water. These increases also create particular hardship for our seniors and many Portland families already struggling economically.

The rise in rates has not been the doing of a single commissioner, but rather the entire City Council. The back room deals and horse-trading at City Hall have been going on for decades and have allowed non-mission critical projects to be approved time and again.

As Mayor, I will put an end to the back room deals.

The City Council's handling of the Water Bureau has caused the public to lose confidence that current officials can put a stop to the steady rate increases.

This is an important matter to all citizens of Portland, as it affects residents and business alike. The rise in water rates leaves less money for families to pay their bills and for businesses to hire more workers.

I view the restoration of a Water Bureau that is solely focused on mission critical projects to be of paramount importance to the citizens of Portland and to my administration as Mayor.

I pledge to keep the City Council and the Water Bureau focused on providing water to the ratepayers of Portland as safely, efficiently, and cost-effectively as possible.

**2. What will you do as a member of the Portland City Council to repair the relationship between the Portland Water Bureau and its customers?**

First, I will work tirelessly to re-establish basic trust between ratepayers and the City Council. I will ensure that decisions aren't made behind closed doors and that citizen input is considered and valued. Presently, there is not a sufficient role for citizens to play in capital improvement projects. I believe we need to tap into our citizen and business communities in order to find solutions that work for all of us. I will reinstitute the Charter Commission, which gives the public a voice. I will ask private citizens, from all segments of our community, to serve on the budget advisory committee and we will listen to their recommendations. The best way to reestablish trust is to have more transparency around the process. I will make transparency a hallmark of my administration and we'll make sure citizens' time and input is valued by getting more things done.

**3. Do you believe water rates are too high, too low or about right? What level of rates do you believe are justified and appropriate? Please explain.**

I believe that water rates are too high. Water rates have gone up 55% since 2008, and rose 150% from 2000-2010. As Mayor, I would work to reverse the trend in water rate increases. At the same time, we must protect the safety of our watershed, ensuring it that endures for generations to come. We must deliver water efficiently and cost effectively to businesses and citizens at a rate that will not discourage people from living or doing business here. We must focus solely on mission critical projects so that rates do not rise for reasons outside of the Water Bureau's purview. When we have accomplished these goals, I am confident that Portlanders will cherish some of the best municipal drinking water in the country and will feel that the water rates are acceptable.

**4. Do you believe Portland water rates should be rising at a greater rate than median income?**

No. Water rates have risen faster than the growth in median income in Portland and these price increases have disproportionately affected our lower income residents. Increased water rates mean that families have less money to feed their children, pay bills, and save money for the future. We need to focus on practices that bring water rates down.

**5. Do you believe Portland's Bull Run water should be additionally treated by either ultraviolet (UV) radiation or by chemical coagulation/filtration?**

No. Public health officials agree that UV radiation and chemical coagulation filtration is not necessary. We have some of the cleanest natural drinking water in the country. There is no reason for our citizens to spend this money.

**6. Do you support taking the City's open drinking water reservoirs at Mt. Tabor and Washington Park offline and replacing that water storage with buried tanks?**

No. I served on the Mt. Tabor Reservoirs Independent Review Panel in 2004, and I said then, as I say now, there is no reason to spend \$400 million to cover some of the purest drinking water in the United States.

**7. Do you support current City policy to work with the Congressional delegation and the EPA to pursue relief from the raw water treatment and storage requirements of the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule ("LT2") for Portland's drinking water?**

I certainly support working with our congressional delegation and the EPA, but the City has not been aggressive enough in advocating for our local interests. This is an example of the need for new leadership at City Hall. As Mayor, I would get out in front of this effort and personally lobby the EPA and the White House. We can't sit by and let the federal government decide what needs or doesn't need to be done in Oregon. I would make it a priority to share our concerns and to propose a more effective and sensible way to proceed. New York has been actively engaging officials in the District of Columbia and, as a result, they have had much more influence over their destiny. We must work with our entire congressional delegation to make sure that we proactively engage the federal government and I will lead that collaborative effort.

**8. Do you support the Portland Water Bureau's plan to exchange land with the US Forest Service?**

I think we need to be very careful before we enter into any land exchange agreement with the USFS. We must consider this issue more completely and fully understand all the implications before the City moves forward with any land swap plans. It is important to balance the best of the protection safeguards in both Federal law and City code. Public involvement in this process will be essential to ensure that the concerns of the community are being addressed. Additionally, we need to further investigate and account for all of the financial implications of this proposed land swap. There are various costs that may rise or fall depending upon the details; for instance we need more clarity about which entity would be responsible for the costs of maintaining the existing infrastructure in the management area.

**9. Will you support a public process for input when logging exceptions are proposed for Cityowned land in the Bull Run Management Unit?**

Yes. The Bull Run Management Unit contains the watershed for Portlanders. It is a part of the public trust and the public must have input when any plans are being made that may affect our watershed. Our citizens deserve the opportunity to be certain that any decisions made will be beneficial to the community as a whole. In order to restore the trust of the public and ratepayers, we need a greater effort to incorporate public process into our watershed management.

**10. Do you support the Bull Run Tour program?**

No. This is an example of why the public has lost trust in the City Council. Ratepayers have been subsidizing the purchase of a tour bus, along with salaries for a bus driver and tour director. I don't see how this falls under the scope of the Water Bureau's essential services, yet it was approved by the Council. In addition to affecting rate payers, bringing over 6,000 people over the past 3 years into our fragile watershed has increased the risk of contamination to our water supply, which potentially could lead to serious financial and health implications.

**11. Who do you believe should be assigned Commissioner-in-Charge of the Portland Water Bureau in 2013 and why?**

I believe it is premature to make decisions about which Bureaus will be assigned to which Commissioner until the make up of the Council is determined by the voters. I will make the assignment in part based on this objective; in order for jobs and employers to flourish in Portland, it is vital that businesses and residents feel confident in water rates and watershed security now and in the future.

**12. Do you support the current Portland Water Bureau executive management, or will do you believe there should be a change in leadership? If you answer "yes," please explain the qualifications you believe the PWB should require in new executive manager(s).**

As with any change in leadership, an evaluation of present management is essential. I'm focused on outcomes. We need management in place at the Water Bureau that can deliver mission critical projects on time and on budget. We need management that has experience in managing large-scale construction projects that cost hundreds of millions of dollars. We need management that can balance value-added improvements within budget restrictions.

**13. Do you believe the Portland Water Bureau's current staff level of 624 FTEs is too high, too low, or about right? Please explain your answer.**

The staff at the Water Bureau has risen by about 150 over the last 8 years. We need the Water Bureau to focus on mission critical projects and it needs a staff size that reflects that objective. One of my first actions as Mayor will be to identify inefficiencies in all bureaus regarding staffing levels. If the Water Bureau can achieve its mission with fewer employees, then its current staffing levels needs to be reduced.

**14. Do you support citizen's rights to full disclosure of the details of the specific purposes of indebtedness (and level of indebtedness) that the Water Bureau is incurring on behalf of citizens?**

Yes. The Water Bureau is a part of the city of Portland and we are all liable for its debt. The public deserves to know what financial liabilities are being held by this public entity.

**15. Would you support a change in City policy regarding the use of the "emergency" clause in ordinances (e.g. an imminent threat to safety or property) before an ordinance is deemed an "emergency?"**

The use of the emergency clause has been used to push projects through the City Council that do not appear to be mission critical. In actual cases of emergencies, it is vital that we have the ability to approve projects. As Mayor, I will not support using this clause for issues that are not true emergencies. Rather than change the clause to prevent the Council from approving projects that are not true emergencies, we need the Council to not abuse the clause.

**16. Please provide your analysis of the sustainability of Portland's 20-year decline in retail water consumption.**

The demand for water has been decreasing, while the price for water has gone up. Demand has decreased due to increasing conservation efforts among consumers and the departure from Portland of some of the largest commercial users. As demand has decreased, water rates have continued to rise, leaving those of us who remain on the hook for an increasingly larger share of the bill. This is partially the result of the Bureau's fixed costs. There are two ways to get prices to decrease; bring more users (namely large commercial users) to Portland or lower the amount of money spent on projects for which rate-payers are liable. As mayor I will work towards both solutions.

**17. If a citizen initiative is launched to spin the Portland Water Bureau off into a separate Peoples Utility District, would you support or oppose that effort? Why?**

If the residents of Portland prefer a People's Utility District for managing water, I would not stand in their way. The City of Portland and the Portland Water Bureau are here to serve the residents of Portland. If citizens feel that a PUD may serve them better, we should welcome that discussion.

**18. Do you believe there is adequate oversight of the Portland Water Bureau? What is your preferred mechanism for oversight of Water Bureau budget and its projects?**

Most importantly we need to restore the public trust and to do this we must have increased transparency. The public is the best measure of oversight available. If the public is adequately involved in the decision making process, then the issue of oversight becomes moot. I support a Water Bureau that focuses on mission critical projects that deliver water safely, efficiently, equitably, and cost-effectively to all of its ratepayers. With increased public involvement, I feel we can achieve all of those goals.

**19. Do you support using water and sewer funds for City projects that are not directly related to the provision of water and sewer services? Please provide examples of the types of projects you believe are appropriate uses of these funds and those that are not.**

No. I believe the Water Bureau has a duty to ratepayers to solely fulfill its mission. There have been numerous examples of projects that were not mission critical. The tours to the Bull Run Management Unit are not mission critical and put the fragile watershed at increased risk of contamination. The Water House is another example of a project that should not have been approved by the City Council. I do support projects that protect the safety of the watershed, improve the efficiency of delivery, and increase the cost effectiveness of service.

**20. Do you support the assessment of a Utility License Fee on Portland water and sewer rates?**

We have a Utility License Fee that incentivizes increasing the budget on projects in order to add more money to the general fund. The issue that most concerns me is that this acts as a de facto tax-increase that is not subject to normal approval processes. While it does supply vital funds to the general fund, we need to limit the expansion of the fee. I propose capping the fee at its current dollar amount so that the general fund does not lose money, but which will also limit the incentive to increase the size of projects.



# Charlie Hales

**Note: Charlie Hales declined to answer 15 of the 20 questions. They are listed here. The questions he did answer follow.**

**2. What will you do as a member of the Portland City Council to repair the relationship between the Portland Water Bureau and its customers?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**3. Do you believe water rates are too high, too low or about right? What level of rates do you believe are justified and appropriate? Please explain.**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**6. Do you support taking the City's open drinking water reservoirs at Mt. Tabor and Washington Park offline and replacing that water storage with buried tanks?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**7. Do you support current City policy to work with the Congressional delegation and the EPA to pursue relief from the raw water treatment and storage requirements of the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule ("LT2") for Portland's drinking water?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**8. Do you support the Portland Water Bureau's plan to exchange land with the US Forest Service?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**9. Will you support a public process for input when logging exceptions are proposed for City owned land in the Bull Run Management Unit?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**10. Do you support the Bull Run Tour program?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**11. Who do you believe should be assigned Commissioner-in-Charge of the Portland Water Bureau in 2013 and why?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**12. Do you support the current Portland Water Bureau executive management, or will do you believe there should be a change in leadership? If you answer "yes," please explain the qualifications you believe the PWB should require in**

**new executive manager(s).**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**13. Do you believe the Portland Water Bureau's current staff level of 624 FTEs is too high, too low, or about right? Please explain your answer.**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**14. Do you support citizen's rights to full disclosure of the details of the specific purposes of indebtedness (and level of indebtedness) that the Water Bureau is incurring on behalf of citizens?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**15. Would you support a change in City policy regarding the use of the "emergency" clause in ordinances (e.g. an imminent threat to safety or property) before an ordinance is deemed an "emergency?"**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**17. If a citizen initiative is launched to spin the Portland Water Bureau off into a separate Peoples Utility District, would you support or oppose that effort? Why?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**18. Do you believe there is adequate oversight of the Portland Water Bureau? What is your preferred mechanism for oversight of Water Bureau budget and its projects?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**20. Do you support the assessment of a Utility License Fee on Portland water and sewer rates?**

**DECLINED TO ANSWER**

**To Interested Parties**  
**From: Charlie Hales**

**Thank you for your interest in water issues in Portland. I am happy to provide answers to general questions about the current and future of the Portland Water system. I have left out answers to those questions that could potentially undermine parties involved in any component of current litigation involving the city; in this case, between water users and the City of Portland. Please contact me with comments or questions at [www.charliehales.com](http://www.charliehales.com)**

**1. What is your vision for the Water Bureau?**

- a. To provide a sufficient quantity of water to meet the community's needs, consistent with a very high level of conservation, stewardship and sustainable environmental management.
- b. To deliver water that meets or exceeds all relevant public health and environmental standards.
- c. To protect and maintain Portland's water infrastructure, which is the most valuable infrastructure system owned by Portland's citizens and the system most difficult to maintain (being largely underground and full of water).
- d. To accomplish all of these high standards in a manner that does not burden the system's ratepayers at any level greater than necessary to fulfill the Bureau's core mission with consistent excellence.
- e. To operate, like all City bureaus, in an open, fair and responsible manner.

**2. Do you believe Portland water rates should be rising at a greater rate than median income?**

Water rates cannot be tied to external economic indicators such as median income or cost-of-living indices. The costs of a water system are driven not by external economic factors but by issues such as the system age, its rate of deterioration, the extent to which needed maintenance has been deferred in the past, costs of energy and a host of other factors specific to maintaining and operating the system. The point is to determine the levels of water quality, quantity and maintenance that the community demands and then to manage the system in a manner that achieves these goals at the optimal cost. Parts of our system are more than 100 years old. We have probably not invested as much as we should have done in system maintenance in the past. It is also important to note that wholesaling Portland water to our neighbors has helped keep our rates down for many years, perhaps as much as 20% below where they would have been otherwise. Maintaining positive regional relationships is a key element in controlling Portland's water rates.

**Do you believe Portland's Bull Run water should be additionally treated by either ultraviolet (UV) radiation or by chemical coagulation/filtration?**

I believe that Bull Run and Portland Groundwater systems must meet Safe Drinking Water Act requirements. I do not believe that the Federal government should require a specific treatment modality for every system in the country but should instead allow unique systems, such as ours, to achieve SDWA requirements in the way that works best at the least cost to ratepayers. The City and the Water Bureau have argued this case since the 1980s and I support it.

**3. Who do you believe should be assigned Commissioner-in-Charge of the Portland Water Bureau in 2013 and why?**

I have said that I will hold all the Bureaus in the Mayor's portfolio for at least three months after taking office, in order to work on focusing the City Council as a team dedicated to the City as a whole, rather than to individual bureau portfolios. During that period, I will meet with the Commissioners to explore their own ideas and interests in this regard. The City Council will include at least two new members and it may include three. Bureau assignments will be made with the workload, philosophy and needs of each Council member, each Bureau, and the City as a whole in mind. I have no preconceived ideas about a preferred Commissioner for the Water Bureau at this time.

**4. Please provide your analysis of the sustainability of Portland's 20-year decline in retail water consumption.**

The level of reduction in our system's consumption is typical of that experienced by water systems all over the U.S. and the industrialized world. Most of this reduction is due to sustained educational efforts in water conservation, advances in water-using machines and processes and public awareness of the value of water. At some point, the per-capita consumption will level off. For Portland ratepayers, the key question will be the extent to which Portland retains its wholesale customer base among suburban users, which underwrites our rates substantially. I am concerned that the current City administration has not maintained positive regional water partnerships in the way that I would like, and I intend to correct that situation. It is important to remember that the costs of maintaining a water utility are not much affected by reductions in consumption, except as it may affect the need for future expansions. Lower demand does not, unfortunately, equal lower utility operating costs and lower rates. In fact, it usually means that fewer customers must divide up the fixed costs of the system, especially as the system ages. So maintaining our customer base becomes crucial to holding rates down as much as possible.

**5. Do you support using water and sewer funds for City projects that are not directly related to the provision of water and sewer services? Please provide examples of the types of projects you believe are appropriate uses of these funds and those that are not.**

I emphatically do NOT support using these funds for purposes such as described in your question and I have spoken out on this issue publicly for at least a year. I read with interest the City Auditor's March, 2011 audit report titled "*Spending Utility Ratepayer Money: Not Always Linked to Services, Decision Process Inconsistent*". The report's title says it all. The audit report provides good examples of projects that would be inappropriate to fund through Water and Sewer rates, such as the Office of Healthy Working Rivers and turning over assets to the Rose Festival Association. This problem of spending outside the boundaries of our Charter language was not a problem when I served on the City Council. I will return our enterprise fund management and direction to a solid footing, well within the intent of our Charter.

Jefferson Smith

**Portland Water Users Coalition and  
Friends of the Reservoirs**  
JOINT CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE  
Portland Water Users Coalition  
2225 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite 208  
Portland, OR 97212  
503.961.4191  
Please respond by Friday, April 13th

**1. What is your vision for the Portland Water Bureau?**

We should spend water and sewer money on water- and sewer-related expenses, while keeping in mind long-term costs. We also need to work with our federal allies so we're not needlessly capping reservoirs or building treatment plants for cryptosporidium we don't have.

**2. What will you do as a member of the Portland City Council to repair the relationship between the Portland Water Bureau and its customers?**

I will increase transparency and focus on the Bureau's mission and core priorities.

**3. Do you believe water rates are too high, too low or about right? What level of rates do you believe are justified and appropriate? Please explain.**

Portland has some of the highest sewer and water rates in the country, and those rates have increased too steeply in recent years. I support an independent review board to ensure that rate increases are needed before they are proposed. I support keeping the accountability of elected officials by requiring a vote to increase rates.

**4. Do you believe Portland water rates should be rising at a greater rate than median income?**

The rates are rising too quickly.

**5. Do you believe Portland's Bull Run water should be additionally treated by either ultraviolet (UV) radiation or by chemical coagulation/filtration?**

No. The Bull Run Watershed is one of Portland's greatest natural strengths. I have heard from more than one scientist that covering or treating the drinking water sourced from it is unnecessary, so I don't support covering or treating it.

**6. Do you support taking the City's open drinking water reservoirs at Mt. Tabor and Washington Park offline and replacing that water storage with buried tanks?**

No. The New York congressional delegation fought for local waivers. We should do likewise. A mayor should carefully pick the opportunities to fight the federal government. Areas of this magnitude qualify.

I was glad to see the Oregon Health Authority's determination that treating Bull Run source water for Cryptosporidium is not necessary to protect the public's health. The OHA issued the variance requested by the City of Portland. As Mayor, I will work with the Drinking Water Program to enforce federal regulations that ensure safe drinking water, but will advocate for flexibility to tailor enforcement to meet the specific conditions in our city.

I heard that Portland Water Bureau did not give City Council or the public opportunity to discuss alternatives for complying with the EPA reservoir "treat or cover" requirement. That would not happen in my administration.

**7. Do you support current City policy to work with the Congressional delegation and the EPA to pursue relief from the raw water treatment and storage requirements of the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule ("LT2") for Portland's drinking water?**

Yes.

**8. Do you support the Portland Water Bureau's plan to exchange land with the US Forest Service?**

I won't make a final determination until we get the EIS back, but I'm cautiously supportive. It makes sense to consolidate our land so we can manage it more effectively.

**9. Will you support a public process for input when logging exceptions are proposed for Cityowned land in the Bull Run Management Unit?**

Yes. Public processes and opportunities for public input are crucial.

**10. Do you support the Bull Run Tour program?**

In tough budget times, I'm cautious about funding a tour program. I support its educational objectives, but we must make sure to fund our core functions first. There might be more cost effective ways to achieve those objectives.

**11. Who do you believe should be assigned Commissioner-in-Charge of the Portland Water Bureau in 2013 and why?**

I will delegate based on interest and capability. I will work with my colleagues on the



council to best determine their strengths and interests, and divide bureaus accordingly. We should be humble about assigning bureaus 9 months prior to taking office. I will defer making commitments about bureau assignments until we know who will be on the next city council.

**12. Do you support the current Portland Water Bureau executive management, or will do you believe there should be a change in leadership? If you answer “yes,” please explain the qualifications you believe the PWB should require in new executive manager(s).**

I don't want to make commitments about bureau management nine months in advance of taking office. They have a job to do and I don't want to make it more difficult.

**13. Do you believe the Portland Water Bureau's current staff level of 624 FTEs is too high, too low, or about right? Please explain your answer.**

Staff size review will be a part of my budgeting process, and we'll look to increase efficiencies. I will look to trim middle management. I carried HB 2020 in the House to shrink middle management ratios to prioritize services and front line workers. That bill can give us some guidance on how we might set an aspirational level for staff-management ratios.

**14. Do you support citizen's rights to full disclosure of the details of the specific purposes of indebtedness (and level of indebtedness) that the Water Bureau is incurring on behalf of citizens?**

Yes.

**15. Would you support a change in City policy regarding the use of the "emergency" clause in ordinances (e.g. an imminent threat to safety or property) before an ordinance is deemed an "emergency?"**

I can imagine situations other than an imminent threat where we'd want to put a law into place quickly. I'd look first to other ways to improve transparency and public review.

**16. Please provide your analysis of the sustainability of Portland's 20-year decline in retail water consumption.**

We need to take water use into account when setting rates.

**17. If a citizen initiative is launched to spin the Portland Water Bureau off into a separate Peoples Utility District, would you support or oppose that effort? Why?**

I'm open to the suggestion, and I'll be looking into a number of options to increase accountability. At this point my preference would be for an independent utility commission rather than a new district with a separate set of elected leaders.

**18. Do you believe there is adequate oversight of the Portland Water Bureau? What is your preferred mechanism for oversight of Water Bureau budget and its projects?**

I'll work with you to increase oversight, including by increasing transparency and citizen review. I think we need expanded independent rate review. We should maintain electoral accountability for final decisions.

**19. Do you support using water and sewer funds for City projects that are not directly related to the provision of water and sewer services? Please provide examples of the types of projects you believe are appropriate uses of these funds and those that are not.**

As I said above, we should spend water and sewer money on water- and sewer-related expenses, while keeping in mind long-term costs. I support education strongly, but college scholarships seem outside the scope of the bureau.

**20. Do you support the assessment of a Utility License Fee on Portland water and sewer rates?**

I will look into the fee. I have concerns about it being directed to non-utility-related projects.

Amanda Fritz

**1. What is your vision for the Portland Water Bureau?**

The PWB's stated Vision is: "The Portland Water Bureau provides the highest quality water, customer service and stewardship of the critical infrastructure, fiscal, and natural resources entrusted to our care. We enhance public health and safety and contribute to the economic viability and livability of the Portland metropolitan region. We are a recognized leader among water service agencies across the country."

I agree, and my vision adds, "We understand we are stewards of precious, pure drinking water resources in Portland, and we are accountable to all our users as well as to the City Council and Commissioner in Charge. We take pride in being a public utility agency with responsibility for the long term public good of our present and future actions."

**2. What will you do as a member of the Portland City Council to repair the relationship between the Portland Water Bureau and its customers?**

I will keep doing what I've been doing throughout my first term – establishing open and honest communication within City government and with Portlanders all over the city. I will act every week on every issue, taking care to spend taxpayers' and ratepayers' money wisely. What you've seen from me in my first three years is what you can expect from me throughout my second term. My staff members have regularly attended the Water Bureau BAC and City PURB meetings, and I review the Rate bureau budgets thoroughly even though I am not yet the Commissioner in Charge. I go that extra mile and don't leave things to chance. I listen and respond to Water Bureau customers as well as communicating with Bureau staff. My staff and I have already started rebuilding trust both with PWB and with customers in the community.

In my first term, with the Public Involvement Advisory Council staffed through the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, I instituted the Public Involvement Statement as a required report to Council on every Agenda item. In my second term, I will call for adding an assessment of rate impacts associated with all new city projects being presented to City Council for approval, and for an assessment of the impacts of proposals on local businesses. I will continue to work to increase public transparency of PWB operations and impacts to rates.

As the Oregonian said in their 4/5/12 endorsement, I think "more like a citizen than a politician". I am "principled, smart, thoughtful and conscientious". By continuing to communicate with and advocate for Water Bureau customers, I will succeed in repairing broken relationships – especially if I am assigned the Water Bureau, when I am no longer the rookie on City Council.

**3. Do you believe water rates are too high, too low or about right? What level of rates do you believe are justified and appropriate? Please explain**

Water rates are too high, and I will continue to work to reduce them. I lowered the rate increase by 6% in 2009, and I voted against the rate increase in 2010 and 2011. I am advocating against adding 2% for switching to monthly billing in this budget. I am asking for potential savings in operations, since no cuts are being proposed by the bureau. If assigned the Water Bureau, I will dig deeply into every line item in the PWB budget to determine where operational and capital efficiencies can be made. I succeeded in avoiding adding any costs into the 2012-13 budget for taking the open reservoirs off line. If re-elected, I will lead a citywide public process to evaluate the most cost-effective methods of complying with federal mandates, and I will continue to lobby to change the LT2 rules. LT2 continues to burden rates.

**4. Do you believe Portland water rates should be rising at a greater rate than median income?**

No.

**5. Do you believe Portland's Bull Run water should be additionally treated by either ultraviolet (UV) radiation or by chemical coagulation/filtration?**

No. I led the successful battle to avoid filtration, and supported PWB's successful request for the variance on treatment with UV radiation. I will also oppose adding fluoride to our precious pure water, especially by fiat from Salem without appropriate public process.

**6. Do you support taking the City's open drinking water reservoirs at Mt. Tabor and Washington Park offline and replacing that water storage with buried tanks?**

No. That decision has not been made in a public process. If re-elected, I will lead a citywide public process to evaluate options and make decisions involving the community and water users, and I will continue to lobby to change the LT2 rules.

**7. Do you support current City policy to work with the Congressional delegation and the EPA to pursue relief from the raw water treatment and storage requirements of the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule ("LT2") for Portland's drinking water?**

Yes. And we must do more. This issue should continue to be top of our federal legislative agenda. In 2009, I initiated a process to include citizens in setting our lobbying priorities. Giving Portlanders multiple opportunities to affect the City of Portland's federal and state priorities and change Council direction will continue to happen if I am re-elected.

**8. Do you support the Portland Water Bureau's plan to exchange land with the US Forest Service?**

I voted for the swap, after examining the issues carefully. It seems prudent and reasonable. I will continue to be cautious on any such proposals, looking for hidden agendas as well as the issue on the surface. I will continue to listen to and work with BARK and other watchdog groups.

**9. Will you support a public process for input when logging exceptions are proposed for City-owned land in the Bull Run Management Unit?**

Yes.

**10. Do you support the Bull Run Tour program?**

Yes and no. I believe the program should be limited to one visit per person per lifetime, with occasional exceptions (for instance, if a person visited as a school student then wants to chaperone their own child's visit). I have visited once on a trip with my son's class, and I was amazed and inspired. Since then I have declined invitations to visit again. As the Commissioner in Charge, I will assess the frequency of trips, and protocols/protections in place to prevent the inadvertent introduction of organisms that could harm the Bull Run watershed and water supply. Although educating the public on the challenges facing the protection of our Bull Run resource is crucial to sustaining that protection, we may need to curtail the frequency of the tours for economic and environmental reasons.

**11. Who do you believe should be assigned Commissioner-in-Charge of the Portland Water Bureau in 2013 and why?**

Re-elected Commissioner Amanda Fritz! I have earned the assignment. I have shown fiscal responsibility and excellent management skills in the bureaus given to me as the rookie on Council, and I have made significant changes in PWB policies and direction even when it isn't "my" bureau. I will lobby hard to persuade whoever is Mayor next year that I have earned the opportunity to use my skills in community process on controversial issues with the PWB.

**12. Do you support the current Portland Water Bureau executive management, or will do you believe there should be a change in leadership? If you answer "yes," please explain the qualifications you believe the PWB should require in new executive manager(s).**

It's impossible to say before being the Commissioner in Charge. David Shaff has been very responsive to my questions and requests for information. He also understands and respects the Commission form of government, and his responsibility to the current Commissioner in Charge. I expect all my Bureau directors to understand and implement my commitment to transparent, inclusive,

accountable decision-making including citizens, ratepayers and taxpayers as true partners. I work as an elected leader in a participatory democracy. The current Commissioner in Charge sees his role differently. I would like to work with Director Shaff to see how he responds to my new direction.

**13. Do you believe the Portland Water Bureau's current staff level of 624 FTEs is too high, too low, or about right? Please explain your answer.**

Almost certainly too high. PWB has added staff while other bureaus have cut. Positions were created to accommodate staff moved over from the Bureau of Development Services when that bureau's staffing was cut in half. BDS is now recovering. 2013 will be the right time for a new Commissioner to evaluate management and front line staffing, and make appropriate adjustments.

**14. Do you support citizen's rights to full disclosure of the details of the specific purposes of indebtedness (and level of indebtedness) that the Water Bureau is incurring on behalf of citizens?**

Yes.

**15. Would you support a change in City policy regarding the use of the "emergency" clause in ordinances (e.g. an imminent threat to safety or property) before an ordinance is deemed an "emergency?"**

Yes. This will take a Charter change. I have committed to establishing a new Charter Commission soon after the new Mayor takes office. Some items on the agenda are listed as Emergency inappropriately. Other items are needlessly delayed for 30 days before being implemented. In 2011, it was not the time to spend hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' money on an extensive Charter Commission. As we climb out of the recession, Portlanders will have more time and the Council will hopefully have more money to support a Charter Commission that can address issues like Emergency ordinances, utility rate setting process, and other important concepts.

**16. Please provide your analysis of the sustainability of Portland's 20-year decline in retail water consumption.**

It's great that Portlanders are conserving our precious water resources. We must continue and enhance efforts to avoid wasting water. The City needs to attract more businesses needing pure Bull Run water, to compensate for lost retail demand. Micro-breweries and electronics manufacturers are two industries that can expand further.

**17. If a citizen initiative is launched to spin the Portland Water Bureau off into a separate Peoples Utility District, would you support or oppose that effort? Why?**

I value Oregon's citizen initiative process, and of course I respect the outcomes decided by voters. I would oppose such a measure. The Water Bureau is a public responsibility and asset that belongs to all the people of Portland and our ratepayers. The City can and should integrate stewardship responsibilities and neighborhood connections in ways that a Utility District could not, since at the City the same elected representatives are responsible for both.

While a Peoples' Utility District sounds like it would be public, it would further fragment and multiply the many agencies affecting Portlanders. I'm told there are nine jurisdictions overlapping in our city. When Portlanders contact me about the PWB, I can address their concerns and find answers, even though I'm not the Commissioner in charge. When they ask me about problems with TriMet, or Metro, or Multnomah County services, I have to refer them elsewhere. We already have too much dispersal of responsibility and accountability.

I voted for a Resolution that states as binding City policy that the PWB will never privatize Bull Run water, an amendment added at my request. I will seek further steps to protect our Bull Run water supply from privatization, to strengthen the language in the July 2009 Resolution, if needed. I don't see the problems and/or goals a Water Utility District would be cost-effective or helpful in solving/achieving.

**18. Do you believe there is adequate oversight of the Portland Water Bureau? What is your preferred mechanism for oversight of Water Bureau budget and its projects?**

The current oversight of the PWB is Commissioner Leonard, as the Commissioner in charge, with input during the budget process by the Council, the Portland Utility Review Board and the bureau Budget Advisory Committee. This oversight has not been enough to earn trust with water users. My preferred mechanism for oversight is for Amanda Fritz to be the Commissioner in Charge in 2013. I would institute a year-round Bureau Advisory Committee, including members of the PURB. I will continue to assign my staff to attend the BAC and PURB. I have nominated several community members to appointments on the PURB, including its current chair. I am asking in the current budget for a year-round PWB analyst to be assigned by the Office of Management and Finance, whose sole job would be to assist ratepayers in monitoring PWB actions every month. It's possible this strategy could produce the desired oversight, without the expense of an Independent Utility Commission.

**19. Do you support using water and sewer funds for City projects that are not directly related to the provision of water and sewer services? Please provide examples of the types of projects you believe are appropriate uses of these funds and those that are not.**

Water and sewer funds should be used for cost-effective provision of drinking water, sewer and stormwater management services. Note that Portland's founders'



failure to consider stormwater as well as sanitary sewers resulted in ratepayers funding the \$1.4 billion federally-mandated Big Pipe project. Paying for surface stormwater facilities instead of more expensive under-road pipes is more cost-effective and provides more jobs and neighborhood benefits. I voted for the so-called "\$20 million sewer money for bike paths", for those reasons. No sewer ratepayer money was spent on bike paths. That would be illegal.

I voted against PWB renovating the McCalls restaurant for the Rose Festival Foundation. The City is currently being sued on this issue, so I can't discuss it in depth. My voting record is clear.

**20. Do you support the assessment of a Utility License Fee on Portland water and sewer rates?**

Yes. Water and sewer pipes use the public Right of Way. The public deserves compensation for this use. It is reasonable to expect public utilities to pay the Utility License Fee, to be consistent with private utilities such as cable companies and electricity/gas corporations. Ratepayers should pay their fair share, just as property taxpayers and others should pay for services.

Thank you for inviting me to submit responses to your questions. I ask for your vote on May 15, since the election for Position 1 will likely end in the Primary. For more information about my record, goals, and supporters, please visit [www.Amanda2012.com](http://www.Amanda2012.com)

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Fritz, RN, MA (Cantab)  
Commissioner, City of Portland

# Steve Novick

Note: Steve Novick declined to respond to the questionnaire, but instead issued this letter.

Dear Portland Water Users Coalition,

Thank you for your ongoing efforts to ensure vigorous discussion of Water Bureau rates and policies. If I am successful in my campaign, I look forward to working with you for years to come.

I am not returning your questionnaire because I take these things very seriously, and am not going to say, for example, precisely how many employees the Water Bureau should have without undertaking more study than I have time to conduct at the moment. I can, however, outline some general principles and approaches I would follow on water issues:

1. Water rates are an equity issue; any increase in rates falls on the poor and middle class harder than on the rich. Striving to keep costs down must be part of the City's commitment to equity.

2. I believe the City should have independent PUC-type professional staff to review water and sewer rates and budgets and engage in a public process with the Bureaus and Commissioners prior to the adoption of any rate increase. I am not certain how such staff should fit into the governing structure. There is no way to "take the politics out" of rate and budget decisions completely. Having all rate and budget decisions made by a board appointed by the Auditor, for example, raises questions of its own; you might suddenly have powerful interests with a special interest in water and sewer rates pump large sums of money into Auditor election, which historically have been rather low-profile and low-cost.

3. I do not believe that covering the reservoirs is the best use of public health dollars and would engage with EPA, our Congressional delegation, and other Cities such as New York to get relief from that requirement.

4. I would insist that the Water Bureau explain and justify its expenses compared to those of other comparably sized cities, and would personally contact other cities with lower water costs to get information on their budgets.

Again, I look forward to working with you.

All my best,

Steve

--

novickforportland.org  
(503) 222-0178

[novickforportland@gmail.com](mailto:novickforportland@gmail.com)

# Mary Nolan

Representative Nolan failed to respond to the Water Users Coalition/Friends of the Reservoirs questionnaire despite requesting, and being granted, an extension of time.