

SEWER & WATER COMMITTEE MEETING
UNAPPROVED MINUTES

June 18, 2009

DIRECTORS PRESENT: Erik Henrikson, Dan Wilkins

STAFF PRESENT: Cindy Gustafson, General Manager
Tony Lalotis, Director of Utilities
Matt Homolka, District Engineer
Doug Olsen, Utilities Superintendent
Carol Hackbarth, Administrative Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 a.m. by Director Henrikson.

1. DRAFT LEAK ADJUSTMENT POLICY

Tony reviewed the draft Leak Adjustment Policy and memo attached. The draft policy contains provisions where customers who suffer significant or catastrophic leakage due to a failure of piping or plumbing components, can once every five years, apply for relief of up to 75% of the lost water due to the leak. Erik clarified this is separate from the condominium leak profiling. He thinks this is a good idea. He has concerns about how we will get the message out to the public. Cindy said it will go on the bills at least one time a year and will be on the web page. We have already been receiving calls about rebates. Tony explained the 6-month averaging factor and the steps the customer must take in the Application Process in the policy. There was discussion on staff time, the cost to process a request, and how many customers and the amount in gallons a customers' request may be. Cindy asked if we should have a minimum amount to be cost effective. Tony will find a balance between the gallons and the costs and incorporate it in the policy. Dan would like a report to the board about the policy in about a year.

2. DRAFT WATER CONSERVATION ORDINANCE AND REBATE PROGRAM

Tony reviewed the memo for the Draft Water Conservation & Rebate Program. He said this is a standalone Ordinance but may be consolidated with the water ordinance in the future. Erik asked about interpretation of the ordinance. Tony explained we do not have staff to police the rules and do not want to be policing. If someone reports an incident or we see it while working then we will investigate it and follow-up.

Tony went through Section one. Each water system will be administered independently when it come to the determination of conservation stage. Stage one is normal conservation. There was discussion on what an economic hardship might be in relation to conservation. One example is if a nursery could not water their plants, the plants would die, and they would lose money. Another example could be a pool in a condo complex with a lot of rentals. If there is no water in the pool, people may not come and rent, and they would lose money. The appeal process was reviewed. Contracted Sales, Section 1.04.1, where we sell water to other agencies, explains that the private water company and its customers are responsible for complying with all conditions in this ordinance. The private water company will be responsible to ensure this happens. Tony said there are water companies with distribution system issues and leaks that they are not fixing. The responsibility to fix them will be written into the contracts and the violations within this ordinance would apply to the company.

Section 2, Stage 1 – Normal Conditions prompted questions, clarifications, and discussions. Erik is concerned about construction water. When you are trying to keep the dust down you want to saturate the land; leaving the nozzle off accomplishes this better. Dan asked if we modeled after other agencies' conservation policies. Tony said we look at many agencies. The items within the ordinance are standard practices for water conservation. The toilet recommendation is more stringent than the state requires.

State requires 1.6 gallons; we suggest 1.3. There is a rebate from 1.6 to 1.3 but not for 3.0 to 1.6. Tony said the industry is heading towards 1.3. Erik asked if this only applies to our water customers. Dan and Erik think it should only apply to our water customers. Various thoughts about requirements and rebates were presented on New Construction, Remodels and Retrofit scenarios. Erik wants anyone changing a toilet to get a rebate. This year's budget of \$15,000 puts a limitation on the number of rebates. Waitlists were also discussed. It was agreed that remodels and new construction rebates should be the same and people just changing their toilets should be more. Dan would like to review new construction in a year also. Commercial requirements haven't changed so the incentives would be the same as residential. Tony will come back with modified rebate amounts for toilets.

Stage 1 requirements discussion continued with the rebates. Erik asked about 2.01.12 Food Service and Drinking Establishments. Dan and Erik discussed this and decided they'd like it in Stage 2. Cindy said some establishments look to the PUD for was to conserve and save money on the water in the glasses and the washing of the glasses. She also said we have to have a Water Conservation Program in place to receive some grant monies. 2.02 Declaration, Implementation and Termination of Drought Response Stages 2 and 3. Adding that the board will decide unless it is an extreme emergency. 2.03: Dan asked that Stage 2 be defined better, giving examples, explaining that potable water may not be available to homes. Customers may think we are not in a drought situation. He also asked that Stage 3 be defined better with examples. Erik and Dan agreed this only applies to houses within our Water Systems. Sewer only customers are not affected.

3.01 Notice of Violation: Personal contact will be added to 1st Violation. 3.02.3 - Flow restrictors in line with meter setters are consistent with the PUC's regulations. Erik asked about the 4th violation. Tony said this would be people who blatantly ignore notices.

Section 4 – Rebate Program: Much was discussed earlier in the meeting. The program covers Irrigation systems, Toilets and Clothes Washers. Cindy is concerned that we will run out of money; more people will apply than we can refund. This year there is only \$15,000 budgeted and that includes staff time, for example the class for the water conservation staff. She asked if we should limit this to one year. Tony asked if Retrofits should be limited to one year. Dan said we should be cautious about over committing ourselves and asked if we should eliminate New Construction in the first year. Maybe limit the number of offers per year or per unit. Dan is also concerned about the inspectors challenge in determining whether one place should be 1.3 gpm versus 1.6 gpm on new construction. Cindy suggested different colored forms. Tony suggested a Wait List, and then we can budget for next year. Cindy said we can review this more and come back to the committee. She said we really want to help the low-end customers. Dan asked how we would know what was being taken out in the retrofits. How will we confirm they are in fact taking out a high-flow toilet? Tony said we would conduct water surveys, noted in 4.02 Water Use Survey which will require two site visits by District staff. There was discussion on Cross-Connection issues and that the Water Conservation staff and the Cross-Connection staff are planned to be the same person.

Dan asked Erik if the report on the issues brought up in the meeting should be brought back to the committee or if it was ok to bring it to the July board meeting. This will be covered within the July board packet.

3. PUBLIC FORUM

No public comment.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 a.m.

Carol Hackbarth, Administrative Secretary