



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Amended WATER UTILITY BOARD

Tuesday, March 25, 2008

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Avenue, Rooms A & B

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

Dan Melton; Lauren Cnare; George E. Meyer; Jonathan H. Standridge;
Gregory W. Harrington; Thomas Schlenker and Michael Schumacher

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Lauren Cnare moved approval of the minutes with one correction: Correct narrative on Item 16. Narrative from Item 15 inadvertently repeated in Item 16. George Meyer seconded; unanimously passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jurgen Patau of 114 Alden Drive: Jurgen made two comments: 1. The process has been interesting and getting public input on SOPs has been a good process. 2. He is happy to see discussion on the growing water pollution. He is curious if it makes any sense at all to create wells in the future that don't include filtration. Wells have a long life and it seems at some point we're going to have to do that. He thinks this should be considered when doing new wells.

REPORTS

2. [08953](#) Water Quality Report

Joe Grande said the format has changed a little, taking into account some of the additional monitoring we have to do this year. Unregulated contaminants will be done in August and again in February.

3. [08954](#) Staffing Report

Lauren said applications for the PIO listing are due March 26. Larry said he hasn't received certification yet. Jon said the list of applicants would be certified to Larry on the 28th. It was decided to go ahead with hiring a PIO before the new manager comes on board since that might be quite awhile yet. Lauren said she wanted to be clear on what we are doing next—Larry will get the tests back on March 28, look at them with some other people, and decide if anyone stands out.

4. [08956](#) Operations Report.

5. [08959](#) Engineering Report

George asked where we are at and what our expectations are on the East Isthmus well siting. Larry said we continue to search for a well site on the east side, and we need to expand the search, probably toward the vicinity of the Truax Airport, Anderson Street. We also have to expand community participation on it. We haven't been moving very rapidly. Dan Melton asked about Well 29 and if we're working with Karl Patzer on that. Larry said yes, we're also working with Alder Joe Clausius. We hope to have information on this by the end of April. We want to try to expand the facilities out there so it's not that noticeable. We'll probably have a meeting mid-April. George said there wasn't a lot of public involvement at the Whitney Way site and asked if we are going to have a public process. Larry said we're trying to get the hydrogeology preliminaries for that. The public participation plan will actually go to full fledged well siting for a near west side well.

6. [08246](#) Customer Service Report.

7. **Steering Committee Report.**

Don Russell said the Steering Committee found it rewarding to participate in the interview process for the General Manager. He said they are constantly reviewing the strategic plan, trying to determine their next steps in creating new design teams. Three new design teams were recently formed but have not started working yet. One is for identifying seminars and training as there are many water utility meetings around the state with training in areas that would benefit the Utility. Doug DeMaster has been doing great work on main break data integration. A main break report is always filled out for each break that gives various information, location, type, size etc. We're expanding on this report with information that will be useful in the future. We're also starting a Design and Review process. Many of our replacement projects follow in the shadow of Engineering where reconstruction of the road is scheduled. Sometimes with two projects on a major street, they'll find an old section between the new ones. Don said they are trying to take a proactive approach.

Don said Carl VanLith from City HR is now sitting in on our Safety Committee meetings to give us an HR perspective. He also helps facilitate the meetings and keeps us focused.

Two designs teams have been completed, the Groundwater Sustainability Plan and design team for an Internal Communications Plan. Groups still ongoing are Workforce Flexibility, which is cross training, and the Standard Operating Procedures group. The Work Practices team is stream lining how each job is done, using flow charts etc. A team investigated the purchase of a hydro excavator. We try to get by without one but there are occasions when it would be very helpful in wet, sloppy conditions. We usually called on the Engineering Department to borrow theirs.

Jon thanked the committees/teams for sticking with this through all of the changes that are taking place.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

8. [09660](#) See attachment for Trial Income Statement for 2007

Robin said this report has been changing on a daily basis as we complete our year end closing, which has to be done a month from today. He said it looks like we won't have any positive net operating income; we'll be in the red. The bottom line number on the report includes the CIAC issue, Contributions In Aid of Construction, which is plant the developer put in the ground and the value of that is turned over to us. That \$3 million isn't actually money that is coming in to us in the form of cash. The new GASB 34 reporting includes this CIAC as part of net income, but it isn't, so we go back to the number \$662,262.68. For comparison, last year we showed a net income of about \$659,000; this year it's showing \$682,000 the opposite way. One of the reasons for that is we made a concerted effort to close more of our work in progress than we did in the past. Last year we closed about \$13 million in work in progress and this year we closed \$21 million in work in progress. We added \$18 million to Plant as opposed to \$12 million last year, so we've increased our Plant value by 50% over what we did last year. We also, in the process of closing those extra work orders, came up with an extra \$1.1 million in expenses that came out of the operating side as opposed to being able to capitalize those. Last year we had \$1.7 million in expenses from work orders and this year it's \$2.8 million. We closed 223 work orders this year, and waited for a few of the large ones on E. Washington Avenue to get the information from the Engineering Section. The numbers that say preliminary will be revised in the next week and the final numbers will be available at the next board meeting. We do need another rate increase to keep up with expenses.

Larry asked, based on PSC's late return on plant, what could that number be. Robin said if we earned the 6.5% rate of return on plant and sold the amount of water we expected to sell, we should have had a number that was in excess of \$3 million because that net income is supposed to be there to cover our payment on the bond principal amounts due each year. Jon said he looks at this like the checkbook balance, which is way lower than we expected it to be at this point. What he would really like to see is a budget, revenues budgeted, and our expense budget, and at the end of the year, actual budget such as here's what you thought you were going to spend and make, and here's what you actually did. Jon said Robin said we didn't sell as much water as we thought we would. Robin said we did miss a bit on that. Jon asked if they are going to get a report on that and Robin said yes. Robin said they worked over the weekend to make sure they can meet the PSC deadline of April 1st for completing the report. He said they have a couple of income statements they prepare for the end of the year. They do the GASB one for what the business community likes to see, but also have a PSC version of the income statement where CIAC is not included in the net income. It's a below the line item as they say. The interest on investments is above the line so when we have the closing completed, you'll see both income statements and be able to see the difference. Robin said if we close those work orders out and get that \$18 million in to plant, the PSC will allow us to earn 6.5% rate of return on that plant in service. It wasn't in service when it was in construction in progress. Robin said we've already spent money on this and we should be able to earn a rate of return on it and not have it sit in our

construction in progress fund because those are dollars the Utility doesn't have any longer.

Larry said other communities are going through double digit increases as well. Robin said we're getting close to finalizing this report. Jon said if we have a 8% increase on our \$18 million, that's like \$1.55 million, so if we had our rate increase a year ago we'd be in good shape; our net income would be right where we thought it should be. So we're about a year behind? Robin said yes, I think we are. Robin said he'll be working with Larry or the new general manager in the future to come up with a cash flow report that we can present. This really doesn't reflect cash as much as it reflects activity. There are non-cash items included like the depreciation expense, and it doesn't take cash from the Utility but generates funds that the Utility is able to use, so Robin doesn't look at this as reflecting our cash balance but a reflection on where our cash balance is or could be if we had different numbers there. Dan Melton asked when we make our next bond payment. Robin said we'll make our interest payment July 1 and next principle payment January 1, 2009. We pay interest on January 1st and July 1st, and principle on January 1st. Dan said it might be helpful for them if Robin sketched out the scenario. Robin said we want to make sure we have enough operating income to cover our bond principle payment; that is the ideal situation.

OLD BUSINESS

9. [08968](#) Prioritize Construction of Water Treatment Facilities.

Larry said we've had public discussion on this, and he has received emails asking why we don't have a filter system like other communities. The next step is to start a public process. Larry recommends we proceed along these lines and see where it goes. He thinks our customer base wants us to move forward on this. We need to get going as it will generate a large public participation process.

Greg Harrington said his sense is that filtration would probably make sense for UW 8 but he hasn't seen the convincing explanation to demonstrate that. The SOP that was discussed would be a good demonstration. Greg asked if we're supposed to make a decision on this memorandum today. Larry said a motion would be to accept the report and to direct staff to commence with public participation. Jon said this will start the process of planning and design, which includes the decision to do it. Greg said we've been doing research on the option of flushing instead. His graduate student has some preliminary results and presented something new today. Unit wells 10, 7 and 29 also need something. If we do a Larkin Street well or a Whitney Way well, it's possible that may resolve all the problems at UW 10. UW 7 is tight in terms of boundaries. It's not clear to him if the unit well we're talking about in the airport area might provide some water for that area of the distribution system. He said you have more land to work with at UW 8. Greg thinks going through the SOP process will identify more what alternatives are.

Jon said he likes that it sends out a process. He said an engineer who used to work for Fitchburg is now doing a PhD with Greg at the university. He talked to me about a theory that there are bacteria coating our rock formations that are releasing iron and manganese. He had a well similar to ours in Lake Delton where he went in with acid followed by chlorine and killed off iron the bacteria that are trapped down there, and the result was that iron and manganese production dropped by 95% and never came back. He has talked to Joe about

this and maybe this is something we could get AWWA funds to look at with us, and experiment with that theory.

Greg said one of their primary sources of drinking water research is the American Water Works Research Foundation. One of their priorities this year is to identify research concerns of utilities that use ground water as their source. The Research Foundation is funded by subscribers of the largest utilities that are surface water suppliers. Jon said Madison is one of the biggest groundwater utilities in the country. Greg said the Research Foundation has three different formats they follow. They have a solicited research program, which is 70% of their projects. 15% goes to unsolicited proposals and another 15% goes to the collaboration process where the subscribing utilities can attempt to develop a research project of regional interest and push it through that way. Madison is a subscriber to AWARF. Robin said we paid \$22,000 this year. Larry said the Mayor has asked Congresswoman Baldwin to consider this as a project for funding.

George Meyer made a motion for acceptance of the report and to direct staff to commence with the public information process. Michael Schumacher seconded; unanimously passed.

10. [09681](#) Site Selection for New Water Utility Facilities

Greg Harrington made a motion to move Item 10 before Item 9. Michael Schumacher seconded; unanimously passed.

Larry said a meeting was held with the Unit Well 3 and Sunset Hills Focus Group; and we are going to have another meeting. We went through the process and discussed how it was going to work. He thinks this created a more comfort level from the neighborhood. Michael said he thinks it is an excellent process, and we continue to get information back that it is working. Once we get through this first process, we'll be in a good place. Jon said we're slowly but surely building some trust with our consumers and customers; this process has been painful but helpful and has us going in the right direction. Dan stated that Jurgen said he doesn't want these meetings to be a gabfest, that he wants us to do business. Jurgen answered a lot of questions but the draft also left a lot of questions. Lauren said a formal evaluation might be considered by participants.

Michael Schumacher made a motion to refer this SOP to the April meeting. George Meyer seconded; unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS

11. [09661](#) See attachments for Status of Rate Structure Request.

Jon said with the actual budget report, we'll see that this is a revenue issue in the budget and not that we're spending too much money on extra project issues. Larry said this is not a project issue, but we worked a lot of overtime this year on main breaks through a very bad winter. Robin said some of those expense issues, like with the 200-plus main breaks we had in February; we have no control over and we can't say that we aren't going to fix them. We do have some control over some expenses.

Michael said we should discuss quarterly billing. Larry said it's on the next agenda. Dan Melton asked if this has ever gone to the Council for a vote. Robin said we haven't; he doesn't know why we haven't, but the three PSC commissioners are the ones who decide what the rates are going to be. He said

he knows in Milwaukee their last rate increase was delayed a couple of months because they wanted to go to the Common Council with what the PSC presented to get approval, but we've just never done that. Jon said at the next meeting we should discuss the board's level of involvement in rate increases and whether we want to change what we've traditionally done. George said the point was made that even if the Council approves it, it is ultimately the PSC who approves it. Larry said the Council passes the storm water and sewer utility rates, and they are actually bigger budgets combined than Water Utility's. They are regulated by the PSC upon complaint. With the Water Utility, you have to go to the PSC for approval of the rate structure. This Utility sustained a 3% cost for labor December 15. George said he thinks the problem is that the PSC treats a utility that bills quarterly the same as one who bills every six months. We need a different system. Robin said they do make some allowances for our six-month billing system. There is some built in allowance granted for that extra length in billing periods. George said it's not enough. Robin said our goal is to file for a rate increase on April 14, and asked if that is okay with the board. There is a six-month lag time between the date that we file and the date that the PSC gives us a rate order saying we can increase our rates. We're looking at sometime in October for getting approval of the rates that will go into effect January 1, 2009 if we're lucky. Larry said he wants to get it in and they will keep the board apprised of what is happening with it. Jon said he thinks for every month we delay, it's about \$100,000 to \$150,000 a month in revenues we don't get. Robin said we can get the application in, they'll start their work and we can always add supplemental information. Greg said if we file April 15, we won't feel the effects of it until January and it's not completely done until June of 2009.

12. [09695](#) Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan

Genesis Bichanich of City Engineering is going to do a presentation from the design team that has been working on the controversial sustainability issue. Genesis said the next step is input from the board. The two major goals were to maintain the current annual rate of groundwater pumping, and to reduce the residential per capita water use by 20% by the end of 2020. The current residential water use is about 73 gallons per day (5-year average from 2002-2006). To meet the 20% goal, each person would need to decrease their daily water use by about 15 gallons, which corresponds to a residential goal of 58 gallons per day. Goals for different water users is divided up among residential, commercial, industrial, and municipal/other government, and the University in order to provide alternatives that may be taken by each to improve water conservation across the city. Genesis said they wanted to see how each of these entities could reduce water usage so they broke up into teams and each team looked at one of those sections. Residential for example, changing to high efficiency appliances, changing showerheads, etc. The document presented gives examples of this.

Other cities were looked at to see what they did with their rate steps. We looked at commercial use with a goal of promoting water conservation through rebate promotions and education. They would have to submit landscape plans and major redevelopment plans.

For industrial, we looked at a one on one approach since we don't have that many industrial customers in Madison. There are 23 industrial customers and they account for 10% of the total water use so the opportunity for water savings is significant. Conservation generally falls into three categories: reducing water usage, reducing water loss, and reusing water that is currently being discarded.

Audits of government buildings will be performed. Water conservation measures

would be replacing old toilets, installing sink aerators, installing rain gardens and rain barrels.

Moving to a system of rates that promotes conservation needs to be done carefully to minimize impacts on low-income residents while maintaining an adequate revenue stream. Larry said they evaluated other communities that use inclining rate structure; we have declining rate structure for all classes of customers. Only the biggest water users benefit from the declining rate structure. The average residential customer uses 45 ccf every six months or 184 gallons per day. The Water Utility should consider conservation rate structure in its 2009 rate case. Larry said we looked at Ann Arbor MI, Boulder CO, Tucson AZ and Waukesha WI where they have issues with respect to quality of their unit wells. All of these communities with the exception of Tucson and Madison are billed on a quarterly basis. The PSC is very concerned about inclining rate structures for communities that have a semi-annual bill. The rationale is that with the inclining rate structure, the people don't get their bill often enough to change their habits to avoid a large bill. Larry pointed out that 40% of the bill is sewer and 10% is storm sewer. Our current median usage is 45; 80% use 60 ccf or less. Larry said we wanted to find out if we could have an inclining rate structure with a semi-annual bill, and next month we plan to come back to the Board with an automated meter reading system and the cost of that, which would mean with the same staff we could read the meters more often. Larry went over the examples of conservation rate structures. Larry said there is not much difference in the initial declining rate structure. He said if we replace 4,000 meters per year and we have another 1,500 new customers, we can get through this in 10 to 12 years. After you get into it for 5 to 6 years, you've got a tipping point where you can actually read the remaining meters.

Jon asked Larry if he has knowledge that the PSC is not interested in a rate structure that would really make people think twice before they turn the tap on. Jon asked if there is any way to get a feel from the PSC that we could actually put numbers in there where the size of the bill would affect people's behavior. Larry said that is something that might be discussed with them. Ken said they are trying to learn that information from Waukesha, but it will take them some time to see if it has had any effect at all on their residential customer rates since they were the first to do it. George said the customer won't cut back because they won't know what happened in a course of six months. Michael said he would be concerned in using rates to change behavior. He asked what the Board's role is in determining what rate structure request we put in. Robin said the rates are based on the cost of service study the PSC completes. It's broken down into what it costs to serve residential customers. They set up a rate structure and present it to us. Robin said we've presented the proposal. Larry said this was done for demonstration purposes. He said we are suggesting this be put on the April agenda. The Water Utility puts in information on finance and needs and PSC develops the cost. They set up a rate structure and if the Board wants to weigh in on it, they can next month. The draft report will be referred to the April meeting. Michael asked for clarification of what the Board's role would be. Lauren said she thinks citizens need information as to why.

Jon said for 2008, you do an 8% increase that takes us to \$1.20—that's already in the works. Robin said to \$1.20. Larry said this will go on the April agenda. Jon asked if it is correct that this will not include any conservation measures that will go to 2009. Michael asked if we are monitoring the amount of water used for flushing operations. Lauren said it's important for citizens to have the companion education piece along with the money—you just get a bigger bill in the mail, it's meaningless.

Comments on this report are due to Genesis on April 15 or earlier. Robin said the

committee would like to review this before it goes back to the Board. George said staff involvement is very important and has been good. He said on page 12 where it talks about sustainability, what are we sustaining? The sustainable goal is the sustaining of the current pumping levels, and if we could do it, many people will look at sustainability in terms of the aquifer. Is there any way we can translate that into sustainability? Jon thinks it's more about putting as much water in through recharge as you're taking out. The plan talks about how we would reduce how much we take out, but doesn't have anything about pavement, rain gardens or a few small items. It doesn't really talk about sustaining the aquifer by recharge, which to him is a big part of the picture. Lauren said we're not the only users in Dane County and asked if he has the sensibility that our neighboring water utilities might be interested in instituting a similar plan or some of the efforts, or is it just us? Other communities should start talking about this. The sewerage district did talk about plans for recharge so it might be important to contact them too and let them know what we are doing and ask them what they are doing.

Larry asked what the Board thinks of a rebate for low flow toilets. All Board members were in favor of it. George said one of the cost savings is the energy to move the water. On the other end too, the water goes to MMSD. He said 15 to 20% of water from source to discharge is for energy use. He asked if we can quantify that. Jon said at the Commission on the Environment meeting last month, they had Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District do a presentation on water reuse and recharge. They really didn't know we were doing this conservation plan that hasn't been released yet. They said they definitely need to know, that if we're going to have 20% reduction, that means a 20% reduction in revenues to them, so they need to be in the loop on this. Jon commended the team for doing a nice, comprehensive report on this.

Ken Key said we didn't put an item in here on green plumbers but we will do so for your review. That is something he and Robin learned about at a seminar in Reno. It's an education program sponsored nationally that started in Australia as a way to educate plumbing contractors about what the latest things are, because you'd be surprised at the things they don't know about energy savings. Ken said we are going to be sponsoring that in Madison and perhaps Dane County. We can also educate the customers about it. In Madison, 1.2-gallon flush toilets are not readily available. All the plumbers now are using the 1.6 standard, which has been mandated but they are not carrying the 1.2 so we want to teach them more about this. Jon said one Commission on the Environment member said he has a 1.1 toilet and it hasn't failed yet.

Michael Schumacher made a motion to refer this item to the next meeting. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

13. Review of Emerging Contaminants, including Pharmaceuticals and Hormones (Presentation by Joe Grande, Water Quality Manager).

This item was discussed with Item 14.

14. Agenda for the Water Quality Advisory Team, April 10, 2008.

Joe Grande referred to the handouts he distributed and the detects in raw water of pharmaceuticals, potential EDCs, steroid hormones and phytoestrogens. He noted that trace amounts of steroids and pharmaceuticals have been reported in water for more than 20 - 30 years. The analytical testing methods we have now

are capable of accurately detecting and quantifying chemicals in water at levels, 0.000000001 g/L. If you want to think of it in terms of parts per trillion, it is like dropping a grain of sand in an olympic size swimming pool. That's equivalent to 1 ppt. We're talking about chemicals detected at a very low level. Only 11 of 62 target compounds were detected in finished drinking water (>20% frequency). Toxicological relevance is critical in order to establish meaningful treatment and analytical goals.

This is an ongoing study from AWWARF; they looked at 17 utilities across the country and some of these pharmaceuticals, EDCs, and hormones are being detected in the water. The list showed 62 of these compounds with the highlighted ones being those that were detected at the 17 utilities. The concentrations in which they were found were listed and most of these were very low levels. He also pointed out that this is in the raw, untreated water. Another handout listed those found in treated water. Most of the utilities that were monitored were surface water utilities. Of the 24 detected in raw water, only 11 were detected in the drinking water.

Joe said besides the selected pharmaceuticals, there are hundreds of potential contaminants. There are well over 3,000 prescribed pharmaceuticals. He said they probably won't test for all of these. Joe also showed E-screen results for estrogens, pointing out that the estrogen activity of common foods that we eat have significant and higher amounts than what we would find in drinking water. He said it will probably become more common for us to test for trace levels. This study also looked at an acceptable daily intake for a number of contaminants that were detected, and used that to do calculations as all toxicological studies will do. They basically show that with those standards and referenced doses for regulations that exist for food and beverages, all of them were the detected levels of these contaminants were well below the level that would show any type of observable impact. When those referenced doses or regulatory limits were established, there was already a large margin of safety built into this. What they are saying is that even with those large margins of safety, you have to drink 600,000 gallons of water on a day-to-day basis to get that dose. AWWWARF is continuing to study this.

Joe asked what the board's recommendation would be for what we should do—he thinks it should be on the next agenda, the April meeting. In April Jocelyn Hemming who does this E screen at the State Lab of Hygiene will lead the discussion on the toxicological relevance. Joe said just because you have detection doesn't necessarily mean anything any more. The question will come down to what does it mean when we do have that low level detection. Joe told Jon that on his recommendation, he did invite the endroconologist from the university to the next meeting. Jon asked if Joe is going to ask if we should test our water and if we do, how are we going to interpret the results? Joe said he's been framing these questions in his mind. Joe thinks we should present our report and recommendation. Jon said to use the experts.

Michael said this also points out the importance of having a Public Information Officer. Jon asked Dr. Schlenker how he interpreted this and took the scare factor out of it. Dr. Schlenker said this type of thing is almost routine business. Larry said thanks to Dan Melton, we got information from all over the country about different cities and states and how they addressed the problem. He said it seemed there was an exertion of political pressure to do something. Joe said Milwaukee tests two times a year, a sweep of the substances. George asked the cost of the testing. Joe is investigating that. The State Lab of Hygiene has been soliciting opinions because they've been solicited by utilities in other municipalities to do testing. They are considering whether they will offer those services, and it will be in the range of \$250 to \$350 per sample to test for 13 to 15.

Joe said if the Board has opinions on what we should do, he'd like to hear them. He has his own ideas, and he thinks we're five years out on this with the EPA. Greg said this is far too large for the states to take on themselves. He recommends that we continue to get involved in research projects. Jon said we need to listen to the experts on all levels as to if we should test and if so, what do we do with the results. Dan said the technical advisory committee should present them with some options, in written form, not verbal. Joe said any recommendations will be given to the Water Board. Joe said for the last two meetings, they have minutes of those and if the board would like them, they are available. Jon said his advice is to listen to the experts.

15. [09663](#) Internal Communication Plan

Robin said he had no formal presentation. He thanked team members, saying they solicited surveys from 101 employees for feedback on how they like to be communicated with. This plan will be similar to the internal communications plan, a working document changing as we see the need for changes. They will take feedback from board members. This will be up for approval at the next board meeting. Michael Schumacher made a motion to refer this item to the next meeting. Dan Melton seconded; unanimously passed.

16. [09673](#) SOP for Unit Well 10 - Emergency Supply

Greg asked if this SOP is for the distribution system as it is today. He sees that it will be updated annually; and asked if it will also be appropriate whenever some changes are made to bring more water into that pressure zone. Larry said all of those could influence this SOP, but the main purpose of this is to state distinctly what the criteria would be if we actually turned this thing on. There are two separate procedures—one is policy and the second is the actual document on procedure for actually operating the valves, etc. This procedure was actually suggested a couple of months ago by Lynn Williamson. Greg said it looks good, that the detail is there. Jon said so this is an executive summary of a 50-page report. Larry said the other SOP is basically where the valve is, what you do etc. We are so detailed we didn't think it was appropriate to put it out to the public. This is the actual criteria we would use in the unusual circumstance that we'd have to put water from Unit Well 10 into the distribution system. This lays out who is responsible for what. Michael asked what kind of training there is for the SOPs. Larry said the first thing is describe what we are doing today, and the editor of this procedure interviewed all of the people who are actually involved. When you do an SOP, there are a few surprises when you look at the whole thing and how many steps there are. This procedure lays out who is responsible for what, and who is responsible to see that the word gets out to the appropriate people.

Dan Melton made a motion to adopt the SOP. Michael Schmacher seconded; unanimously passed.

NEXT MEETING DATE

17. **Confirm next meeting date of April 29, 2008.**

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:06 p.m. Michael Schumacher made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
George Meyer seconded; unanimously passed.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Review the Accomplishments in the Major Focus Areas identified at the Special Meeting on March 8, 2008.

Consider a Sustainability Plan for Energy Usage of Water Utility Vehicles using 2007 as the base year.

Demonstrations of the Capabilities of the Water Utility Hydraulic Model including potential improvements.