



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved WATER UTILITY BOARD

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A&B

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Gregory Harrington called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. The Mayor's office is working on a replacement for Ald. Schumacher, who has asked to leave his position on the Water Utility Board.

Present: 6 -

Lauren Cnare; Dan Melton; Gregory W. Harrington; Thomas Schlenker; Bruce Mayer and Madeline B. Gotkowitz

Excused: 2 -

George E. Meyer and Michael Schumacher

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Gotkowitz, to Approve the Minutes of the December 15 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. [14500](#) Resolution to Establish the Project: Near West Side Water Supply Augmentation

Attachments: [Resolution to Establish the Near West Side Water Supply Augmentation Project](#)
[Online Contact the Mayor Submission and Response.pdf](#)
[Written Public Comments- Near West Side Water Supply Augmentation Project](#)

The attached documents were distributed. Principal Engineer Al Larson introduced the project.

Two members of the public were present to address the Board at the hearing.

David Askuvich was against the project. He asked the Board to consider past habitat destruction on the west side, specifically at Owen Park. The alternatives of filtering Well 10 or transferring water from another zone should be considered instead of drilling a new well that could later develop high levels of iron and manganese. Askuvich was asked for clarification on the Owen Park project. He said forest there was destroyed for water retainment ponds a few years ago. Staff was asked if this was a Water Utility project. Larson said it was not, it was a City Engineering drainage project.

Lynn Williamson, a member of the Citizen Advisory Panel (CAP) for the project, said over 40 people attended a public meeting at Stephens School in October. Detailed questions were asked that demonstrated the depth of consumer understanding and concern. The CAP also had additional questions related to the scope of the project. The latest scoping document incorporated many of these questions, but the CAP did not take a vote. They were told the decision had already been made by management to present at this meeting. Williamson

was asked if all the questions had been answered. She said they have been persistent in trying to get those answers. Part of the problem is the scope; the project involves the entire west side. The CAP would have preferred to bring a recommendation, but they were told that consensus was not needed. Williamson was asked what the next steps are for the CAP. She said there will be some time before the CAP receives additional information.

Larson was asked how many trees could be affected. He said he did not know. The site that is owned by the Water Utility is wooded. It is roughly 40,000 square feet and the footprint of a facility would be 10-15,000 square feet.

Larson was asked a series of questions about next steps depending on which action the Board took. He said if the Board approved the project, the next step would be detailed alternative analysis, the appropriate step for many of the questions Williamson referred to. The project could also be established and then significantly change, like the Well 8 project that has become an east side evaluation project. If the Board voted against establishment, the project would stop. The Utility would have to reevaluate the water supply situation and would probably make a recommendation to establish a different project. If the Board deferred the decision until it received the CAP's recommendation, the CAP would be reconvened and staff would try to answer any questions they could. There is a question of boundaries, but the project is trying to be focused, primarily because of budgeting concerns.

There was a discussion of the role of the CAP. Larson said by name, it is advisory; the staff does the work, takes input from the CAP, and makes the recommendation to the Board. The CAP could disagree with this recommendation, and the Board would decide based on the information presented. General Manager Tom Heikkinen said the Public Participation Process does not say a CAP must vote. The project manager is not the leader of the CAP, and the CAP can establish its own processes and decide how it prefers to provide input to the Board.

It was suggested that taking some additional time to let the CAP come to a decision would allow maximum input without compromising the project. It was also suggested that the Public Participation Process document should be reviewed and updated. A subcommittee could be created, or the Board could address this as part of its Policy Governance work.

A motion was made by Melton, seconded by Cnare, to refer to a future Board meeting within the next two months, at which time the Board would receive the recommendation of the Citizen Advisory Panel on whether or not to establish the project. The motion passed by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Three citizens were present to address the Board regarding water fluoridation.

Bruce Rideout said no one should be forced to ingest medication, but the people of Madison are forced to drink hydrofluorosilicic acid, a toxic waste chemical. He questioned the credibility of the national and global organizations that have declared fluoridation safe. The citizens of Madison should be allowed to make their own health choices. Rideout was asked if he was requesting that the Board stop fluoridation or for a reduction in the level. He said he would like the practice stopped but would also welcome a reduction. Rideout was asked if he was familiar with any utilities that used a different form besides hydrofluorosilicic acid. He said he was not. There is sodium fluoride, but that is not what this Utility uses.

John Barnes said drinking water should not be used for medical delivery. Fluoride is an environmental contaminant that is not removed in sewage treatment. Full-scale retrospective epidemiological studies correlate artificial water fluoridation with cancer. Fluoride works primarily through topical surface mechanisms; its efficacy in drinking water is a matter of opinion. There should be diligent, comprehensive review of water fluoridation by the U.S. national institutes of health. Barnes was asked if he was requesting that the Board stop fluoridation or for a reduction in the level. He said it should be stopped altogether.

Susan Michetti referenced an e-mail sent to the Board that included several statements and studies. She was concerned that even a fluoride concentration of 0.7-1.2 mg/L could have adverse health effects, and that there is a thyroid epidemic in Madison. Fluoride in combination with silicon and lead or manganese also affects the African-American population by increasing aggression and violence. Michetti was asked if there was a study of thyroid effects in Madison. She said she knew from talking to people and her own experience that it is a problem, and these endocrine effects are associated with water fluoridation levels that are considered acceptable. Michetti was asked if her doctor recommended that she not drink fluoridated water. She said she had talked to doctors who suggested this.

4a. [15490](#)

Review Current Policy of Fluoridating the Public Water Supply

Attachments: [Board of Health 10-15-2009 Meeting Minutes-Approved.pdf](#)
[Board of Health 12-17-2009 Meeting Minutes-Draft.pdf](#)
[Memo from City Attorney Regarding Authority to Fluoridate Water Supply.pdf](#)

Agenda items 4a and 4b were taken out of order by Board consensus.

There was a discussion of whether this should be a Common Council or Water Utility Board decision. Cnare said the Water Utility Board and Board of Health have authority independent of the Council, and read a memo she received from the City Attorney on this subject into the minutes (see attached).

A long discussion followed of the advantages and disadvantages of water fluoridation. All of the Board members had reviewed literature on both sides of the issue. Supporting points for fluoridation included cavity prevention, especially for low-income children and underserved populations, and the

recommendation from authorities like the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), U.S. Surgeon General, and World Health Organization. Concerns included individuals with health conditions who should not consume fluoride, that the benefit is topical but water fluoridation delivers it in an unregulated dose, and a perceived lack of conclusive science on the efficacy and safety of fluoridation. The idea of reducing the level was also considered.

It was suggested that information should be provided on the Water Utility website about the risk of enamel fluorosis. Schlenker said his understanding is that in 90% of cases, fluorosis is invisible to the naked eye, and when it is visible it is very mild. The optimal level is 0.7-1.2 mg/L because it is high enough to prevent cavities and in most cases, the fluorosis is not visible.

Larson was asked why hydrofluorosilicic acid is used. He said sodium fluoride is significantly more expensive and is a solid. Heikkinen said hydrofluorosilicic acid is the compound most commonly used by water utilities.

Grande was asked to briefly describe the Utility's policies. He said a concentrated solution is added at each unit well, and fluoride levels at each well are field tested daily. A monthly sample is also sent to the state lab. In 2009, 5,048 samples were collected, and none were over 2 mg/L, the secondary standard based on increased risk of dental fluorosis. A Standard Operating Procedure more closely defines the protocols and establishes .6 to 1.6 as the acceptable range, taking into account variability because of the field-testing equipment used. Over the last 12-15 months, the Utility has been trying to tighten this range to .9 to 1.3.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Mayer, to

- Adopt Board of Health Resolution #2009-22,
- Instruct the Water Utility to provide brief information regarding enamel fluorosis on its website, including links to the Centers for Disease Control's information on the subject, and
- Request that the Water Utility General Manager and Board Chair discuss an effective way to request that the National Research Council review the safety and efficacy of water fluoridation.

The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: 2 -

George E. Meyer and Michael Schumacher

Ayes: 3 -

Lauren Cnare; Gregory W. Harrington and Madeline B. Gotkowitz

Noes: 2 -

Dan Melton and Bruce Mayer

4b. [17115](#)

#2009-22 Board of Health Resolution - Fluoridation Policy Adopted December 17, 2009

Attachments: [2009 22 BOH Fluoridation Policy APP 12 17 09.pdf](#)

ADMINISTRATION REPORTS

2. [17152](#) General Manager's Report

Attachments: [General Manager Report January 2010.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed. There was a brief discussion of the new groundwater rule.

NEW BUSINESS

3. [17153](#) Proposal for Reinventing the Madison Water Utility Board

Attachments: [WUB Policy Governance Proposal.pdf](#)
[Discussion Points for Board Governance Proposal.pdf](#)

The attached documents were distributed. There was a discussion of the expense. Most of the Board thought the proposal was reasonable and that an experienced consultant was necessary in order to successfully implement the model. Heikkinen was asked if he had received any feedback. He said the Mayor was very interested and thought there might be potential application for other boards and committees in the City, or for these ideas to be incorporated into training for new committee members. There was concern about sole sourcing. Heikkinen said expenses less than \$25,000 have a more informal process because they do not warrant the cost and time of preparing and issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP). This is not a widely available service. There is an International Policy Governance Association, but they wanted an RFP to distribute to members.

It was suggested that the Board should wait until the new alderperson is assigned to begin this process, and someone from the City's organization and training department should be invited to observe.

There was a discussion of whether to use time from four Board meetings or have one or two separate retreats. There was concern that one hour might not be sufficient time to attend to other business, but scheduling the training during meetings was preferred.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Gotkowitz, to Approve the proposal. The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: 2 -
George E. Meyer and Michael Schumacher

Ayes: 3 -
Bruce Mayer; Lauren Cnare and Madeline B. Gotkowitz

Noes: 1 -
Dan Melton

Non Voting: 1 -
Gregory W. Harrington and Thomas Schlenker

5. [14501](#) Introduction of Future Agenda Items

The following future agenda items were previously suggested:

**Report on Well 8 Disinfection Pilot Study
Policy Governance Education and Development Sessions**

It was suggested that the Well 8 Disinfection Pilot Study could be presented to the Water Quality Technical Advisory Committee, and a written report could be included in the General Manager's Report so interested Board members could read it.

ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made by Melton, seconded by Mayer, to Adjourn at 6:59 p.m.
The motion passed by voice vote.**