



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved WATER UTILITY BOARD

Tuesday, May 27, 2008

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Avenue

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

Wendy Fitch read the minor word changes provided by Dan Melton. George Meyer made a motion to approve the minutes with the amendments. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Schumacher made a motion to amend the agenda to include public comment. Greg Harrington seconded; unanimously passed.

Carin Clauss of 3909 Priscilla Lane said she would like to express thanks to Larry Nelson and Adam Wiederhoeft for their response to the concerns of the neighborhood. They took us very seriously, and she thinks it made a better document with our input. It has enhanced our confidence in the Water Utility as we go forth with major infrastructure changes.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

2. [10636](#) See attachment

3. [10669](#) Staffing Report

Jon said at the bottom of the staffing report it used to say "Authorized FTE" and how many positions were filled and how many vacancies. He'd like that put back on the staffing report.
Larry said that it inadvertently was left off.

4. [10638](#) Operations Report.

Dan Melton asked about training on the Well 29 filter so operators feel comfortable with it. Al said several of the operators, including him, would be getting training as part of the contract. It will be extensive, hands on training. Larry said it would occur no sooner than a couple of months before it goes into operation.

5. [10645](#) Engineering Report

Dan asked if the target date for when Whitney Way work might be done. Joe DeMorett said we got the data and it's probably 1,000 pages long so we're working with them right now to try to come up with a different format. He's hoping by the end of the week that will be resolved. Al said once we get that date, we could finalize the siting study and apply to the DNR for a permit to drill the well and bid it through Public Works.

6. [10647](#) Customer Service Report

7. Public Information Officer Report.

Gail Gawenda introduced herself as the new Public Information Officer, saying prior to this she worked the State as a Public Relations Officer and with the UW where she worked with the Engineering Division.

8. Water Supply - FL Incident

Joe DeMorett stated on May 7 we had a high level fluoride inadvertently go to the reservoir at Unit Well 12. Joe handed out a packet with a timeline of what occurred. It included a copy of the press release that went out. On May 7 at 10:15 p.m. the operator shut the booster at Well 12 down. Jon said if you shut the booster off, nothing goes into the distribution system. Joe said that is correct. The following morning about 6:15 a.m. the operator turned the booster pump on at Well 12, which began putting water into the system. Approximately 25 minutes after that, the deep well started up to refill the reservoir. When the operator started the well at 6:15, he noticed the chlorine level was a little low. He noticed after about ½ hour the level began to decline. The level was .23 in the beginning when it hit .15 we shut the booster pump down and called maintenance to go out and check the chlorine system, which is our standard operating procedure. At 7 a.m. we ran the booster pump for 45 minutes total, which was about 20 minutes of deep well time. Maintenance verified that it had low chlorine content and was too low to put it in the distribution system, so they drained the reservoir, 150,000 gallons.

Our rounder, doing his daily rounds, showed up at noon and determined that the chlorine was low and also sampled for fluoride. Notice that the fluorisic acid in the reservoir tank there was lower than it should have been. It was tested and a dilution was done. Additional sampling was done to make sure this water didn't get into the distribution system. Sampling was done at

different points, a school, a library, a convenience store, a well that was on standby and a fire station. They got levels between 1.08 and 1.96 mpl and we couldn't find it in the distribution system. That was around 3 p.m. when he completed that. In the meantime, Maintenance went out and looked over the fluoride system. It was determined that the five-way valve on the fluoride sampling system had failed. Between 6:15 a.m. and 10:15 we think there was fluoridgoing into the system, even though the deep well was not running. About 25 gallons entered the system over an 8-hour period of time. Normally two to three gallons would have entered, so we were probably eight times higher than we should have been at that time. We believe the fluoride went into the pipe that runs between the well and the reservoir. Joe showed some photos showing the valves, etc. and where it went into the pipe and sat there until the deep well was turned on and then pushed into the reservoir.

Maintenance changed the pump and the fly away valve out, took some samples, and filled the reservoir. All checked out okay. Some follow up sampling was done later and everything was within range. At 8:35, a press release was issued. Following the incident we had a follow up meeting for all staff that was involved, and we reviewed the situation and discussed ways to make sure this didn't happen again.

Joe said we do have a chemical inventory software program that identifies problems like this. We should have caught this earlier than we did, and we were trying to figure out why we didn't and how to make sure it wouldn't happen again. The software identifies when we have high or low chorine or fluoride use. Joe thinks the Operators see this so much it becomes second nature and he thinks they didn't see the little warning that went on. The well wasn't on and they don't typically look at the wells that are off. They are concentrating on the 15 or so wells that are on. Joe said they came up with a number of recommendations to implement so this won't happen again; they were listed on the last page of his handout. Greg asked if this software generates an alarm; Joe said no, it's a spreadsheet and a very small line of text comes up. You have to manually update the system by pressing F9. When the fluoride tanks are filled, they get a warning message that stays there for a couple of days before it goes away. He thinks they just get accustomed to false alarms and they become desensitized. They have to constantly recalculate it when they hit this button. We're looking at a better alarm system. Al is looking at this, too.

Larry said at 11:00, he was being interviewed by a Capital Times reporter and that lasted until about noon. Then the reporter and photographer were to go out with the water quality staff to look at some wells. As Joe said, water samples were taken of the perimeter area including Well 10. Reporter reported problems were with Well 10, which was not the case, so there was confusion on that issue. Larry was pleased with the way staff came together to figure this thing out. Greg asked if the SOP will be updated as a result of this incident. Joe said the SOP worked sufficiently but we may need to add another SOP, that SOPs are working documents. Jon said he wanted to summarize—we have a fluoride and chlorine use things where we want to keep chlorine above a certain level and fluoride below a certain level, both to protect public health. We put these SOPs together and with a little bit of luck with timing, along with the SOPs, we dodged a bullet and didn't put anyone at risk, which means the SOPs worked. We also learned a few things where we can improve the SOPs and maybe write an additional one based on the knowledge we gained from this incident. Jon said this is how SOPs should work and they should be working documents, always being changed. He commended everyone for putting them together and that they worked.

Al said Intellisus is going to do some reprogramming of the SCADA system, too. Larry said we've ordered furniture to make the SCADA room more of a command center so that the operators can see all of the screens etc more easily.

9. **Steering Committee Report.**

Glenn Puntney, a member of the Steering Team, said as of April 8 we celebrated our one-year anniversary. May 19 we participated in the second general manager interviews. The Water Board approved the Internal Communication Plan. The Hydro-excavator Design Team had a demo for one model and a demo for another has been set up. A team was set up to investigate the justification of buying a motor for the distribution main crews. Our main break data integration has been met. Customer feedback cards keep coming in. They are looking into employee reviews and exit interviews.

Glenn said a potluck lunch has been set up for Friday, the 30th, from 11:45 to 1:30 for employees of the entire Utility.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

10. [10652](#)

Jon said on the Salary line, we're \$400,000 under budget; he asked if that is going to correct itself because seasonal workers during the summer. Robin said part of the explanation is that Payroll No. 1 was almost entirely in 2007 so those dollars paid to employees on the first payday in January were almost entirely from December 2007. When December rolls around again, we'll have an extra payroll coming up in January that will show up in our December numbers; we are kind of a payroll behind so that will catch up. Jon asked how much payroll is per month. Robin said \$275,000. Robin also mentioned that when we get a new General Manager, we'll be paying that salary but right now, the Sewer Utility is paying Larry Nelson so there's a little savings in salaries there. Robin said we are starting to fill some vacancies so we won't have a lot of holes in our permanent salary detail. Jon said he noticed in the Fund Balance Report that our loan amount from the City is down a little; does that mean we made a payment? Robin said we did and that was as a result of the 2007 tax bill collections. They collected money for us, \$688,000 that we were able to repay. That is part of what we borrowed and we knew we'd be able to repay them as soon as they gave us that money.

11. [10650](#)

Fund Balance Report

OLD BUSINESS

12. [09681](#)

Site Selection for New Water Utility Facilities

Jon said we have this new SOP dated May 20. It went up on Legistar Saturday

morning. Larry said we've been close since March. The neighborhood met and based on some meetings, we had some revisions and in order to better understand it, we flow charted it to avoid confusion. Larry thinks this will be a useful tool. The biggest issues we had with the neighborhood groups was just getting an understanding of what each side is talking about, and after we understood that, it moved very quickly. Jon said he was impressed with the work that went into this. He sent an email commending Adam for the work he did on the flow-charting. Jon said he thinks this document will make the process much better than it has been.

Michael Schumacher made a motion to approve the SOP and the resolution for the SOP. Lauren Cnare seconded it. Unanimously passed.

George asked what the next step is on this. Larry said it will be sent, with the Board's concurrence, on to the Common Council as required by the Gruber resolution and then it will be one of our SOPs. After the Council approves it, we will put the date of the Council approval on it. I will need a resolution and he would think the motion includes the resolution at all. In the future, if it changes, it will probably have to go the same route; unlike other SOPs. George said we'd also like publicity on this to let the public know we are doing this in an effort for the Utility to be proactive; it may be newsworthy.

Jon said we have to introduce the motion acceptance and forward it on to the Council, a friendly amendment. Michael Schumacher again made the motion to accept this and forward it to the Common Council. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

Larry said he thinks it is going to require a more focused plan. Now we've got a procedure we'll go through, but when we start off a major investment project, we have a roadmap of how we're going to go through it. It is possible it will cost more, but as long as everyone knows that, it should be good. Larry said it is difficult to say what the fiscal impact will be. He said there are probably two or three projects per year that this would apply to. Larry said Adam Wiederhoeft was the writer on that but the management team did review it. Larry said he and Gail will work on a news release.

Legistar No. 09681 (Miscellaneous – In Committee) was approved by the Water Utility Board in which Legistar No. 10693 approved the resolution of the procedure on May 27, 2008 by the Water Utility Board.

10693

Approving the Public Participation Process for Water Utility Facilities.

A motion was made by Schumacher, seconded by Cnare, to **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER**. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

13. 09695

Draft Groundwater Sustainability Plan

Referred to June 24, 2008 meeting.

Priority 1: Reduce Residential Per Capita Water Use by 20% by the Year 2020.

Jeff Ripp from the Public Service Commission attended the meeting to discuss this item. Larry said for some time we've had a committee preparing a water conservation/groundwater sustainability plan. Larry thinks they have reached the point where they need some direction from the Board so they can move this to a conclusion. Larry said they started using the City of Waukesha's plan as we knew that has been publicly provided to the PSC, although he

understands the commission has not approved that. We wanted to get a list of priorities to the Board, so you could give approvals, disapprovals and get this completed. Larry suggested taking them one at a time. Jon said you are looking for guidance from the Board for specifics of the plan and this is the framework to start that discussion. Larry said that is correct. Larry said he recommends that we get feedback from the Board with regard to these priorities and then we'll ask the committee to reconvene and do that. Larry said Genesis from City Engineering has been working as editor on this and it would be helpful for the Engineering Division if Gail Gawenda would move into that role rather than Genesis. Jon thinks it's a good idea to bring it in-house, and asked Gail if she's willing to take this assignment on. Gail said she is.

Priority 1: Reduce residential per capita water use by 20% by the Year 2020. Michael Schumacher said he'd like to see another column added for what we are trading off. One of them would be with less water use we'd have less sales, which will impact the rate structure. He thinks it would be helpful to list some consensus on a goal e side effects that we have to keep an eye on. He said maybe add a column for notes.

George Meyer said we need to get this to the PSC as part of the current rate case. Jon said these are goals, not commitments. Lauren said this is about reaching consensus on goals. Larry said if we're going to get feedback to the report, this is number one. Either we're going to have a goal for water conservation or we're not. If we're not going to have a goal for water conservation, we don't need this report. If we can't get some kind of consensus on a goal, it doesn't have to be 20/20 but there about. Jon said to him it means if we say yes to priority one, we are committed to doing what it takes to get that done; which is raising rates or inclined rate structure—all of the things that go along with this concept of reducing by 20%. We're going to work hard, and he likes it the way it is. Michael asked why 20%. Greg Harrington asked if somebody just demonstrated that 20% is feasible—you're talking about 58 gallons per capita per day. Are municipalities demonstrating they can get that? Larry said in the draft report there is an analysis of what EPA can do if we take some action. Jon asked Jeff Ripp where the 20% number came from.

Jeff said he can provide a little more framework from the State perspective; what we're seeing is voluntary conservation. It's not that 20% is the right goal for water utilities, but the PSC is interested in looking at utilities that are developing programs that will demonstrate using water more efficiently. There is a general interest in improving conservation and the PSC is looking at ways they can assist water utilities. Waukesha looked at it and came up with 20% looking at where demand was going to be in 20 years. Trying to answer that question for Madison Water Utility, looking at it from the standpoint of where do you think demand is going to be in 20 years, if the goal is to maintain where Madison is at today. Jeff said the Commission won't say it's the wrong goal. They will look at that goal but they won't dictate the rate case.

Dr. Schlenker said it appears to him that if production is held at its current level and population continues to grow at the same pace it has been, that we will automatically achieve this by 2020 or is he just guessing. Jon said growth is going to be something like 20% in the next 12 years. Dan Melton said he thinks Priority 1 is excellent, that it is somewhat arbitrary; he understands all the questions but other municipalities have chosen this figure and 20% is an easy figure for the public to remember, 20% by 2020.

Jon said we could pick a benchmark, which could be our highest year ever. That could be one way to look at it. Robin thinks it was before 2004 and Al

said 2001. Jon said for Priority 1, we're going to keep it the way it is. For the next version of this, we're going to have advantages and disadvantages when we start working our plan. Michael said we must have a clear reason for this reduction, some rationale. Jon said we're the biggest power user in the City. Al said he has the population in the year 2020 as 245,000. Now it is around 219,000. Jon said so we'd actually be using less water, that our 20/20 is a little more ambitious than that. We'd actually be using less water. Jon noted that we are the largest power user in the city. Al said 245,00 in 2020 is 10 or 11% growth. George said this should be tied to the energy use reduction. Greg said he'd like to see numbers from other municipalities including Waukesha. Larry said there was one suggested by the committee in the draft plan. and they actually included funds in our rate case with the PSC for it.

Priority 2: Establish a Toilet Rebate Program: Larry said a rebate of \$100 per dwelling unit was discussed. This is a very ambitious program. Using our data from the Assessor's file, we have approximately 79,000 dwelling units, and we've got a count of toilet fixtures that were put in prior to 1995. Larry said you're talking about a pretty expensive program to replace all of those, but a toilet fixture represents the biggest savings that we can get on available data. By going from 4.5 to 6 gallons per flush, to 1.6 gallons per flush—it's estimated it will save a little over 10 gallons per capita; looking at a population, that would be around 2 million gallons per day. We're talking about one unit per dwelling and that could be an apartment, a service station, whatever. It's just one of the ideas for conservation. Using a licensed plumber to replace a toilet would cost around \$350, and we hope they'd change our more toilets in the residence. Larry said the sum of \$250,000 representing 2,500 toilet replacements per year per dwelling unit has been requested as part of the annual rate structure. This rebate program could be administered in much the same way as the Utility's successful lead service replacement program. Larry said it's pretty sketchy and it's an ambitious program.

Lauren asked how does the number of toilets in residences compare to the non-residences such as schools, hospitals. Larry said we don't have very good data on that, but you're still talking one per customer on that. Lauren asked if it would make sense at some point to have a companion program that includes institutions to move that direction, or do you think they already are doing that. Larry said there is not a lot of data on that. He noted that hospitals are on of our largest water users. Lauren said she's in favor of this, that it makes sense, but she wants to make sure we're not missing 75% of the toilets in our community by just focusing on residential.

Jon said he thinks there is an element of education. He said there is a belief out there that the low-flow toilets don't work, you push the button and nothing happens. That is not the truth. The new generation of toilets work. That would be Gail's job to get that message out about which ones work. There is an education component to this. George said he's hearing we need an educational program beyond this. Larry said this will be a major program with regard to public education, and what he is really concerned about is our ability to afford to handle all of the requests. At 2500 a year, it's going to take a number of years to get through it. Michael asked if they have looked for any partners out there that would match dollars, that type of thing.

Dan said other cities have established programs with Menards, etc. Jon said he noticed that WaterSense toilets have come down 10%, \$20 to \$30. George said we should focus on energy too. Greg said under the lead service replacement program, we initially tried to get that paid for out of the Water Utility's rates, and the PSC denied that, so it ended up coming out of the Storm Sewer monies. He asked what the thinking is here. Larry said we've

requested PSC include this in our rates.

Jeff Ripp said this is really new and he commends the Utility for moving forth on this. He said in Wisconsin, we do have a public benefit fund on the electricity side that the PSC has approved. Indications from commissioners are that they are in favor of this, and they will make the final decision on this. Jeff said by making a clear justified case of why you need this, saying this is what we want to achieve, with timelines, and it will make a strong case for it. Michael asked where we get \$250,000 up front. Larry said we will not propose the program to the board unless we have PSC support for this.

Priority 3: Providing Customers with the Current Consumption Data. Larry said one of the challenges the Water Utility has is that it renders bills on a six-month basis, and we understand that the PSC is concerned about giving people an opportunity to rectify their use and six months doesn't do that. A quarterly doesn't particularly help but it is better than a six-month. What we would like to do is propose that we help instruct our customers on how to track their water use on a monthly basis or more frequently if they would like. The Water Utility spend \$3 million a year maintaining its meter system, reading those meters, issuing bills and that is a big chunk of our operation. We would like to send individual water customers a card stock card that they can use to actually track their water usage on a monthly basis and back that up with some public instruction. Larry said that was his idea and the committee immediately said oh, that's so old-fashioned; we need to put on our webpage system where a person could go outside, write down their meter numbers, plug in that number and it will calculate their bill for them. Larry said he thinks that is probably the way to go. He hasn't discussed this with the PSC. We get more than a handful of folks who are interested in that sort of thing. In order to address water conservation, the property owners have to know how much they are using right now. The six-month bill is where we're at and we'd have to explain to people that there is a little box on the outside of their house—sometimes it's pretty handy- and they can write down those numbers to calculate usage. If you are watering your garden and you know how big your garden is, you can use that water meter to determine how much you're using a week, too. Michael asked if we're eventually going to do something like Vilas, and what would it look like if we continue billing every six-months, minimizing the cost to the Utility but having the customer able to calculate usage. Jon said the hardware is \$7 million. He said Larry has come up with a creative way to get away from the monthly billing issue, and does it have any merit. Jeff Ripp said when they were looking at Waukesha last summer, one of the concerns was with quarterly billing. He thinks the days of six-month billing cycles are numbered. Greg asked if customers know their daily usage, and Larry said every day people call and ask that question and the billing clerks do answer that. Lauren said it shows us right now the average six-month bill is \$207.75, but that is everything, not just water. Jeff said there was a preliminary study done using Wisconsin data, looking at various things such as frequency of billing and the monthly billing cycle did have an effect. Michael said implementing more frequent billing and achieving conservation, we'll see higher than 18% increases and we're going to have to have public education as to why this is happening. Jon asked if we put in here the cost of putting in remote meter reading so we can do monthly billing and ask for a rate increase to pay for that over a period of time, the PSC would be supportive of that? Jeff said it's like any other capital project you are doing, it would be looked at in terms of the overall utility operations, in terms of what is reasonable, etc. Larry said if we could encourage some of our users and we won't get all, but some who are really interested in this and their overall environmental

footprint, and actually have the knowledge to do this, I'd be very happy if we got like the Prius effect, where people are trying to maximize the mileage with a Prius car, turning the air conditioner off and everything else, trying to get 70 miles to the gallon. If we get some of our customers who have that interest and that information, he'd be happy. Jon said he thinks we're saying that we should leave this concept in of people doing this self-monitoring to see how they are doing. We should leave in here the fact that we realize that quarterly or monthly billing is coming and it is expensive, but we're going to save somebody looking at it in 2010. He thinks he's hearing that three and five are okay as they are. Lauren said you're all aware of M Power of Madison, which she thinks MG&E does along with other people, they do have a section on conserving water and she thinks that is your market--people who are already interested in this and hooked up to it, doing all these things. She said it doesn't mention low-flow toilets and she thinks we should coordinate with other environmental outlets regarding this. Jon said ENACT is out there too, doing these home things.

Priority 4: Enact an Inclining Rate Structure for Residential Customers.

Jon said this is a modest rate structure and maybe we should get something more aggressive. Jon asked Jeff Ripp if it's worthwhile to put out a modest inclining rate structure now to sort of provide the groundwork for doing a more aggressive one later. Jeff said if you're trying to achieve drastic water use reduction in a short period of time, then maybe you need to ...? The procedure the PSC uses is based on actual cost so there is a limit to where you can set your actual pricing. There are issues regarding the structure of rate setting, and more than one policy consideration. He said the best advice he can give to the Utility and the Board is, if it's one of your priorities to pursue inclining water rate structure, and it comes across that this is the direction you want to go, at that point we can look at working within the current rate case or some future rate case, at what structure makes sense. Jeff said talking about actual pricing points at this time is premature.

Michael said in this case, he would not favor an aggressive program. He would like it to be modest, as it is. He thinks need to get used to incremental increases. Jon said so you are saying keep it as it is for now, and we'll address this in the future. Jeff said there are a lot of ways to get at that ?? requirement, and in some cases maybe inclining rate structure does work. If you want to propose that, it's something that could be done. Greg asked if we're talking usage at 61 gallons per day and if our goal is 58 gallons per day per capita, 61 gallons per day sounds really small. Larry said that is our 2007 residential customer base usage, the lowest 20% usage was 61 gallons per day. The median is 184. Jon said these numbers are in this document but weren't in the original. Michael said it should be simple to give an explanation as to what the annual numbers would be. Jon said you could do an estimate of usage based on Madison's population and the number of dwellings for an average use. Just a couple of sentences to explain where these numbers came from. This would be a friendly change to this item.

Priority 5: Investigate the Conversion of Water Meters to Provide for Quarterly Billing and the Potential of Monthly Billing.

Jon said quarterly billing is costly but we could build it into our rates, and what this really says is that we are really going to look at this. Jon said the Meter Shop is a big part of costs being 15% of our budget. A big part of it is

replacing those meters. Larry said automated meter reading would reduce the costs over that of conventional meter reading. Now, in addition to the operating costs, you have to capitalize the heads you put on the meters. We replace meters every 12 years, so the idea is, when we replace the meters, we put the \$110 head on the meter; or we can hire competitively a contractor to do this. Then instead of the reading being taken off the meter, running up a wire to the outside of the house, you would have a vehicle like MG&E has that just drives down the street and sends a signal. Or you can go to the next step and put receivers on your water towers.

The Utility's cost to levy its bills, including meter reading and maintenance of meter, is \$3,001,210 per year or around \$23.07 for each six-month bill. We realize that the PSC is interested in having us look at more frequent billing, and we're only putting it off a year until we get some serious discussion on this issue. It would cost the Utility another \$724,000 per year to levy bills quarterly with conventional meter reading, or \$436,000 per year using AMR (Automatic Meter Reading). The cost to convert to AMR is estimated at \$639,000 per year, assuming the debt would be retired in 20 years. The use of AMR would allow the Utility to bill monthly. Michael asked if monthly billing is off the table. Larry said yes, at this time but the board may want to look at it in the future. Michael said we're paying \$3 million now, and asked what it would drop if kept at six months.

Michael had a friendly addition to this priority, saying to drop off the last line of priority 5, which reads, "The Water Utility should consider conversion of water meters to AMR in 2010.

Priority 6: Enact Outdoors Water Usage Restrictions to Maintain Pumpage Below a Preset Daily Amount.

Madison General Ordinances provides for voluntary and mandatory restrictions for outdoor water usage. In 2007 there were 29 days where pumpage exceeded 40 MGD, 11 days where it exceeded 45 MGD, and 3 days where it exceeded 50 MGD. This goal would provide that voluntary restrictions be imposed whenever pumpage exceeded 45 MGD for 3 continuous days and mandatory restrictions whenever pumpage exceeds 50 MGD for two continuous days.

While not directly tied to water conservation, the enactment of water usage restrictions would save on electricity during high use days and inform customers about the limitations of the system.

Larry said the City of Madison hasn't had to implement mandatory restrictions on outdoor use. We would like the board to reach a consensus with regards to trigger points and work on them with the public. George said the current conservation ordinance isn't based on usage but on Water Utility capability. Greg asked the capacity of the system. Al said 68 million gallons with everything running. When we get to 55 million, we start having problems keeping the reservoirs full. The Board's protocol has reduced the capacity. If it got a little low on a hot day, we kept on pumping with an average of 32 to 33 million gallons per day. Jon asked if we're comfortable with those levels. George asked when and how it's applicable, and if we should look at time of day. Larry said we're always encouraged not to water during hot times of the day. Lauren said she would be in favor of looking at that. Al said in 2007 there were three days over 50 million, none consecutive. Jeff said education is important with municipal ordinances, and putting together what is happening across the state; doing that may help in the debate.

George said for the 2009 season, time of day water use should be proposed

to the Council. Greg said for two or three years, have it voluntary and after that, mandatory. Lauren said she thinks this could be priority number one, time of day use. Larry said there will be exceptions. Jon said Greg suggests holding off on numbers for three years and then making it mandatory if usage exceeds a certain amount for so many days. Jon said these are goals to look at.

On Priority 6, George would like to add time of day water use restrictions in time to be presented to the Common Council and implemented in 2009. Michael thinks we need to do more research. Larry wants a trigger point put in it by summer. You'd have to put out an announcement similar to our snow days. We would ask for voluntary restrictions first, and we'd have to put out the notice daily. Michael said he'd like to strike "two consecutive days." George said mandatory is no water of lawns, or every other day. Larry likes it two days to have time to get this stuff out. After 2 days, we reach the trigger point. Jon said time of day but nothing else added at this time. These numbers will be subject to change based on the PSC report. Jon said if we withdraw the plan the PSC has seen, is there any possibility we won't get a rate increase. Jeff Ripp said he doesn't think so, that he doesn't see this having any effect. The Commission won't nit-pick what you put in your plan. Providing more information to PSC on a rate case is a good thing. Jon asked if we could add this to what we've already given them. Robin said it hasn't been submitted as part of the rate case yet. Jeff said the PSC hasn't asked for utilities to submit a conservation plan yet. He thinks a well thought out document with vision, goals and how you plan to achieve this would be good. Michael said being mindful that this required Common Council approval, don't jump the gun. We need a strategic document that outlines where we want to go with this.

Jon said we need a motion to accept this document with a friendly amendment and forward it to the PSC as part of our rate case.

George Meyer made a motion to accept this with the friendly amendment. Lauren Cnare seconded; unanimously passed.

Michael said he wanted to make sure on how to proceed with this, to make sure we have everything covered. George said in terms of cost items, he doesn't see this being different from things where we ask the PSC for other infrastructure. He views it as the same. As far as Priority No. 6, we have to do it as an ordinance subject to Council approval. Lauren said the worse case scenario would be if the PSC made a decision based on this and it didn't come true.

Dan said his only reservation is the card under Priority No. 3—he doesn't see the need for mailing cards to customers; he doesn't see the value of it. He said a lot of municipalities are going to Real Time Smart Meters. His intuition tells him that that is the way we should be thinking about going. You could, right on your lap top, see what your water usage was that morning. Jon said to Dan you're just weighing in on that and I think we've got it covered.

Jon called a vote—all in favor, passes unanimously.

Jon said the second part of this agenda item—we've agreed to put this in our rate request, and the second part is the existing document conservation plan, whether we're going to pull it back to the Plan Commission or whether we're going to wait until a revised version is done. At some point we'll go to the Plan Commission with the next rate case or maybe this one. Joel Crestwell is one of the original citizen authors of that plan and present. Jon asked Joel if he thinks we should have a revised version and not send this to the Plan Commission, or do you think we should send this with the proviso that a more refined version would go in the future. Joel said he feels that it is still

a work in progress, that it still needs rewriting. It's a document that was written by a group of people and it still reads that way. He said he thinks there are a lot of loose ends that need to be tied up. As various members of the Board have commented on the document, both at this meeting and previous written comments of the committee, he thinks it would benefit from further rewriting and tightening up of language, being fine-tuned.

Robin said there are some parts of that that could be improved. At the last committee design team discussion, we intentionally set out to put together a plan that didn't have all the little details filled in. We wanted to allow ourselves some room to be able to add better ideas and to take into account our hiring of a PIO/Conservation person and get input from that person. The intention was, when putting this document together, to get something down on paper to get us started. One of the board's goals was water conservation plan and we wanted to get started on that, to have something to work from, especially with the rate case we're in the middle of.

Jon said there is a lot of good stuff in it. It's a good document as it stands and there are things that need to be added to it yet. Joe Grande said he agrees with Joel, that it can be tightened up yet. These priorities will probably change over time in that we'll go down a path and decide that path didn't work out the way we anticipated, or we'll find something that was better. He thinks we have a document that lays the general framework and offer quite a bit of vision. Joe said he supports putting this document forth to the PSC at this time, as this will be an ongoing process. Dan said if we would submit this as part of our rate case, so it would be available electronically to the Commissioners, and let's say a rewritten version comes back to the July 22 board meeting, or would the PSC be looking for something sooner. Jeff said there is no requirement to submit any plan at all to the PSC, so that would certainly work fine. He said whenever the board and Water Utility is comfortable with the plan, that is the point where you need to submit it. If you want the draft in place as a work in progress, he thinks that would be fine too.

Michael said his is an editorial and he can go either way. His personal preference however is getting a report done that addresses the key elements, a clear vision to outsiders. When an outsider who has not seen the report before, will the mission come through clearly. What's the knowledge behind it, the data, then what are we trying to achieve with that. How to motivate others and resources for us and users to use, and saying here are the next steps for the coming years. He thinks we should run through this one more time.

Jon said we've hired a PIO (Public Information Officer) who has to the skills to do these types of repairs. George asked Robin asked when he thinks the rate case will go. Robin said under the timeline he's been given by the PSC, we probably won't have a final decision until end of September, early October, so he doesn't think it will happen in July.

Jeff said on the issue of timing, with the rebate in there, we will take that and add a month of time for processing. He thinks six months would be the outside. That is an issue we will take before the PSC for an open meeting.

Gail Gawenda, PIO, said she will work on this if she gets her resources.

Jon said the motion we're looking for is to forward the existing document to the PSC. We need a motion to forward it. Michael Schumacher made a motion to forward the draft document. George Meyer seconded. Lauren said she thinks it premature and she will probably vote no. Michael Schumacher then withdrew his motion and George Meyer also withdrew his motion to second it. Dan said we've already decided to submit this to the PSC as part of our rate case.

Michael Schumacher made a motion to reaffirm referring this document to the July meeting. Dan Melton seconded; unanimously passed.

14. [08381](#)

SUBSTITUTE - Requiring all City agencies and departments, in cooperation with the Facilities and Sustainability Manager, to estimate their current water consumption and to come up with a comprehensive list of steps to reduce their water consumption.

Larry said he went through the resolution and then he added two whereas clauses and

Amended to resolved clauses, which included the Sustainability Committee, which included the Water Utility in working with the Sustainability Manager. Then we added the final resolve clause which states the report would be incorporated into the water conservation issue and sustainable ground water. Larry said it is somewhat subjective, and he sat down with Joe DeMorett who is our hydrogeologist and said which one of these are you comfortable with.

Michael said since that was one of his concerns, he is pleased to see what you've done with it. He's looked at all the changes and he thinks it's a tighter resolution, and he thanked staff for their work. Lauren said in the fifth Whereas clause, she thinks there should be after capacity and before the. In the 12th one, it reads "Whereas water conservation and efficiency can save money by reducing water demand and perhaps eliminating the need for future capital expenditures such as new wells..." Lauren said we're going to need new wells, whether they're additional new wells; we're going to have to replace wells, so she wonders if the language could be changed to one of two things, the first one being "Whereas water conservation can save the City money by reducing water demand and perhaps reducing the need for future capital expenditures such as new wells" etc. because we're going to have to replace a well and that is called a new well by definition, or you could say something to the effect, "Whereas water conservation, energy and efficiency can save the City money by reducing water demand and perhaps eliminating the need for future capital expenditures such as additional new wells." She thinks it is clearer that way. You get to pick one or the other.

Jon said we have this resolution for acceptance of the substitute resolution with these whereas's, do we want to call it changes, modifications or a substitute. Lauren said it is a substitute. Jon said so when it goes to the Council, what does it mean? Michael said this will be the one that goes to the Council. Jon said it's a choice for the Council one way or the other. Michael said they could modify it. Michael said one line he'd like to strike, "Whereas water is essential for life." He thinks this is an unnecessary statement. Jon asked if everyone is in agreement on scratching the first whereas. Lauren said to move approval with the following amendments. In the fifth Whereas clause, correct grammar by adding by the word has, "capacity has the potential." She said it reads that you could have new wells and that is never going to be the case, so "Whereas, water conservation and efficiency can save the City money by reducing water demand and perhaps eliminating the need for future capital expenditures such as additional new wells."

George said where it says, ", , , reduce Madison's carbon footprint," and add the clause "reduce energy costs and consumption . . ." Dan Melton said he'd like to be recorded as abstaining and the reason is he doesn't think we should be presented anything in writing at the meeting; he thinks we should have it prior to the meeting. He thinks abstaining on this is a compromise vote. He can't really vote no but is abstaining. Michael said he understands but

unfortunately, this is often the case sometimes. For all practical purposes, this happens all the time on other commissions and committees. Jon said one of his goals as president this year is to make sure every document that we're going to vote on is in our hands the Friday before the meeting so you can read it, work on it and come prepared to the meeting. He's going to keep pushing for it. He realizes this puts huge pressure on staff and makes things difficult, but that's the goal. We are better than most other groups and we'll probably never be perfect.

Michael Schumacher made a motion to approve the substitute resolution. Lauren Cnare seconded; passed unanimously with Dan Melton abstaining.

A motion was made by Schumacher, seconded by Cnare, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 -

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

Abstentions: 1 -

Dan Melton

NEW BUSINESS

15. [10490](#) Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Professional Services Agreement with Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions LLC for extended pumping and testing of the Larkin Street test well. 11th AD.

Lauren Cnare made a motion for approval. Michael Schumacher seconded. Jon said his recollection is that we discussed this already and decided in principle it was a good idea. The work is already done so we're deciding to pay them for what they already did. Dan Melton said perhaps he's being naive in saying this but it would make sense that when the work reached the dollar amount that we had approved, the work would have temporarily halted at that moment. Montgomery would have submitted a written proposal to amend the contract for a set amount it estimated it would take. He said he's not saying we shouldn't pay this bill as we are probably obligated to, but he doesn't think the process was kosher. Michael said when we had the EMA contract, that was a big issue as people continued to work and deliver. He recalls Larry saying something at the Public Works meeting at that time that it is no unusual in the city to sometimes have this happening. In the EMA contract, they could have stopped. There would have been no problem. But as in this case, some of the work that is being done, stopping it would almost be counter productive. Larry said work for a consultant would be change orders and a public works contract. What we do is, when there is additional work, we determine if it's in the City's interest to stop the work and get approval for the work, or to continue the work. What is the most cost effective. We are on State Street and if we have a water main that is different under the ground or there is a conflict with another utility that wasn't anticipated, what we'll do is issue a field order and go around that other utility. There will be a change order that later the Board of Public Works will see. If we stopped the work, the contractor would be eligible for additional damages because we delayed them. The same thing with consultants—in the case of

this one, the Board was aware that the work was proceeding and was actually anxious for it to be concluded as soon as possible. To go through and get a proposal, prepare a resolution and send it to the Common Council would only have delayed the work. The Board was aware we were in that situation and we kept the Board apprised of it. The contract clearly identified it as an additional service. Larry said once a project is started, like a test well, there are a lot of variables out there, and you're in the project until it's done. You've made that commitment. George said it might have cost us more if we had stopped.

Unanimously passed.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Schumacher, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

16. [10653](#)

Lauren Cnare made a motion to approve this item, to join WaterSense Partnership Program as part of our water conservation effort. George Meyer seconded; unanimously passed. The application will be submitted to WaterSense.

CORRESPONDENCE AND SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

17. [10654](#)

Letter to Parks Commission

Larry said when the city is in the process of getting a neighborhood plan passed on the northeast side, we had a lot of questions with respect to the proposed water well in that area, and they addressed the Parks Commission along with other standing committees and the North Side Neighborhood Plan. We had separate discussions with the neighborhood with regards to the Gruber resolution, the issue of the use of park areas. We had discussion with respect to the replacement of Well 3. A number of parks were identified as potential locations for the well. After some discussion with Si Wodstrand, the Parks planner, we thought we'd better get the Parks Commission interested. Larry said he is always concerned that anytime we have any kind of a project dealing with parks, be it a highway, sewer or storm water project, he's found the Parks Commission is very concerned about the use of park lands both now and in the future, and they regard that they have a public trust that they have identify. Larry said he drafted this letter and got it out to them to get this kind of discussion going on. He thinks it would be absolutely deadly to our public participation plans to go ahead and add in park lands as potential well sites. He thinks you'll find entire neighborhoods that will erupt and he's spent a lot of time explaining that. He thinks that the Park Commissioner is going to probably say in some parks, no way, and in other parks, like the immense Door Creek Park on the east side, it's possible. He thinks they'll say, come to us when you can't find anything else. He'd like to have that dialogue to share with the board and committees in looking at future projects.

Michael said, as a Parks Commissioner, he agrees with Larry. There is a sense of stewardship that comes with being a Parks Commissioner. He

wouldn't want to see the Parks Commission as a trigger. It's important to see if it fits into the Parks plan and vision. You would include the Parks Commission or any commission in the process as necessary.

Jon said this is a "FYI" item so there is no action that needs to be taken.

Lauren said if we see that there are a fair amount of pieces of property that are parks that have a water tower next to them. There is one in Grandview Commons, Olbrich Hill has something on it. Are we neighbors with a lot of parks already? She said it seems like we are and we could be good neighbors. Larry said in most cases we have lots adjacent to parks, for example, we have Unit Well 8 on the east side which is essentially surrounded by Olbrich Park.

Michael said that is an interesting point that Larry made—they don't recognize that the Water Utility was there before. Larry said we'll get back to the Parks Commission and get their thoughts and report back to this board.

ADJOURNMENT

Lauren Cnare made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Michael Schumacher seconded; unanimously passed.
Meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Review the Accomplishments in the Major Focus Areas identified at the Special Meeting on March 8, 2007.

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

A report regarding AMR (Automatic Meter Reading). It was staff's intent to have this report available for the April 29, 2008 Board meeting. However, the report is still being drafted.