



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved WATER UTILITY BOARD

Tuesday, December 15, 2009

4:30 PM

119 E. Olin Ave., Rooms A&B

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Gregory Harrington called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.

Present: 5 -

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

Excused: 3 -

George E. Meyer; Thomas Schlenker and Michael Schumacher

PUBLIC HEARING

1. [16852](#) Alternative Evaluation for the Pressure Zone 4 Water Supply Augmentation Project

Attachments: [Alternative Evaluation Report for Pressure Zone 4 Water Supply Augmentatic](#)
[Fire Flow Analysis Maps.pdf](#)
[Citizen Advisory Panel Report.pdf](#)
[Written Public Comment Zone4 Alternative Evaluation Hearing.pdf](#)

The attached Alternative Evaluation Report was distributed. Water Utility Engineer Dennis Cawley gave a brief introduction to the project, which seeks to address fire flow deficiencies and the lack of a redundant water supply in Zone 4. His presentation included a series of fire flow analysis maps (see attached). The recommended alternative was to drill a new well.

One citizen was present to address the Board at the hearing.

Mark McColloch, 4805 Flint Lane, introduced himself as the spokesman for the Citizen Advisory Panel (CAP) for this project. He read their report into the minutes (see attached).

One comment was submitted for the Board's review prior to the meeting (see attached).

Following a discussion of project budgeting and next steps in the Public Participation Process, Cawley was asked if he was concerned about finding an appropriate site. He said there are concerns because the geology of the area could make it difficult to find a site with enough capacity. The Water Utility might have look outside of the city, which has been done before.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Gotkowitz, to Approve the alternative of drilling a new well to serve Zone 4. The motion passed by the following vote:

Excused: 2 -

George E. Meyer; Thomas Schlenker and Michael Schumacher

Ayes: 3 -

Lauren Cnare; Bruce Mayer and Madeline B. Gotkowitz

Noes: 1 -

Dan Melton

Non Voting: 1 -

Gregory W. Harrington

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mayer, seconded by Cnare, to Approve the Minutes of the November 24 and December 1 meetings. The motion passed by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public registered to speak.

ADMINISTRATION REPORTS

2. [14080](#) General Manager's Report

General Manager Tom Heikkinen said the public hearing for the rate case was the previous week. The Utility just learned that the Commission decided to review the rate case instead of delegating the decision to staff. This will delay implementation of the rates by another month. He was asked if there was any public comment at the hearing. Heikkinen said one member of the public, Steve Holtzman, gave testimony.

3. [14085](#) Water Quality Monitoring Report

Attachments: [Water Quality Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

4. [14086](#) Water Supply Report

Attachments: [Water Supply Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

5. [14087](#) Operations Report

Attachments: [Operations Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

6. [14088](#) Staffing Report

Attachments: [Staffing Report December 2009.pdf](#)

Heikkinen was asked if crews were involved in snow removal the previous week. He said the crews plowed and cleared Water Utility facilities. There were active main breaks during the storm, and resources were needed for that.

7. [14089](#) Customer Service Report

Attachments: [Customer Service Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

8. [14090](#) Public Information Report

Attachments: [Public Information Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

9. [14122](#) Engineering Report

Attachments: [Engineering Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

10. [14092](#) Financial Report: Toilet Rebate Program

Attachments: [Toilet Rebate Program Financial Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

11. [14123](#) Fund Balance Report

Attachments: [Fund Balance Report December 2009.pdf](#)

The attached report was distributed.

NEW BUSINESS

12. [16853](#) Discussion of Water Utility Board Governance Policy

Attachments: [Water Utility Board Governance Policy Handout.pdf](#)

Harrington distributed the attached handout. Heikkinen said he had received several responses to his inquiry on AMWA. Water Utility Boards in Eugene, Oregon and Mobile, Alabama had tried the Policy Governance model but ultimately chosen not to go forward with it. Their directors were very interested in this Board's experience.

Don Percy was present to address the Board. He introduced himself as a consultant whose focus is coaching CEOs and Board training and development. He proposed a three-month evaluation period with the Policy Governance model. The Board would then have the tools it needed to make an informed decision about becoming a policy board. Full implementation usually takes about three years. He suggested that the Board set a goal of developing a policy book over the next three months. He could provide materials to facilitate this process, and A.B. Orlik could teach them.

A discussion followed of the Policy Governance model. Percy was asked if there were other models, and for the common criticisms of Policy Governance. He said there are other models, but this is the best one he has encountered because it frees the Board to be stakeholder representatives and strategic thinkers. Common criticism includes that it can lead to a procedural focus, or that some members keep old habits. Full commitment from all members is necessary.

There was a discussion of whether additional meetings were necessary. Percy advised against a daylong retreat and recommended several shorter sessions. The Board could commit to take an hour at the end of three of its regularly scheduled meetings for education and development.

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Gotkowitz, to adopt the following policy:

Effective immediately, the Water Utility Board shall explore the feasibility of implementing the Policy Governance Model for its future operation. If this model is adopted, the Board will:

1. Develop policies in four major categories:
 - a. Water Utility Outcomes (Ends),
 - b. Water Utility Management Limitations
 - c. Board/ General Manager Relationships, and
 - d. Board Processes.
2. Use the Ten Attributes described by the Effective Utility Management Collaborative as key reference points in designing the Outcomes policies.

The motion passed by voice vote.

13. [14501](#) Introduction of Future Agenda Items

The following future agenda items were previously suggested:

- Report on Well 8 Disinfection Pilot Study
- Board of Health Review of Fluoridation Policy
- Forecasting Future Rates to Support Capital Programs
- Collaboration with Dane County Water Utilities
- Discussion of Relationship with Municipalities that are Wholesale Customers
- Developing a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Strategy
- Education on Contaminant Transport

Harrington suggested that most of these items could be replaced by the Board's Policy Governance work and developing the policy book. Many of the items on the list are related to policies and would be included in this process. In the future, if an item is brought forward for New Business, he would like the Board to begin by evaluating whether or not it is something they should consider.

There was a discussion of balancing operational details with the big picture focus of a policy board. There was a concern that important information might not come to the Board's attention. Percy said this is negotiated in the policies defining what the CEO shall not do and shall not fail to do. For certain subjects, like the siting of well, the Board could choose to develop subsidiary policies. However, this could be taken too far, to the point that the Board is not making the best use of its time and limits the CEO'S creativity. There are some things the Board is required to do by ordinance. However, the amount of time spent on these items can be reduced. It was suggested that finding a balance would be one of the challenges when developing the policies, and the Board would have to work together to determine what and how much information it needs and what it would hold the CEO accountable for.

It was suggested that becoming a policy board would require that Board members speak to each other, and currently this can only be done at a meeting. Harrington said it is his preference that discussion take place at the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Mayer, to Adjourn at 6:07 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote.