

Member Advisory Committee Meeting Tuesday February 11th, 2020
Agenda (5:00 PM – 7:00 PM)

Rich Formisano	Joyce Hibma	Ted Stonebridge (GM)
Shawn McKone	Andy Neff	Eric O'Brien (Board P)
Stephen Kangas		Daylin Baker (Board VP)
Possible New Members:	Guest:	
Elmer Sams	Larry Costello (Board)	

1. New members to MAC (5 min)
Elmer is able to join. He discussed how board handled E. coli event and meeting at casino, commended the board, he was impressed.
The committee recommended Elmer for approval by the board for joining MAC.

2. Demographics project discussion – in progress (Rich) (15 min)
Joyce has made progress but had questions for how to account for properties that are not buildable but may still be usable (need water). Should they be eliminated from the demand calculations. Rich suggested they be categorized as “not buildable”. Also some other random one-off findings that she will work with Rich on.
Rich asked that Ted keep him and Joyce in the loop as the new billing software comes online so they can work on adding the member stats to the bills.

3. Member survey update (Joyce & Andy) (15 min)
Andy did a skeleton of a member survey. Started with putting made up numbers on a scale to let people express their priorities of \$ vs. untreated water. The initial draft range was \$1,000+ to \$0. Eric suggested using the survey for a few more questions due to anticipated decline in participation if we do multiple surveys. Andy felt this initial question could discern if we need to continue with researching the further costs and risk of returning to untreated. Shawn proposed a question for the survey that asks for an indication of how much they notice the taste/smell of chlorine in their water now. Andy suggested they may also have objections based on other concerns such as health.
We discussed using survey monkey, Shawn said it can authenticate users if set that way. We also discussed sending a paper survey out with the bill so people without computers can participate. There’s a need for a PIN # or serial # on the paper versions – how to track to ensure one response per member?
Joyce suggested considering the health question from the other angle – mentioned gentleman who said he’d sue Sallal if we went back to untreated because he doesn’t want to risk getting E. coli. Andy said maybe we could add ways to capture someone that would pay money to keep the chlorine in the water.
Rich suggested we could consider additional costs of staying treated. Ted explained that the contact time is only required for Well #2, and that the chlorine added to Well #4 is

going in regardless, because of the current DOH requirement to maintain a residual in the system. Shawn asked about what would happen if we offered decommission Well #2? Ted said we would still need to go through the uphill battle to prove to DOH because we had hits throughout our system. Eric mentioned that Well #4 is critical because we are already on the edge for capacity during the summer, so closing Well #2 wouldn't be feasible. Eric suggested we advertise this at the members meeting. We discussed a raffle prize (or prizes) to get people to take the survey.

We discussed adding other questions that the board wanted to ask about communication – how are we doing? We agreed it should stay short to increase participation. Shawn considered a question about demographics to identify pockets of stronger smell/taste of chlorine. Stephen questioned what could we do about it? Ted said we are doing it, it's typically in dead end areas. Eric suggested we could ask it by quadrants, not addresses. Andy said we will have a connection to the person already with the tag on the survey.

Elmer asked how many calls a month Ted gets about chlorine complaints. Ted said about half a dozen in January, double that in December, more before that.

Rich asked how we will update members after the survey to what they can expect next – what is bigger project plan to get this to a finish line? We need to be prepared for the renewed interest from the members. Rich said he could put together an outline for a project plan for the board. Eric suggested having this ready for the annual membership meeting, like mailing it out with the end of March bill and then announcing/promoting it at the meeting.

4. Review ideas for more ways the MAC can help the BOT (Rich) (15 min)

Rich reviewed his list: WSP, Contract with City (and alternatives), Rate Study, Emergency backup power at the new office (Rich will share sketched out options with Ted & Elmer), searching for legal/technical experts, developing or reviewing project plans, and review updates to emergency response plans and risk assessments. Eric suggested next meeting, the MAC pick the top three to focus on. Stephen asked what the board's priorities? Larry shared that he has a list of issues with the WSP and suggested that the MAC could help boil it down to a helpful recommendation that would go back to the board for their consideration. MAC will request access to full WSP draft at next week's board meeting.

5. Review WUE goals – continue discussion from last meeting (20 min)

We reviewed the annual report provided by Ted that showed how Sallal is accountable to DOH for WUE goals. Rich discussed that DSL monitoring and shared that this isn't really a goal, it's a requirement to track this. He read the manual and his biggest takeaway is that some of the goals we are listing are actually mandatory measures, not goals. Ted disagreed, he thought they are allowed to be a goal as well, even though it's mandatory. Andy suggested that the mandatory part was to monitor, the goal part was to try to get to 6%. Larry also saw it the same way that Rich did. He explained that he talked to Warren about it and accepts that Sallal did this six years ago in this same way and it was accepted by DOH. Ted recapped that they have accepted it in 2009 and again in 2014, after DOH reviewed it. Ted said he was aware we are required to have five, so

he asked Warren why we only have four. Warren told him that one or more of them cover more than one class, that's why it meets the requirements. Shawn and Andy suggested there may be risk for doing the same thing if it's not adequate (and never was). Ted explained that even if that happened, they would just give us recommendations on how to fix it, so risk is very low.

Andy asked about the recommendation to maintain our GPD instead of reduce it. Rich said the guidebook requires a lot more explanation if you just maintain instead of reducing usage. Larry restated his offer to work with MAC members to work through his comments on WSP and that they would capture these WUE issues.

Rich suggested making the baseline clear (197 vs 184 per ERU) in our WSP. Debate ensued on the pros and cons of submitting more complete and thoughtful goals vs. just doing the minimum to get approved by DOH. This led to debate on the philosophy and purpose of conservation.

6. 2020 Master Rate Schedule 8% rate increase (15 min)
We agreed this didn't need discussion because it's a done deal and was explained in the newsletter.
7. BOT retreat summary (Daylin) (10 min)
Daylin reviewed notes from December Board Retreat.
8. MAC member editorial for monthly newsletter (5 min)
We did not have time to talk about this.
9. Roundtable (20 min)
We did not have time for any roundtable.
 - MAC minutes will need to be approved by BOT before being added to website
 - Next meeting Tuesday March 10th 5:00 pm

*These notes were sent out to meeting participants for review and edits during the week following the meeting and any responses were incorporated into this final version.