

**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
WATER PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**October 19, 2020
3:30 P.M.**

- EVMWD BOARD ACTION
- APPROVED
 - APPROVED AS AMENDED
 - DENIED
 - CONTINUED

The Regular Water Planning Committee (WPC) Meeting was held via teleconference, with members of the public notified of the ability to observe and provide public comment telephonically through the information provided on the meeting Agenda.

Directors Present

Andy Morris
Darcy M. Burke

Staff Present

Greg Thomas, General Manager
Ganesh Krishnamurthy, Assistant General Manager – Eng. and Ops.
Robert Hartwig, Assistant General Manager- Business Services
Terese Quintanar, District Secretary/Administrative Services Supervisor
Jason Dafforn, Director of Engineering and Water Resources
Margie Armstrong, Director of Strategic Programs
Jase Warner, Director of Operations
Greg Morrison, Government Relations Officer
Tim Collie, Water Operations Manager
Parag Kalaria, Water Resources Manager
David Smith, Maintenance Manager
Matthew Bates, Engineering Manager
Mike Ali, Water Quality Administrator
Jesus Gastelum, Sr. Water Resources Planner Engineer
Shane Sibbett, Civil Engineer - Planning
Bonnie Woodrome, Community Affairs Supervisor
Andrea Kraft, Engineer Project Coordinator
Christina Henry, Community Relations Manager
Nelson Nuezca, Principal Engineer, Capital Projects

Others Present

Public

CALL TO ORDER

Director Burke called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The meeting was opened to public comments and there were none.

1. **Cost of Compliance** – Many of the tasks performed by staff are done to comply with numerous requirements that regulate the water and wastewater industry. The Board requested staff to compile the District's costs related to compliance with those various regulatory agencies.

Various departmental staff outlined the types of compliance activities associated with their departments and the agencies regulating those tasks. Ms. Armstrong described most of the federal, state and local regulatory agencies staff works with and shared that most agencies have multiple items to comply with. Training, safety, certifications, contact hours and many other factors also contribute to the cost of compliance.

Costs were broken out by department. Water Operations has close to \$3M in costs, Wastewater Operations has \$2.5M in costs, Facility and Vehicle Maintenance has \$500K on the water side and 413K on the wastewater side, and Engineering also have over \$500K in costs. The total costs are equivalent to \$10.10 to every account on the water side or 11% of an average bill and \$8.45 on the wastewater side or 18% of the average bill. Every agency has different costs, and it is hard to compare costs, agency to agency. Director Burke asked if the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Plant Expansion was done to comply with the directive from the Regional Water Quality Board and if these costs were included. The timing of the expansion is a directive; however, the expansion was to accommodate more customers, therefore was not included. The Vulnerability Study is also included in these costs. Board training is not included, but Director Burke asked if other staff training costs were included. There have been some costs, such as audits that are not included. Director Burke opined that it would be helpful to know what is and what is not included because it is important to understand that there is a very finite amount of discretionary input the Board has. The effect of the compliance costs has on bills is 30% monthly (based on a household of four). There are a few items on the Administration and Board levels that are not included, but that amount is very small. President Morris commented that this is representative of costs we have no control of. The question of discretionary versus non-discretionary is a question that continues to come up. Director Burke asked to have Human Resources and Administrative compliance costs be included when presented to the Board at a Study Session. Director Burke also mentioned best management practices that are prudent to follow that are not necessarily regulatory items.

2. **Key Water Quality Parameters** – Mr. Ali reported that groundwater arsenic compliance levels have continuously been maintained under the MCL. Distribution TDS are at good levels and imported water has been trending as predicted. Staff is sampling at Canyon Lake. Recycled water remains stable. PFOS and PFOA State Permits are in hand for the northern wells and we are

monitoring compliance, which is also non-discretionary. In regard to Summerly Well, it does exceed the State's response level and we are continuing to work with the State for permitting. Director Burke asked about the Canyon Lake Study and Mr. Krishnamurthy responded that staff will be reporting to the Board in November.

3. **Water Resources at a Glance** – Mr. Gastelum reported that the lakes have good water levels and are above the minimum obligations. Staff will look again at the estimated levels for 2022. Precipitation is at 62% of the average in Northern California and 77% in Southern California. Elsinore precipitation is at 12.7" which is above average. State Water Project allocation is at 20%, typical for this time of the year. We are hoping to get some rain this season, however the forecast does not look good. It is predicted that we will have dryer conditions. Reservoir levels in California are doing well, with Oroville at 74% of historical average. Lake Mead is still at a low historical level. Gallons per capita per day (GPCD) is 138, typical for this time of year. The residential use is 74% of total water consumption for August. Asset Transfer has used 4,569 CFS, or 63% of available capacity. Domestic water usage is less than 1% in inefficient use than last year. For excessive use, there is a total of 150 AF, which is 25 AF higher than the past year. Landscape has almost zero change from last year. Division 1 is the highest consumption for inefficient and excessive, and Division 5 is next highest. Division 2 has the highest consumption for landscape irrigation.

Staff presented information on how many customers are on autopay and also how many are in the inefficient and excessive domestic water use categories. There are close to 35% in these groups who are also on autopay. On the irrigation side, there are about 65% in the inefficient group on autopay and in excessive category there are 61% on autopay.

4. **Operational Statistics** – Mr. Collie reported a substantial increase in well production this year, over 1100 AF produced more than last year. Back Basin WTP has been online and produced 791 AF. There was 216 AF transferred into the Elsinore Basin from the Coldwater Basin. Total water imported was less than last year, but total production was 100 AF more than last year. Cost per acre foot for wells are \$249 and the Back Basin WTP is at \$383 per acre foot. Transfer from the Coldwater Basin was \$143 per acre foot and the total cost of imported water was \$1,125 per acre foot. The combined average totals \$910 per acre foot. In the Temescal Division, 61% of water produced is exported to the Elsinore system. Total production in Temescal is 354 AF, with an average cost at \$143 per acre foot. Water loss is a 1.8% and AWWA says anything under 15% is good. Staff is focusing on getting the water loss to under 1%.
5. **Other** – Mr. Krishnamurthy distributed a letter from the Regional Water Quality Control Board on the PFOAS issue at March ARB. Being a big development, EVMWD will be engaging them regarding Canyon Lake and the upstream sampling. He continued to talk of an agreement that Orange County is interested

in joining. The City of Corona initially did not want to participate but now has expressed interest.

An informational short video clip from CME group titled “Understanding Nasdaq Veles California Water Index” was then shown. Mr. Hartwig further explained that they will be selling water futures contracts. Each contract will be for 10 AF of water, which can either be purchased or sold. The video described how the price was to be determined. A person who invests in this market will be buying or selling in what is called the margin amount. The margin amount would then be placed in a trust account maintained by a third party. Under State law, governments cannot participate in this market because it is too risky. There is no actual commodity delivered.

Mr. Kirshnamurthy reported that the Upper Temescal Valley Salt and Nutrient Plan agenda item was adjourned to the December Regional Water Quality Board meeting. This plan will help establish water quality objectives and save millions on the capital side and operational side.

Director Morris mentioned that the City of Canyon Lake does not have a landscape ordinance for new construction and asked if we can share that ordinance with Canyon Lake. Mr. Thomas reported that staff has shared this with Chris Mann, the City Manager of Canyon Lake. Director Morris also asked if the PFAS monitoring plans are ready since we are expecting rain this weekend. Mr. Kalaria responded that they are ready however, 2-3 days of continuous rain is needed to get the samples.

6. **Consider Items for Board Review** – There were none.
7. **Adjournment at 4:30 p.m.**