

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PUBLIC AWARENESS/PERSONNEL/POLICY COMMITTEE
OF THE VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT
TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2018 AT 10:00 A.M.
AT THE DISTRICT OFFICE, 201 VALLECITOS DE ORO,
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA

Director Evans called the meeting to order at the hour of 10:02 a.m.

Present: Director Evans
Director Hernandez
General Manager Pruiam
District Engineer Gumpel
Development Services Senior Engineer Scholl
Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins
Public Information Representative Urabe
Public Information Representative Yerman
Administrative Secretary Johnson

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

VID/VWD ANNEXATION AREA DISCUSSION

District Engineer Gumpel provided maps and historical background on the area referred to as the "Boot and Bennett Area" which is comprised of approximately 1,268 acres located in the Vista Irrigation District (VID) service area that generally follows the flume. Many decades ago LAFCO determined these areas are within Vallecitos Water District's (VWD) sphere of influence and should be taken over by VWD. VID and VWD are in agreement on this and have included it in their Master Plans. There is no urgency to this; however, situations where it would be difficult or too costly for VWD to install infrastructure where VID already has infrastructure nearby are becoming more common, resulting in exchange agreements between the two agencies.

Development Services Senior Engineer Scholl stated staff met with VID staff last year to discuss a pilot program for the southern part of the "Boot and Bennett Area" comprised of five isolated areas covering approximately 30.93 acres. The pilot program would develop a concept as to how and when the five areas would be detached from VID and annexed into VWD. Options to consider include VWD taking over existing VID infrastructure, VID constructing infrastructure to VWD's standards and turning it over to VWD, and the costs and details involved. VID has indicated they would compensate VWD in some manner for taking over their aging infrastructure. The benefits to VID would be that the customers in those pilot areas would be better served with faster response times, VID's ability to pressurize the flume, and to create redundancy in the water distribution system. Annexing these isolated areas into VWD would add approximately 150 customers but would not trigger any expansions for VWD.

General Manager Pruim requested the Committee consider whether or not to annex the "Boot and Bennett Area" into VWD starting with the five isolated areas in the pilot program.

General discussion took place regarding who would be responsible for annexation and capital facility fees. District Engineer Gumpel recommended a study be performed to consider a mass annexation. Options for annexation fees would be to charge, waive, or ask VID for a contribution of the fees. In undeveloped areas, developers would have to build the infrastructure and pay their capital facility fees.

District Engineer Gumpel stated that for the entire 1,268 area it may make sense to:

- Waive capital facility fees for existing VID connections (VWD would receive funds from VID for replacement values of aging infrastructure)
- Charge capital facility fees for vacant land as a meter must be purchased and connected to the water system (VID and/or future development would build new infrastructure to VWD's standards)
- Charge annexation fees for existing VID connections and vacant land (VID would pay the fee to VWD for existing connections)
- The appropriate amount of replacement costs VID has collected for their infrastructure that VWD is taking over would be given to VWD, based on the value and age of the infrastructure.

The consensus of the Committee was to direct staff to continue with the development of the pilot program for the 30.93 acres to consider waiving the capital facility fees for existing VID connections.

Mike Hunsaker, member of the public, inquired about possible annexation issues with wastewater, water rights, and if existing VID customers have any say in the annexation matter. Staff responded that VID provides water services only, VWD already serves many of the existing VID customers, and VWD's water exchange agreements address how water provided to VID customers is taken out of VID's allocation.

DISPOSITION OF DISTRICT VEHICLE #9

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins provided information regarding the revenue or expense associated with the options available for disposition of vehicle #9. The options include keeping the vehicle in operating condition, full restoration of the vehicle, selling it at auction, donating it, or displaying it at the District office in the lobby or garden.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins stated the vehicle was refurbished 12 years ago and has continued to deteriorate. The cost to keep it running and meet safety standards would cost approximately \$10,000. A full restoration to return the vehicle to its original condition is estimated to cost \$40,000 to \$50,000. Selling the

vehicle at auction could possibly bring as much as \$9,000. Preparation of the vehicle for display in the lobby would cost approximately \$2,500 or \$1,200 in the garden including staff time, overhead, signage and a car port in the garden. The San Marcos Historical Society (SMHS) is interested in accepting the vehicle as a donation; however, they would need to secure a place to store it as well as their historic fire engine.

General discussion took place regarding the various options during which the suggestion was made to keep the vehicle where it is currently stored or as part of a display in the lobby until the SMHS is able to accept it.

The Committee directed staff to research what type of display could be placed in the lobby to better utilize the space and if including vehicle #9 would be appropriate.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH FOR SCHOOLS AND WATER ACADEMY

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins stated that at their February 12 meeting, the Committee requested additional information on expenses for the District's public outreach programs. He provided details on the costs for events such as Jack's Pond visits, Hands on History, the Green Machine, Splash Lab, and school tours. The school tours are costlier than the other events and impact staff the most, especially the Collections staff.

General discussion took place regarding the possibility of holding a half-day Open House in addition to the fall Water Academy. The event could include a tour of the District garden, Water Operations and Collections similar to the school tours but would not have the expense of renting a bus to take visitors to other locations. Breakfast snacks and lunch could be optional, or if included, would cost approximately \$3 for snacks and \$15 for lunch per visitor. Staff time and if held on a Saturday, overtime, would add to the overall cost of the event.

The Committee directed staff to proceed with preparations for a half-day Open House to be scheduled six months after the October 25 Water Academy and to include snacks and lunch for the visitors.

AGRICULTURAL WATER ELIGIBILITY

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins provided background information on the San Diego County Water Authority's Transitional Special Agricultural Water Rate (TSAWR) and the District's Certified Non-Participating Agricultural Water Rate (CNPAWR). The District's CNPAWR was established during the 2007-2009 California Drought, petitioned by customers, to provide an agricultural rate that would not be subject to water use reductions in times of drought or supply cutbacks. The CNPAWR was originally referenced in Ordinance No. 165, adopted in 2009, which included the same requirements as the SDCWA's TSAWR program. Ordinance No. 165 has been revised and replaced over the years. The current Ordinance No. 207 does not contain language regarding the CNPAWR.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Robbins stated he is receiving requests from customers wanting the CNPAWR. Pending requests are from varied customers: a small farming operation, a commercial mushroom farm, a resident wanting to install an orchard on their property, a horse stable, and a palm tree business. The fiscal impact of allowing customers the CNPAWR would vary from customer to customer. CNPAWR customers are currently charged a flat rate at the Tier 2 rate of \$4.43 per HCF and would never reach Tier 3 which is \$8.47 per HCF. This would result in reduced revenue of \$4.04 for every unit of Tier 3 water that would have been charged.

General discussion took place regarding pros and cons of allowing the CNPAWR, what requirements should be necessary to qualify for the CNPAWR, the need to inspect, certify and maintain the property, and modification of the current ordinance.

The Committee directed staff to review Ordinance No. 165 to try to determine the intent of and why the language pertaining to CNPAWR was deleted at some point, how to certify agricultural properties, and how much revenue would be lost or gained with tier options. They would also like to review a water billing history for the last five years of a small agricultural customer and a calculation as to how much revenue had been lost during the years they were charged the Tier 2 rate. The requested information will be brought back to the Committee for their review.

Mike Hunsaker, member of the public, expressed his concerns that this could become a public relations disaster, and that the agricultural water would have to come from somewhere, is not subject to rationing, is billed at a lower rate than residential customers receive, and the potential for crops requiring more water.

General Manager Pruim stated that there is no direct correlation between the new State-mandated restrictions and limitations on indoor water use and water supplies. Standards will be developed for outdoor water use such as agricultural.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at the hour of 11:45 a.m.