AGENDA FOR A COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE WHOLE
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE VALLECITOS WATER DISTRICT
MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2013, AT 11:00 A.M.
AT THE DISTRICT OFFICE
201 VALLECITOS DE ORO, SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA

CALL TO ORDER – PRESIDENT HERNANDEZ

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Persons wishing to address a matter not on the Agenda may be heard at this time; however, no action will be taken until the matter is placed on a future agenda in accordance with Board policy.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

1. PRESENTATION ON 2008 MASTER PLAN AND CAPACITY FEE STUDIES
2. REIMBURSEMENT POLICY, ORDINANCE NO. 161
3. COST TO TELEVISE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS UPDATE
4. REVIEW PROPOSED WEBSITE HOMEPAGE

*****END OF DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS*****

OTHER BUSINESS

*****END OF OTHER BUSINESS*****

If you have any disability which would require accommodation in order to enable you to participate in this meeting, please call the Executive Secretary at 760.744.0460 ext. 264 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

I, Diane Posvar, Executive Secretary of the Vallecitos Water District, hereby certify that I caused the posting of this Agenda in the outside display case at the District office, 201 Vallecitos de Oro, San Marcos, California by 1:00 p.m., Thursday, March 7, 2013.

Diane Posvar
President Hernandez called the Committee meeting to order at the hour of 11:00 a.m.

Present:  Director Evans
         Director Ferguson
         Director Martin
         Director Poltl
         Director Hernandez

Staff Present: General Manger Lamb
              Assistant General Manager Scaglione
              Legal Counsel Scott
              Director of Engineering and Operations Gerdes
              Administrative Services Manager Emmanuel
              Finance Manager Fusco
              Principal Engineer Gumpel
              Capital Facilities Engineer Scholl
              Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe
              Water Operations Supervisor Pedrazzi
              Engineering Technician Koonce
              Executive Secretary Posvar

Others Present: Darrell Gentry
               Michael McDonald
               Paul Metcalf
               Jason Simmons

President Hernandez stated that the Board Committee will not be having an open public hearing on any one of the items on the agenda. If any individual requests to speak under Oral Communications that will take place as usual.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. McDonald said he didn’t have any statement but asked if it’s possible, in the course of the presentation, should questions arise, as members of the audience could they raise their hand and ask a question.

President Hernandez requested the members of the public hold their questions until the end of the presentation.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

President Hernandez requested to change the order of the agenda items in order to allow those staff to leave who did not need to participate in the presentation. Item 1 was moved to the end of the agenda and discussion began with Item 2 and followed consecutively.
REIMBURSEMENT POLICY, ORDINANCE NO. 161

General Manager Lamb provided background on this item stating that Ordinance No. 161 was adopted by the Board in 2009 and is the current policy with respect to reimbursement agreements for water and wastewater. This includes oversizing, District capital projects and developer funded projects. This policy has been brought forward over the past couple of years, most recently on April 12 and May 14, 2012, for discussion to consider potential changes. There was no action on either of those dates on behalf of the Board.

General Manager Lamb stated that on January 7, 2013, staff was directed to bring this item before the Board in February, which staff did at the February 11 Board Committee meeting. At the direction of the Board, staff modified Ordinance No. 161 to include, for discussion purposes today, all of the changes that were suggested by Director Hernandez in 2012.

General Manager Lamb presented a red-lined version of the ordinance indicating the proposed changes. He also presented a copy of the items submitted by Director Hernandez for suggested changes. Prior to the May 14, 2012 meeting, the Board directed him to take Director Hernandez’s comments, compare what he was suggesting with the old ordinance, to the new ordinance.

President Hernandez stated that the purpose he brings this forward is to be fair and equitable to all the property owners, not just those that are troubled with a failing septic tank or less than three parcels. He put together a graphic as an example, although it is an actual project, it is not relative to that project as it has been completed. He reviewed the graphic describing the scenario and explaining in his opinion why it would be fair and equitable for the surrounding parcels of the project parcel be subject to a reimbursement agreement to the project property owner who paid for installation of water and sewer. He stated this is the basis for his bringing this matter forward. The other properties, should they attach, benefit from this.

General Manager Lamb stated that prior to the 2009 adoption the Board has had paybacks for everything over the years. The District paid the difference in the cost if the project required a larger size pipe based on District requirements. He provided additional background information on prior Board discussions related to the reimbursement issue. He further stated that Director Hernandez’s example would have been a project that staff would have recommended a reimbursement agreement had the developers requested one. He explained the process for requesting a reimbursement agreement.

General Manager Lamb stated that under Section 3.3, Facility Eligibility, of Ordinance No. 161, an example of an eligible project is included. He referred to the May 14, 2012, Board Committee meeting staff report stating that the intent of the Board was based upon the Board’s discussion to provide an example in Section 3.3. The intent of the
Board was to authorize service in a reimbursement to properties that would receive the basic entitlement of water and wastewater. What is currently before the Board Committee is to remove that example from the Ordinance as suggested by Director Hernandez.

Director Martin asked what the purpose is of checking a box on the plan check form indicating whether or not the developer is seeking reimbursement. He further asked if it should be the District who determines whether they are able to accept reimbursement or not.

General Manager Lamb stated that staff meets with the developer at which the policy is discussed and a copy of the Ordinance is provided. It is the developer’s responsibility to determine whether or not they will seek reimbursement.

Director Evans asked if someone indicated they would not seek reimbursement but then later changed their mind, would that be possible.

General Manager Lamb stated that they could request the change but that approval would be at the Board’s discretion. General discussion continued on the process including additional examples.

Director Hernandez stated that the exception that he took to the example in Section 3.3 was the “…existing property for a new single family home, or new water service because of a failed domestic water well.” He stated that the verbiage prior to this seems to be clear enough; he didn’t believe the example was necessary. This is why he is requesting that it be removed.

General Manager Lamb provided additional historical information including on the earlier version of the Ordinance, Ordinance 115, with additional examples. He stated that if the verbiage was removed, as suggested by Director Hernandez, it would basically take the policy back to where any project that builds within the district is eligible for reimbursement.

Director Poltl questioned that it was the prior Board who had requested the example be added to the Ordinance.

General Manager Lamb stated the discussions date back to 2007 and 2008. The example was added to the Ordinance in 2009 to clarify what projects were eligible for reimbursement. General discussion continued with additional examples.

Legal Counsel Scott stated that removing the example doesn’t have any measurable effect on the Ordinance. It is just used as an example.

Director Hernandez stated he would like to have the example removed and asked the Board Committee if there was a consensus to that effect.
Director Poltl stated he would rather keep the example in the Ordinance.

Director Martin stated that if staff has no objection with it, he didn’t see why it needed to be taken out.

General Manager Lamb stated that staff does not have a preference either way; it is the Board’s policy.

Director Ferguson stated that she felt the example should be left in for clarification purposes.

Director Evans stated that she didn’t feel it clarifies anything.

Director Hernandez stated that it’s the facility that they’re talking about for eligibility; it already says what facilities are eligible. He stated that he didn’t think the example was pertinent to the facility.

Director Hernandez stated the consensus seemed to be to take it out of Section 3.3.

General Manager Lamb began the discussion of Section 3.5 stating that this section relates to Section 3.3 by identifying the projects not eligible for a reimbursement agreement.

Director Hernandez stated that his practical thought was that there should not be any projects that are ineligible. He cited his examples to support his opinion. He stated that he thinks the non-eligible projects should be eliminated completely.

Director Poltl asked what the ramifications of that would be, stating it’s kind of vague. He further asked about the length of time for recouping the costs.

General Manager Lamb stated that it is 20 years at 5½% interest - it’s quite a recovery for the developer over the life of the payback. General discussion followed including various examples.

Director Poltl stated that the District provides sanitation and water and the he doesn’t really want to get into financing to where the District is actually involved over a long period of time with a developer on reimbursements or anything of that nature if it can be avoided.

General Manager Lamb stated that a 20 year agreement at 5½% will basically double the investment of the developer if he was ever able to get his money back at that point.

Director Hernandez continued general discussion referencing project examples. During general discussion he stated that he thinks there is a reimbursement that does come when a parcel putting in improvements is benefitting another property.
General Manager Lamb stated that if this is considered, he asked that the Board reconsider the 20 year period as he feels this is an unfair burden.

Legal Counsel Scott stated that he wanted the Board to consider this very carefully. He cited an example project and asked if the District would then have to try and figure out who might benefit from the improvement in the future and add some type of formula.

General Manager Lamb stated Mr. Scott is correct and that the other issue was if the District pays for oversizing, the oversizing benefit would be recovered from future ratepayers.

Director Evans asked why the District isn’t asking the next developer to reimburse a portion of what the District paid for the bigger pipe.

General Manager Lamb stated that there is no end-of-line benefit. If the District were to do that, every time somebody extends a main or ties onto it, the District will be chasing that pipeline all the way down to the ocean. Therefore, there is never an end-of-line benefit.

Director Evans stated that she didn’t know if that was her question. Her question was that if a person builds it all the way to the end, and he only needs a 12” and the District wants the 18”, the District pays the difference between the 12” and 18”. Then you said that difference comes out of the ratepayers.

General Manager Lamb stated it comes out of the capacity fees for future connections.

Director Evans asked why that doesn’t become reimbursed like when another parcel decides to come in. The same bit of line that was extended for the initial parcel, why isn’t the other parcel paying a portion of the 6” the District paid for?

General Manager Lamb stated that it is paid through their capacity fees. He further stated that when the District pays for the oversizing, there is no pay back on the 0 – 12” because the District paid for the extra capacity. There is no pay back and is very clear in the Ordinance.

Director Hernandez stated that this was not part of the thinking he had to begin with. He reiterated that his issue is directed at the standard line passing other properties that would get an indirect benefit from it. This is what he doesn’t think is fair.

Director Poltl asked what the standard is.

General Manager Lamb responded that it is all over the place.

Director Evans asked if the original intent of this ordinance was for the protection of a homeowner more than anything else.
General Manager Lamb responded that the intent was to recover and protect people who were investing their money and may need to recover.

Director Hernandez stated that this was his concern that when they are all gone and there are other members sitting here, and they choose not to allow a commercial/industrial developer a reimbursement agreement. He wants to eliminate this possibility.

Director Evans stated that what she wants to be careful about is that whatever is put in the ordinance, does that mean that every single project has to come before the Board.

General Manager Lamb responded no.

Director Evans stated that it sounds as if everything is eligible; the Board decides if it's eligible. So one person could come in, say they are developing four houses, and the Board could say they will do it. Then the next says they want to develop 4,000 and the Board says no, this confuses her.

Director Hernandez stated that if everything is eligible, and he comes in as a 100-unit subdivision, and the Board feels that he is going to make up the $200,000 by $20 a unit, he is not eligible. He thinks this is the proper Board decision. But the individual has the right to ask for it or not and the Board has a right to approve it or not. The process is laid out very simply. It isn't like today the Board says it's ineligible and next time they won't. He is trying to take this out of the picture and leave it so that everyone is eligible and if the Board believes they are eligible, then they are.

Director Evans clarified that she would like the ordinance to be simple and basic, that everyone is eligible and that each individual, instead of each individual marking they are or are not going to seek reimbursement, the Board one by one approves or disapproves granting them a reimbursement.

Director Hernandez stated that no, the two boxes can remain on the form.

Director Evans stated then the individual chooses to come forward for reimbursement, each party that is seeking reimbursement then comes before the Board and the Board decides on an individual case if that person/developer is eligible for reimbursement.

General Manager Lamb stated that the way it would go is from a definition of what is and what isn’t eligible to everything is eligible. The Board would go through the process on every single project coming through.

Director Poltl stated that when policy is written, there are two ways of writing it – one is to be definitive and one is to be vague. There are reasons for both of these. If it is written to be definitive, which when the Board wrote this ordinance, it was so that when a decision is made as a Board, there is some backing.
General Manager Lamb cited another project example and stated that when you want to try and have examples of what can and can’t be done, you try to be very definitive or it’s opened up to say that everything is eligible. If everything is eligible, it just means that the Board will be going through this process a lot more on a lot of projects.

Director Hernandez restated that the reason he brought it up is because at some future date someone may come up and say no, they are not eligible and it specifically says that.

General Manager Lamb stated that he believes the verbiage is in the ordinance that no matter what, it is still up to the Board’s discretion.

Director Martin asked when was Ordinance No. 115 put into effect and was good until when.

General Manager Lamb stated that it was put into effect in 1995 and the new ordinance was adopted in 2009.

Director Martin stated that until 2009 it seemed to work fine.

General Manager Lamb stated no, that the reason it came forward was because there were so many ongoing continuing problems. This is why the Board directed him to bring it back to the Board to fix it.

Director Evans asked when this first happened.

General Manager Lamb stated that conversations first started taking place in 2008 and it was brought back to the Board in 2009.

Director Martin asked when Ordinance No. 115 was approved.

General Manager Lamb stated is was approved in 1995.

Director Martin asked that this change was put in to make sure developers are not taking unfair advantage of the person buying the house.

General Manager Lamb responded no. He stated the intent of the ordinance was to provide reimbursement agreements to a homeowner or property owner that is putting in basic essential water and wastewater services.

Director Evans asked if there was a specific situation that occurred that brought this about in that time span.
General Manager Lamb responded that the last one that really prompted the biggest concern by the Board of Directors was the Paloma development. A number of years after the Paloma development was approved and the Mello Roos bonds were sold, the District was approached by the developer and by the City of San Marcos to provide a reimbursement agreement for all the facilities that were paid for through the Mello Roos. When Twin Oaks Ranch went through the process, a reimbursement agreement was reached for oversizing in Twin Oaks Valley Road for water and sewer. That wasn’t an issue but there were discussions that they should be paid back their basic extensions that they had to put in for their project.

Director Evans asked if the problem was that someone came forward and asked for this because they thought they were eligible and the District didn’t have any policy that helped them realize they wouldn’t be eligible or was it that the Board wasn’t comfortable with having to say no. She stated she is trying to figure out why that ordinance failed to work or what the situation was that brought it forward.

General Manager Lamb responded the issues that were ongoing was that property owners were not aware of the reimbursement agreement. There were numerous issues such as notification to the public, having a hearing process, and establishing the cost of how they would pay for the District going through the process.

Director Evans asked that if the examples are taken out and make this very simple, it sounds to her like what they really need to tighten up is the definition of the reimbursement time. She asked Legal Counsel if the District is in a position to write the ordinance that a developer has ten years and a homeowner has 20 years. After the ordinance is changed, do homeowners know what is happening any more than they did before.

General Manager Lamb stated it has nothing to do with the homeowner, it has to do with notice to people that are adjacent to the property. The big issue here is what is eligible for reimbursement. The ordinance itself has been cleaned up very clearly toward anybody that could be impacted, they will know it right up front.

Director Evans asked Director Hernandez if the other sections under question could be reviewed. She needs to see the other issues before she can understand the whole thing and make a decision.

Director Hernandez stated he was ok with discussing the other sections and then coming back to this one.

General Manager Lamb stated that Section 4.1, Reimbursement Report, is 30 days versus 15 days. The 15 days was in order to be timely. The reason staff is saying it should only take 15 days from the time of acceptance of the project, the initial hearing has already taken place, already have a preliminary spread and preliminary cost. All the developer has to do is give the final construction cost.
Director Hernandez stated that, having been involved in construction projects, 15 days is a blink of an eye for a 180 - 200 day project, getting all the documents put together, making sure they are all correct, getting the accounting, getting everybody confirmed that it is in fact an extra that has to be agreed to or not, before it is delivered. This is why he said 30 days and that 30 days is a reasonable amount, it isn't going to make or break anything.

Director Evans stated that she was looking at it for the homeowner and would definitely need 30 days, maybe 45.

General Manager Lamb stated it doesn't have anything to do with the homeowner and that actually, 15 days is more beneficial to the homeowner. It is saying staff will get the document completed and to the final hearing much quicker. If it is given 30 days, the only thing it does is drag out the period, it has no benefit to the homeowner from that standpoint.

Director Hernandez stated that it's the same thing whether it's the homeowner or a developer. It's the time it takes to gather up those costs.

General Manager Lamb clarified that he was speaking if the homeowner was getting from the benefit area. He stated that 30 days would be fine.

Director Ferguson stated that the last sentence will need to be changed as well.

The consensus was to change from 15 to 30 days.

General Manager stated that Section 4.2, Eligible Costs, in the previous ordinance did not allow any costs.

Director Hernandez stated that from the developer/builder standpoint, if it was the District that was doing this, they would certainly be charging for the engineering, financing, surveying, permits, legal, as well as the administration, which he has had second thoughts on because it is truly a little bit harder to define. He suggested removing administration as well as legal services. The other items are definitive, they are documented, can be tested against the water engineering department. These items are part of the whole cost of the project and should be reimbursed.

General Manager Lamb stated that financing is up to an individual, he is putting future people at risk because you have one developer who can get financing and one who can't. He said this is the same with permits. Director Hernandez stated he would take out financing.

Director Hernandez stated that permits are part of the cost, that's an easily defined number, it would be part of any cost.
General Manager Lamb stated that from sitting on his side, he has had developers turn in the cost for an 8” pipe at only $10 per foot and then turn in the cost for an 18” pipe at $183 per foot. This has been an ongoing issue for years, which is why the prior ordinances didn’t allow it. He further stated that the District gets put into a judgment call as to what is and what is not applicable.

Director Martin stated that of the ones he sees on the list, the only ones that are known quantities would be the permit and the inspection, if that is done by Vallecitos and is charged for that. Other than that, he would agree with General Manager Lamb that those numbers are fictitious; developers could put down almost any number they wanted to. He agrees with the permit and the known fees, but anything he doesn’t see.

General Manager Lamb requested clarification on what is being talked about when they say permit. He stated when developers come in, the plan check fee is paid.

Director Ferguson asked that if this is eliminated, why don’t we just write a check for whatever they bring in. She stated that it looks like Director Hernandez is the only one that has been harmed by this.

Director Poltl stated that he thought what they were trying to do is keep it simple and keep it definitive and make it understandable for everybody. If it gets widened out and say that anything can be dumped in it, he doesn’t see how the District will ever get business done.

Director Ferguson stated that she thinks that if all these costs are eliminated, they’re leaving an open-end blank check.

The consensus was to leave Section 4.2 intact; no changes.

General Manager Lamb stated the next section for discussion is Section 4.5, Other Costs.

Director Hernandez stated his thought was that if during the construction, if the District said a sewer lateral and street “L” be installed to each property instead of ripping up the road again, that would be an additional cost he would have to bear; he would hope to be reimbursed by that. But it appears by reading the section that this is not reimbursable.

Legal Counsel Scott confirmed it would not be reimbursable. General Manager Lamb provided an example and the general intent why it is not reimbursable.

Director Hernandez stated he is trying to make this section clear.

Director Ferguson stated that she felt this should be left up to staff who are looking at the plans.
General Manager Lamb clarified that Director Hernandez is speaking about the facilities, not the capacity fees. He further stated that this section is talking about capital facility fees, not sewer or lateral.

Director Hernandez acknowledged the confusion. The section will remain as is.

General Lamb began discussion on Section 5.3, District Reimbursement.

Director Hernandez stated that maybe he is confused again because in discussion today General Manager Lamb has said that if the charges are larger, the District is paying that up front.

General Manager Lamb stated that was correct, however, his preference is that if they have an agreement that makes him oversize something, he would prefer a check just be written to him if the money is available. The section was written that if the District participates jointly in a pipeline, and then there is a reimbursement agreement on that pipeline, the District is putting capital monies into a reimbursement agreement that are for the District. Therefore if a 50/50% is going to be allowed between the developer and the District, the District is actually funding part of the developer’s project for a 20 year period. The District is at risk of never recovering that money.

Director Hernandez stated that the language then needs to be clarified because then the District should not have been part of the process to begin with. Taking the developers side, if he is building a pipe, but the District wants it to be larger and doesn’t have the money, he would probably have to borrow the money and why should the District be paid off first.

General Manager Lamb clarified that the District would have paid for part of it; that is the intent of the section. He further stated he would be happy to take out the position that the District never jointly participate in funding a project. This section was left in because it was in the old ordinance and was allowed. The District hasn’t entered into a joint facility agreement since the 1970’s.

Director Martin stated that he would like to see this section remain as is with no changes; there is a reason why it is in there, just not sure why it is. He directed this question to legal counsel.

Legal Counsel Scott responded that this section was just continued over from the original ordinance. He stated that some of these issues just never arise; it was based on something similar to the situation in the ‘70’s. He further stated that he couldn’t recall in the past 25 years ever recalling a joint project.

Director Evans asked that if somewhere in the next 25 years this became a necessity, it doesn’t prevent the District from looking at it. Legal Counsel Scott acknowledged this.
General Manager Lamb stated that he would prefer just removing the section. If the section is modified to just the strikeout that Director Hernandez was requesting, it would put the District at risk of recovering capital monies.

The consensus was to remove Section 5.3.

Director Hernandez resumed discussion on Section 3.5, Non-Eligible Projects. He stated that he believed it should be open to whether the property owner wants it and then goes to the Board for discussion.

Staff clarified that this is for the basic services. General discussion on basic services took place and included examples.

Director Martin stated that his question with Section 3.5 is if it was good until 2009, he doesn’t understand what the change is for, but that would be the determination he would think would be made as to whether it’s eligible for reimbursement vs. just telling people it isn’t eligible, because maybe it is.

General Manager Lamb stated that if he doesn’t have something clear that says either it is or isn’t eligible, then it’s going to be him making a determination/judgment call if it should or shouldn’t be eligible. This is why they try to establish the examples; this is what would be used to determine what is eligible for reimbursement.

Director Evans stated for clarification purposes that if she were to install sewer she could come in and request eligibility for reimbursement.

General Manager Lamb responded correct.

Director Evans asked that if the same piece of property were in a commercial area, and she wanted to build a commercial unit, would she have to put in the whole sewer and cannot ask for reimbursement, because Section 3.5 lists commercial.

General Manager Lamb stated that this would be an example of providing basic service to a piece of property.

Director Evans clarified that he is saying that if it's a piece of property and she wants it to be commercial, but it’s providing all the basic service, she would still be eligible?

General Manger Lamb responded that this is why the discretion of the Board was left in the section.

Director Evans clarified that if she read the ordinance and thinks she is ineligible, she could still come in and ask if she is eligible.

General Manager Lamb responded yes.
Director Evans stated then why doesn’t it just say all are eligible or none are eligible. She further stated that she would like to see this section remain, however, would like commercial and industrial be removed.

Director Poltl asked why she would do that.

Director Evans stated that if she were to do a commercial project and put in the basic service, technically she would be eligible. However, if she read this ordinance, she wouldn’t know that. She would rather leave the option there that someone could ask if they are eligible.

Director Ferguson stated that as a former developer, she feels that this is leaving projects in the hands of staff to make a determination. She would like specificity here so that she would know that her project was eligible. She agreed with what Director Evans was saying but feels everything should be left in there; everything should be eligible.

The consensus was to remove Section 3.5.

Legal Counsel Scott referred the Board to Section 5.1, Term of Agreement, stating that this section allows up to 20 years at a rate of 5½% interest.

Director Ferguson stated that she had fought to get 20 years in the ordinance. This was to protect the homeowner.

General Manager Lamb stated that in the prior ordinance the maximum was 10 years. General discussion followed on the interest rate. During general discussion the suggestion was made to utilize an engineering index.

The consensus was to leave in 20 years and to utilize Engineering News Record Index Los Angeles edition, to determine the interest rate.

Staff was directed to modify the ordinance as discussed.

COST TO TELEVISE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS UPDATE

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe stated that at the last Committee meeting she was asked to investigate the costs associated with hiring Palomar College TV to record the District Board and Committee meetings. Palomar College was contacted and they turned down the job stating they do not have the staff to do an ongoing production. She was referred to KOTC in Oceanside. They are the agency that used to televise the City of San Marcos’s meetings.

Director Martin asked who is televising their meetings now.
Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe responded that they hire a videographer now, however, they have all the equipment in place. That is the key; the District does not have the equipment.

Director Hernandez asked if the District elected to purchase a static camera and have one of the staff turn the camera on/off, place it on a CD and send to Palomar, what would that cost be.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe stated that it could be sent to the City at that point and it would be very reasonable.

General Manager Lamb stated that the issue was how the District would get the signal to the City. A line would need to be installed which would be $70,000. The cheapest option was the static camera which would be between $6,000 - $10,000. This would be one camera placed in the back of the room. If the Board would want staff to take the tape and place the video on the District website, which would require editing and posting, it would cost between $14,000 - $30,000 annually. If a static camera were to be used and the video be placed on the District’s web page, this would be done through the company Granicus. Where it will get costly is if PowerPoint presentations, agenda, etc. is included in the video. The least expensive way would be with the static camera video only and a staff person placing it on the District’s website.

Director Hernandez asked if the video could be taken to Palomar or the City and have them put it on their broadcast.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe stated that the City could be given a DVD which could be played on their channel at a later time. The question becomes quality.

General discussion followed on editing and raw footage. During discussion Director Hernandez stated that he is speaking about the most basic, economical method. Then take this to the City and have them put it on their channel.

General Manager Lamb stated that staff would need to ask the City what the cost would be to do this.

Director Martin stated the equipment costs about $10,000 to have it set up and approximately $30,000 a year to have it edited to where it is presentable on TV. He stated that they do not want it presentable as a YouTube video. It needs to be edited to be televised. This is the biggest outreach program that this District can do, getting on television.

General Manager Lamb clarified that the direction is to look at a static camera, look at editing to get it to the City to broadcast (not live), and whatever the City may choose to charge for this service.
REVIEW PROPOSED WEBSITE HOMEPAGE

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe presented the redesigned VWD homepage for review along with a copy of the current website homepage for reference. She compared the current homepage with the redesigned homepage and provided examples of what could be added onto the redesigned website. She also reviewed the various items and information that will be placed on the new website.

Director Hernandez asked if staff would need to employ the web designer firm in order to make changes on the website.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe responded yes if any changes are wanted to the design. She further stated that she will be the administrator of the website for any updates to be made.

Director Evans asked when the new website will up.

Public Information/Conservation Supervisor Urabe responded that it will be up this summer.

This item was presented for information only.

PRESENTATION ON 2008 MASTER PLAN AND CAPACITY FEE STUDIES

Principal Engineer Gumpel facilitated the presentation on the 2008 Master Plan Technical Review conducted at the Workshop held on Wednesday, August 18, 2010. The presentation including the following topics:

- Master Plan Process/Progress
- Land Use
- Duty Factors
- Water Duty Factor Comparison with past Master Plans
- Sewer Duty Factor Comparison with past Master Plans
- Water and Sewer Demands
- Historical Water Demands and Water Demand Projections
- Historical Sewer Flows and Sewer Flow Projections
- Mixed Use
- Development Example 1 – Small Residential to Mixed Use
  - Water Demand Estimates
  - Sewer Generation Estimates
- Development Example 2 – Light Industrial to Commercial
  - Water Demand Estimates
  - Sewer Generation Estimates
- Development Example 3 – Light Industrial to Mixed Use
General discussion took place during this presentation.

Principal Engineer Gumpel facilitated the presentation on the Capital Facility Impact Fees and Fee Application conducted at the Workshop held in September 2010. The presentation including the following topics:

- Summary of Meetings
- Water/Sewer Use vs. Capacity
- Capital Facility Fees
- 2008 Master Plan and Capital Facility Fees
- Impact to the District due to density Increase
- Costs of Impacts/Water Storage
- Costs of Impacts/Sewer Treatment
- Treatment Expansion Cost in 2010 Dollars
- Costs of Impacts/Outfall
- Impact Fee Study and Development Options
- Sample Options Assumption

General discussion took place during the presentation.

Principal Engineer Gumpel facilitated the presentation on the Application of Capital Facility Fees for Development conducted at the Workshop held in October 2010. The presentation including the following topics:

- Summary of Meetings
- Impact Fee Study and Development Options
- Options for Impact Fee Calculations
- Assumptions for Examples
- Fees Used in Example Calculations
- Preliminary Cost Estimate
- Master Plan and EIR Schedule

General discussion took place during the presentation.

The presentations were provided for information only.

Discussion took place on adjourning the meeting and presenting the last two presentations at a meeting to be held on another date. The consensus was to hold the adjourned meeting on Monday, March 25, 2013, at 1:00 p.m.
OTHER BUSINESS

Director Poltl stated that Encina Wastewater Authority (EWA) is reviewing the Draft Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. He provided a copy of the first two pages of the document which covers the history of EWA to each Board member.

Director Evans stated that when she was at the tour of the EWA facility, she was very proud to have them brag about the District’s two representatives and the General Manager.

Director Evans addressed the Board regarding the uncomfortableness at the last two Board meetings and was a little disheartened with how things transpired. But she was very encouraged that they got stuff out in the open. She has been thinking about it a lot and has some confusion on it. She directed a comment to Director Poltl stating that she came to the meeting and knew nothing about Jim and the Mayor and Hal and is just wondering how did he find out about that. Did he see them in the public, how did he know they had a meeting or what it was about?

President Hernandez stated that this is not an agendized item.

Director Martin stated that maybe he could have brought that up at the last two meetings.

Legal Counsel Scott stated that there was Board discussion at the last two meetings that was agendized.

Director Evans asked that she should bring this up at the next Board meeting.

Legal Counsel Scott stated yes, otherwise, unless she wanted to speak to individual Board members specifically, rather than out in public. He stated that it was at least on the last agenda - Board comments.

Director Martin asked Director Hernandez if he had that on the agenda.

Director Hernandez stated it was under Board of Director comments.

Director Evans asked that if she has it, she can bring them up under Directors’ Comments.

Legal Counsel Scott responded yes.

Director Evans clarified that he just said she could talk to him privately.

Legal Counsel Scott responded yes she could directly ask one of the members.
Director Evans stated that that was kind of her question, because her thought would have been if she had heard about it, she would have gone to them and asked about it. And he didn’t so she is she is thinking is it her responsibility if she sees two people does she always ask them here or does she ask them personally. This is where she was coming from.

It was confirmed that she could bring this up under Director’s comments.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, President Hernandez adjourned the Board Committee meeting at the hour of 3:30 p.m.

A Regular Meeting of the Vallecitos Water District Board of Directors has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. at the District office, 201 Vallecitos de Oro, San Marcos, California.

James Hernandez, President
Board of Directors
Vallecitos Water District

ATTEST: 

Dennis O. Lamb, Secretary
Board of Directors
Vallecitos Water District