

**MINUTES OF THE ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
JUNE 6, 2018**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The Engineering and Operations Committee Meeting of the Rainbow Municipal Water District on June 6, 2018 was called to order by Chairperson Prince at 2:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the District, 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, CA 92028. Chairperson Prince, presiding.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Member Prince, Member Taufer, Member Marnett, Alternate Nelson, Member Stitle (Arrived at 3:15 p.m.), Member Brazier (Arrived at 3:15 p.m.)

Also Present: General Manager Kennedy, Associate Engineer Powers, Operations Manager Milner, Engineering Tech. Rubio.

Absent: Member Robertson, Member Radican, Alternate Kirby.

Member Robertson arrived prior to the commencement of the Engineering and Operations Committee Meeting and asked to be excused from the meeting.

There was one member of the public present: Mr. Stewart.

4. **CANONITA TANK TOUR**

The meeting convened to the Canonita Tank tour at 2:03 p.m.

The meeting reconvened from the Canonita Tank tour to the District Office at 3:15 p.m.

Ms. Brazier and Mr. Stitle did not attend the Canonita Tank tour and arrived at 3:15 p.m.

5. **SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Mr. Nelson was invited to take a voting seat.

6. **ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA (Government Code §54954.2)**

Mr. Kennedy stated Item 10 – Flow Monitoring Project would be deleted.

Mr. Taufer asked to add an item to the agenda. Ms. Brazier stated real time changes to the agenda can only be of an emergency or urgent situation. Mr. Prince suggested adding it to next month's meeting.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT RELATING TO ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS

***8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. May 2, 2018

Motion: Approve the minutes as written

Action: Approve, Moved by Member Stitle, Seconded by Alternate Nelson.

Vote: Motion carried by roll call vote (summary: Ayes 5, Abstain 1 = 6).

Abstain: Member Brazier.

Ayes: Member Prince, Member Taufer, Member Stitle, Member Marnett, Alternate Nelson.

9. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE SOUTH ZONE RAW WATER SUPPLY PROJECT

Mr. Kennedy said Mr. Carey asked the District to research the potential for surveying some of the growers located south of Gopher Canyon, Silver Leaf and El Paseo regarding raw water supply. He said the District would need to have an agreement with Oceanside, which has a raw water connection through the Weese Filtration Plant. He mentioned the cost of the raw water was about \$300 an acre foot cheaper. He explained the capital costs to build the storage tank and pipelines for the first phase were roughly calculated at a low 1.6M and in order to pay off these costs it was suggested to have the growers pay the normal rates for water and use the excess to pay off the capital costs. He pointed out the challenge being that by charging the normal rates now it was placing the avocado groves out of business. He said the District required 30 years to recover the capital costs; and the odds of recovering the costs were unattainable. He said although Mr. Carey was supporting this project, there was not a lot of support from the property owners. He stated unfortunately Mr. Carey was not in attendance for discussion.

Mr. Powers provided a spreadsheet detailing all the parcels in the project boundary with the approximate costs on a 30 year payback plan. He pointed out the following conclusions:

- 41 land owners were within the project boundary.
- 10 land owners had no usage and would be paying into a system with no benefit.
- 11 land owners would receive some benefit, but would not out-way their cost for the project.
- Out of the 41 land owners 21 would have a negative affect with this project.
- 20 land owners would potentially benefit from this project, assuming the initial project cost was correct, it was paid within the 30 year payback, and the water usage stayed within the current rate.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out the initial project cost of \$1.6 was a rough estimate and the current projected cost was estimated at \$3M. Discussion ensued.

Motion: Regarding the raw water proposal south of the Gopher Canyon area, staff and the committee reviewed the financial and logistical implications finding this project infeasible and agreed not to pursue this project any further.

Action: Approve, Moved by Member Nelson, Seconded by Member Brazier.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Ayes = 6).

Ayes: Member Prince, Member Brazier, Member Taufer, Member Stille, Member Marnett, Alternate Nelson.

Mr. Kennedy said the District would send a letter to Mr. Carey regarding the Engineering Committee's response.

10. DISCUSSION REGARDING FLOW MONITORING PROJECT

Discussion regarding the Flow Monitoring Project was deferred.

Mr. Kennedy provided an update of the AMI test pilot with SDG&E. He said the Itron Project has been delayed repeatedly and Itron has not been able to deliver on its promises. He mentioned the original range from the water meter to the electric meter was changed from 1000 feet to 300 feet, which would not be feasible for the District. He stated the District may need to cancel this project, due to Itron's inability to fulfill its part. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Kennedy said a new company established out of Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Engineering Department developed a leak detection device called Flume. He mentioned purchasing the device to test it on his house water meter. He explained the Flume communicates to another device placed in the house, which is connected to the Wi-Fi. He explained, once connected, the Flume monitors real time water management providing usage data, enabling the management of consumption, sending notifications of abnormal water usage and quickly detecting leaks all through an APP on his phone.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out with AMI the District was looking at obtaining meter data at one hour blocks or 15 minute blocks at the best resolution. He said the Flume device sends highly accurate data up to a 100th of a gallon every minute with the batteries lasting at least two years at that rate. He stated the cost was about \$200 per device. He said the hardware for each AMI was approximately \$130 to \$140 each, plus .75 cents a month per read (approx. \$6K per month). He explained AMI was not for the District's use, it was for the customer to assist with leak detection and water monitoring. He mentioned if the traditional AMI model does not work, the District may be able to provide a better way at a lower cost with a new device. Discussion ensued.

11. LIST OF SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The following agenda items were suggested:

Mr. Taufer suggested adding discussion regarding a potential hazard. Mr. Kennedy referred Mr. Taufer to discuss his concern with the Operations Manager, since it was an isolated issue.

- ABM Update
- LS1 Design Update
- Meter Division Update
- Operations Introduction of each Division

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Timothy Prince, Committee Chairperson

Dawn M. Washburn, Board Secretary