



Agenda

**SANTA FE WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM
1142 SILER ROAD, BUILDING A**

November 13, 2018
4:00 PM TO 6:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 16, 2018 MEETING

CONSENT AGENDA:

6. WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM SCORECARD UPDATE FOR SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER 2018 (Christine Chavez, Water Conservation Manager, cychavez@santafenm.gov, 955-4219)
7. UPDATE ON CURRENT WATER SUPPLY STATUS (Christine Chavez, Water Conservation Manager, cychavez@santafenm.gov, 955-4219))

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

8. UPDATE ON NMED GRAY WATER SYSTEM APPROVAL MECHANISMS (Doug Pushard, Water Conservation Committee Member, doug@kuelwater.org)
9. UPDATE ON 2015 UPC CODE ADOPTION AND GREEN BUILDING CODE AMENDMENT (Christine Chavez, Water Conservation Manager, cychavez@santafenm.gov, 955-4219)

ACTION ITEMS:

10. DISCUSSION ON JOINT CITY/COUNTY WATER MEETING (Councilor Romero-Wirth)
11. FOLLOW UP ON SUSTAINABILITY PRESENTATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE WORK (Councilor Romero-Wirth)
12. FORMATION AND APPOINTMENTS TO WATER CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE GROUPS (Christine Chavez, Water Conservation Manager, cychavez@santafenm.gov, 955-4219)

MATTERS FROM PUBLIC:

MATTERS FROM STAFF:

MATTERS FROM COMMITTEE:

NEXT MEETING – (Councilor’s Conference Room): TUESDAY, December 11, 2018

CAPTIONS: due by 3:00 pm, November 26, 2018

PACKET MATERIAL: due by 3:00 pm, Wednesday, November 28, 2018

ADJOURN.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk’s office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to meeting date.

RECEIVED AT THE CITY CLERK’S OFFICE

DATE: 11/05/2018

TIME: 3:17 PM

**SUMMARY OF ACTION
SANTA FE WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM
1142 SILER ROAD, BUILDING A
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2018, 4:00 PM**

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CALL TO ORDER		1
ROLL CALL	QUORUM	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	APPROVED	1-2
APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA	APPROVED	2
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	APPROVED	2
<u>CONSENT AGENDA</u>		
WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM SCORECARD UPDATE FOR SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER 2018	APPROVED ON CONSENT	2
UPDATE ON CURRENT WATER SUPPLY STATUS	APPROVED ON CONSENT	2
<u>INFORMATIONAL ITEMS</u>		
UPDATE ON NMED GRAY WATER SYSTEM APPROVAL MECHANISMS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	2-3
UPDATE ON 2015 UPC CODE ADOPTION AND GREEN BUILDING CODE AMENDMENT	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	3-7
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>		
DISCUSSION ON JOINT CITY/COUNTY WATER MEETING	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	7-10
FOLLOW UP ON SUSTAINABILITY PRESENTATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE WORK	APPROVED	10-14
FORMATION AND APPOINTMENTS TO WATER	POSTPONED	14

CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE GROUPS

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	14
MATTERS FROM STAFF	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	14
MATTERS FROM COMMITTEE	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	14
NEXT MEETING	DECEMBER 11, 2018	15
ADJOURN	ADJOURNED	15

**SANTA FE WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM
1142 SILER ROAD, BUILDING A
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2018, 4:00 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Santa Fe Water Conservation Committee was called to order at 4:00 pm by Councilor Romero-Wirth, Chair, on Tuesday, November 13, 2018, at the Environmental Services Conference Room, 1142 Siler Road, Building A, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilor Carol Romero-Wirth, Chair
Tim Michael
Scott Bunton
Doug Pushard
Lisa Randall
Ken Kirk
Stephen K. Wiman
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Robert Coombe, Excused
Bill Roth, Excused

OTHERS PRESENT

Christine Chavez, City of Santa Fe, Water Conservation Manager
Kathryn Mortimer, City of Santa Fe, Long Range Planning
Andy Otto, Santa Fe Watershed
David Carlson, Potential Board Member
Stephen Schmelling, Potential Board Member
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Pushard, seconded by Ms. Randall, to approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Pushard, seconded by Mr. Kirk, to approve the consent agenda.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
OCTOBER 16, 2018**

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Michael, seconded by Ms. Randall, to approve the minutes as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM SCORECARD UPDATE FOR SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER 2018

Approved on Consent.

7. UPDATE ON CURRENT WATER SUPPLY STATUS

Approved on Consent.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

8. UPDATE ON NMED GRAY WATER SYSTEM APPROVAL MECHANISMS

Mr. Pushard said these two items are linked. He will do this one first. Within New Mexico we have two people who approve codes when it comes to water use. The Construction Industries Division (CID) approves the plumbing code. The other is the New Mexico Environment Department. They approve outdoor septic sewer permits. That Division is how we do things in this area of gray water. The New Mexico Environment Department published the gray water code that talks about no permit versus a permit. CID does not inspect gray or black water systems. The Environment Department does those inspections. We have not inspected anything through the City. The Environment Department has a code for gray and black water. They are using black water for irrigation purposes. We had a hole in what we could approve because if you were at the 250 gallons and wanted to do a holding tank there was nothing addressing this.

Mr. Pushard said in the packet is information from an Environment Department meeting in October. We now have a product that can be installed in high end residential and commercial. We had something for

households less than 250, but that was it. If you wanted larger than that there was nothing in code to allow that. We now have it and it was approved by the State Environment Department and adheres to the plumbing code. It was not the simplest process, but it is done. The new product has been added to the list. It is a product for processing gray water for subsurface irrigation and toilet flushing.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked which Department do you have to go through on this.

Mr. Pushard said the Environment Department, not CID. It gets approved by them. It will be posted on their website.

Ms. Randall said in terms of CID being involved won't they have to be involved in internal plumbing.

Mr. Pushard said yes, interior walls are approved by the County or the City. The City also looks at externals.

Mr. Pushard said we will be working with the Wastewater Technical Advisory Committee (WTAC) on gray water quality. This unit and most other processing units need a higher water quality so we will be able to use them for almost all uses except drinking. That will take another year to get them to approve for all systems except drinking. Even spray irrigation.

9. UPDATE ON 2015 UNIFORM PLUMBING CODE (UPC) ADOPTION AND GREEN BUILDING CODE AMENDMENT

Ms. Chavez said this came to this committee a couple of months ago. It came here because we had big issue between departments when Lisa was trying to put in a rain water system and her team ran into issues because Land Use was requiring a back flow system and an additional air gap. We realized then that there was a big discrepancy between the codes Land Use was using and utilities working off of. We thought we could reconcile the process. We met with Land Use and are making sure we will not run into other issues with this code. We talked about addressing Chris Calvert's issue as well as part of this code adoption. Kathryn Mortimer is here today to help with the Chris Calvert issue. On the UPC code draft Scott is going to be helping me look at that. Jesse Guillen will be who we get this to and hopefully through committee in December. There are two things we wanted to address. First all in the agreement an air gap is required when using City water make up for rain water systems. Second, in the new code it requires a permit for gray water systems. We were saying in our advertising that no permit was required if we are going to put language in our adoption saying the New Mexico Environment Department regulations supercede the 2015 UPC where there is conflict. That will give us the ability to continue to incentivize the gray water systems without a permit. Also we want to start on a survey about what is out there. We have given eight rebates for small gray water systems already.

Mr. Schmelling asked how do you decide the 250.

Mr. Pushard said it is calculated by the number of people in the household. That is State regulation.

Ms. Chavez said 250 gallons per day. We are going to say that the regulations in the Environment Department handbook still have to be followed. She appreciates Doug and Scott and their help in understanding how these things are written in looking at the code book and deciphering it. We will bring this back in December for approval by this Committee and then route it to the other committees.

Ms. Chavez said the Chris Calvert issue, he was here several months ago and explained his issue to us. He wanted to require builders to add a gray water stub out to any one fixture in the home. We are not addressing this in this code.

Ms. Mortimer said we added that requirement at a time when we were having a lot of trouble getting inspectors to inspect a lot of things in the green code and there were some unexpected issues that came out of it. You must have a backflow valve/preventor. With all that it requires an investment of between \$200 and \$300 dollars. She is not aware of any of that being activated. That happened on one hand. At the same time we adopted the Water Efficiency Rating Score (WERS). That was a calculation of how much water you use. We tried to match the first requirement the first time we were doing it with about what people were already doing. We have had that now for about a year and a half and are starting to get that number down. That was a performance requirement. We went to a check list format and that was daunting for people. At the end we were never sure of how much water or energy we were saving. By going to a model format basing that on the number of people in the house we can predict the amount of water and energy used. We could predict with a certain amount of accuracy how much water will be used. So when we went to that performance model and the enforcement was sketchy and expensive if they did it we took that out. It was one of the things we used to sell this to the building community. Having to pay another professional and saying we are taking away all the requirements and letting you do it. It was a big selling point. That is how we got where we are.

Ms. Mortimer said here is another aspect of saving water and reducing the amount of water going into the sewer system. With all the reports, we conserve water more than most places. We have already experienced a change in the ratio of solids to liquids in our wastewater. As we have less water for showers, dish washing, hand washing etc, the amount of solids stay the same. We have already experienced a need for new equipment at the Wastewater Treatment Plant to accommodate that denser material is what she has heard. There was a concern raised early on that just moving this stuff through the pipe you can get to the point of having to replace pipes, but you also have to add water which is contrary to saving water. So in this new generation of water conservation we need to start thinking about taking that and black water. So it is interesting in the timing of this new technology. We need to start thinking about taking out that black water. If right now we start telling everyone let's start taking out more water and having people plumb for that it flies against the issue of conserving water. We need to take the solids with the liquid at some point otherwise there will not be enough liquid to push the solids to the Wastewater Plant. The other thing that confused her is the thought that it is a lot more expensive to do the retrofit for washing machines. That does not make sense. If you are on an outside wall you go through that wall. That is not that big of a deal. To take it out and bring it underground to follow the regulations, that is not that big of a lift. If you went underneath the slab and the footing then it is harder to get it. She is not sure that is any easier.

Mr. Pushard said thank you for coming to talk with us. He would like to get Kathryn on a future

meeting agenda to give an update on WERS and on reducing that number and multi family. He understands what Calvert was trying to do with the stub out. He also agrees with her. Other cities have seen the same problem. It did not increase the people using gray water. The stub outs were buried. When we get into multi family they are the water users. Have you guys talked about doing something in the area of requiring something there.

Ms. Mortimer said we have not. We are just in the early stages of talking about multi family issues. We are starting to do a WERS analysis on them just to see where the numbers are coming out at.

Mr. Pushard said he supports the WERS approach. He thinks when your are looking at multi family if you could calculate how much gray water we are looking at that would be helpful.

Ms. Mortimer said there is also that percentage of solids.

Mr. Pushard asked have you folks talked at all to the County Fire people about when they clean out their hydrants. They flush that water down the street. It could be easily be put down the sewer. Usually wherever you have a hydrant you have a sewer cap.

Ms. Mortimer said we have not addressed that issue at all. That is a good thought. It could be that we pump that into a big truck as well. We would have to have that disbursed the way the solids are disbursed.

Mr. Pushard said the main problem is because we do not do a combined storm water and sewer system. Here it is the bigger pipes where we get stoppage. The wave action would do a lot more than you think it would.

Ms. Mortimer said the multi family is the cost benefit for putting in some of these systems, looking at it as black water. She also looks a it in terms of hotels.

Mr. Michael asked what is the outcome here and how does ex Councilor Calvert feel about this.

Ms. Mortimer said she has not spoken to him in a long time on this. He has not had the benefit of more discussion on this.

Chair Romero-Wirth said she wishes she had knows she was here today. She would have invited him.

Chair Romero-Wirth said so you don't think it makes sense to do stub outs and if we encourage more gray water because we will not be able to move the solids through the sewer system.

Ms. Mortimer said yes.

Chair Romero-Wirth said we do need to have more conservation on this. So how are we going to deal with this solids issue.

Ms. Chavez said we talked about the unintended consequences of conservation. They have had to change the way they process some of the water that comes into the plant due to the higher ratio. That does not mean we can't incentivize gray water, we just have to stay in balance. We need to have more discussions. It does not mean it is off the table or that we should not do it. We just need to get a large bulk amount of gray water in large developments. We also need to look at the reuse study.

Mr. Michael said we don't have enough liquid in there to move the solids.

Mr. Bunton said there should be a distinction between gray water and conservation. Water conservation reduces the water in the toilet up front.

Ms. Mortimer said we are about to submit a grant application on distributes water and energy coordinated to create resilience in terms of big plants and to help with drought. The idea is to prepare here solar panel installations that can then, when electricity is cut off or water systems are cut off, commence cleaning black water so we could use that. Cities and counties are starting to see this is the situation we have to plan for and put out there.

Mr. Kirk asked has the City talked to other communities around the country who have similar problems. LA had a huge problem a few years ago.

Ms. Mortimer said we are in touch with other cities. We are not at the point where we are having trouble moving solids through the pipes. We are just aware that is an issue we may get to. We are trying to get out ahead of it.

Chair Romero-Wirth said it would be good to know at what point does it become a problem. We would want to push that and take advantage of what that span is. If we did the stub outs that Calvert suggested that would not take us to the brink.

Ms. Mortimer said the average person does not think about that.

Chair Romero-Wirth said we have not been in a place where we need them. As we get further into climate change and drought these things will become more critical. Aren't we going to get into a situation where we will need options. Doesn't it make sense to think a bit ahead.

Ms. Mortimer said we are seeing a potential problem with that route. The real future includes the solids.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked does that mean gray water systems are not something we want. Where does gray water fit into that..

Mr. Michael said it is interesting you say we are not close to that point. None of this really matters unless it gets used. If gray water gets really tight gray water may not be an option. We have to make sure if gray water can be used as a replacement for other water.

Ms. Chavez said she understood from the Land Use group when they are building a brand new home there is a requirement for the builders to put a stub out. We were requiring that. They are talking about reducing the WERS score more and that might be a good time to make that requirement again. They have no way now to know if people hook up to the stub out. The other thing is when a home is built there may be more room for landscaping and people are looking for water. That is another opportunity to push the landscape rebates.

Mr. Pushard said when they take down WERS the builders are going to have to make some decisions on what they do. The County currently requires the installation of a cistern. The majority of those cisterns are never used. We require them to install it. The reason we went to WERS was for installations like that so the builders would have a choice of not building a tank like that, but to do something else to meet the numbers. It is a tax on homeowners. On multi family we will have a large influx of those units coming up and they are huge in using gray water. That is water where they are using potable water for landscapes today.

Ms. Mortimer said there are opportunities there.

Mr. Pushard said when he first got into the rainwater business 20 years ago he heard the issue of solids. He has not found a study of when do we hit the number or what is the ratio where we start getting problems.

Ms. Mortimer said bringing in rain water means we are adding new water. If we were going to incentivize something rain water capture, in terms of the overall system, is a better thing to incentivize.

Ms. Chavez said all these things are related. The UPC will go first then the back flow program and hopefully following that will be a domestic well program. We are hoping the back flow will go to committees in January or February, then domestic wells. We can set up a meeting to talk to Chris Calvert about some of the reasons why we did not include his suggestion in the UPC and about possibly including it with multi family programs.

Chair Romero-Wirth said she would very much like to have Ms. Mortimer come back to discuss the WERS program. She also encourages us to loop back around with Chris Calvert. She is happy to be part of that meeting.

Chair Romero-Wirth thanked Ms. Mortimer for her presentation.

ACTION ITEMS

10. DISCUSSION ON JOINT CITY/COUNTY WATER MEETING

Chair Romero-Wirth said she wanted to thank everyone for attending. It was a good start to find some common ground and make some progress. She would like to hear the Committee's thoughts and ideas.

Mr. Bunton said he concurs that it was a good beginning. Any beginning is a good beginning and that one was even better than it might have been. He wants to make sure it was that and not just a meeting where everyone said the right things, but nothing flows from it. He hopes this Committee can get together a list of items that could be pursued jointly and sell that to the County and begin working together. The ultimate objective would be to try to combine forces permanently. His hope is it will occur sooner rather than later. He wants to thank Councilor Romero-Wirth for reaching out and putting the meeting together. He hopes we can take it somewhat further than where it is now.

Chair Romero-Wirth said another constituent here as to how we move forward is staff in the City and the County. She has followed up with the City staff. She doesn't know if Commissioner Hamilton has followed up with County staff. We don't want to go off and create our own reality. We need to make sure we are adding value to the direction the staff is going and the work they are doing. She just wanted to throw that in.

Mr. Kirk said unfortunately he was not at the meeting. He is on the County Water Advisory Committee. They met just a few days ago. They were very positive about the meeting and are interested in moving forward. A couple of things stood out in their minds around issues they would like to discuss in moving forward. They are very interested in future coordination and collaboration, but stopped short of any discussion on regionalization or any type of authority that would go that way. That was disappointing to him. They did not think regionalization was feasible to move forward on. One of the major ideas they came up with was the idea of working with the City on funding. They pointed out the City and County have different models they use for water quality issues and given the fact that the Democrats have taken over and there is a lot of money available the County should work with the City to secure some funding to do a basin wide modeling exercise. They understood that could not happen in the next session due to a lack of time, but would like to address this in the 2020 session. They focused somewhat on wells and drilling any new wells. They talked about management, aquifer recharge, drought management and conservation and infrastructure. They did have a very positive attitude about the meeting and do want to have further meetings down the road. Commissioner Hamilton was very positive.

Chair Romero-Wirth said she wants to make sure she draws attention to the final County slide as to the potential future City/County projects they put forward. One was the modeling that Mr. Kirk talked about. We could dive deeper into the issue of modeling. There are definitely issues there. They also in the slide mentioned a 40 year plan. We have done that. In her conversations with staff they were amenable and willing to help the County with their 40 year plan. We could look at how we might facilitate their planning. The next item was water conservation and drought response. That might be one of the easiest areas to start working with and it would have positive outcomes and help relationships. The issue of reuse is a huge area where we could have future conversations and have an understanding and see if we could figure out a path forward that serves both areas. The point is these areas seem to be things we could work in. She does not think we will talk very quickly about regionalization. What we are doing here is developing a relationship and figuring out working in a collaborative and positive way and maybe finding solutions in some areas where there is tension and conflict. That will be the focus. This slide is a potential starting point in thinking about what we want to do.

Mr. Wiman asked were there specific things where City staff thought they could do their job better

in collaboration with the County. A specific manageable issue we could collaborate on.

Chair Romero-Wirth said that is where we are going to have to have some future conversations in the next meeting. She has not followed up with Commissioner Hansen. We are going to need to meet and talk about where we want to start. We could take any of these things. We could put conservation and drought management on the agenda and talk about how to collaborate. We could put any one of these topics on an agenda and bring issues that surround these things to the surface and how we might deal with the issue.

Mr. Bunton asked would a logical first step be to have the City and County staff prepare a list of areas of potential cooperation.

Chair Romero-Wirth said we have that in this slide. Christine please send just this slide to everyone. She thinks what we need to do is she and Commissioner Hamilton need to meet and based on what both Committees are interested in and thinking about figure out the next agenda focus.

Ms. Chavez said because we have the 5 year water conservation plan coming up she saw that as a way to do something with the County on our ordinances and planning. We were going to do that on our own, but since we have all these other reports so tied together we were talking about maybe having them help us with writing the climate change piece so we can coordinate all those pieces. Right now they default to everything we do, but there are some things we can work together on. If we help with their 40 year plan that also works.

Mr. Pushard said he thinks having the meeting was great. Thank you very much. The style of the meeting and doing deep dives into issues is a great way to do it. Not burdening staff is a good approach. He learned a lot. The other side said they learned a lot as well. He agrees with Christine. We currently contract with the County to provide services for the County. We do water audits, they don't. There are things we already do that they would like us to do for them so they don't have to reinvent some of these things. There is interest to do that on a fee for service basis. Our Land Use Water Conservation Code and theirs is 180 degrees different. He tried, unsuccessfully, to provide an option for the builder and homeowner instead of a cistern. Getting them closer to us would be good. The last one is one of the reasons why he wanted to see us work with the County is we can talk about everything and control everything within our walled area, but outside our walled area they are drilling wells like crazy and we are all in the same basin. The wells is an area he really wants to see.

Chair Romero-Wirth said the reuse issue, she is learning, has all kinds of issues. That is an area for future conversation.

Mr. Otto said regarding the ground water management plan, we don't have one in the County. There needs to be a watershed wide type of plan.

Chair Romero-Wirth said if you look at this list there are tons we could do. This is years of work we could do. This is all good.

Mr. Wiman asked did you talk about BDD and how it is managed jointly. Was that okay or were there issues.

Chair Romero-Wirth said we did not talk about it. There is a committee with City and County representation that works on that.

Mr. Wiman said it touches future water issues.

Chair Romero-Wirth said there is no budget for this. It is a public meeting so we do need a stenographer. There is an agreement that we would trade off. The County will provide one, then we provide one. There is support from both Committees. The Mayor is very supportive of this. As we do a workplan we will have to figure out how often we will meet. She doesn't think we will do another meeting until after the first of the year. With the holidays and the fact that we need time to let both Committees meet and for she and Commissioner Hamilton to meet it is best to wait until after the first of the year. We want to be really thoughtful about this.

Mr. Bunton said he takes your point and Ken's point that regionalization is not around the corner. He has been involved in regionalization activities in areas out of the Santa Fe area. Baby steps for that would be data collection and information gathering. Those are the steps least controversial. If there could be an agenda for important information and data that would be helpful for both the City and County to have and that would be beneficial to combining efforts that might be a good place to begin.

Chair Romero-Wirth said she will meet with Commissioner Hamilton and staff and we will devise what should happen next.

Ms. Randall said thank you.

11. FOLLOW UP ON SUSTAINABILITY PRESENTATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE WORK

Chair Romero-Wirth said she knows Mr. Pushard has some things to say about this. Also she would like to hear from anyone else who would like to comment. This Resolution is before Council this week.

Mr. Pushard said he kept his comments to just the water portion. His list was handed out to the Committee. These are very specific comments. He will give you the high level summary. Overall we are doing everything they have mentioned in the plan except for the poop item. That is why he wanted to add a couple of things to the goals/strategy they have. Us being a leader is not talked about and should be. The text he put forward talks about that and maintaining our leadership position. We are dedicated to that leadership position going forward and that continues to push us. They talk about our voluntary conservation programs. Some of our conservation programs are not volunteer. Strike voluntary. On page 33, the first paragraph of the box is incorrect. He has the correct verbiage for a replacement box. On page 34 they only talk about gray water changing into water reuse systems. It should not be specific to gray water. On page 34 they use the word utility when they are talking about water decisions. The City Council also has the authority to make decisions about water. That should be removed. It needs to be changed to

expand water conservation programs to all sections of the community. On page 35 they just did recycling, gray water and black water, but only used one application. Make it broader. He has the language to use on his handout. On the poop one, they talked about water quality and poop and that we need to create a poop awareness program for pet poop. He thought that was a good idea, but that is one thing. That takes us into water quality issues and we have not talked about water quality nor do they, except for scoop the poop. He suggests they expand it to include other efforts.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked water quality is governed by the State, correct.

Mr. Michael said there is a Surface Water Quality Bureau and a Ground Water Quality Bureau. We report our process to EPA and the State. He doesn't know if we govern that type of water.

Chair Romero-Wirth said we have some authority at the State level.

Mr. Michael said we do.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked what do you want the City to do in this regard.

Mr. Pushard said they have scoop the poop for water quality, but there are other things we can do in a broader sense. His language make this section broader.

Mr. Michael asked are you proposing a whole new section on water quality.

Mr. Pushard said it is adding one sentence.

Mr. Michael said you are proposing that they put some wording in here with a broader statement.

Mr. Pushard said yes. Expand the sentence to be more inclusive.

Mr. Pushard said he would like to increase partnerships to drive water conservation awareness, Broaden that statement. Also pursue funding, joint funding requests, with the County and others. The suggested language is included in his handout.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked what do we do with his thoughts. This is on final passage tomorrow night. She would like other people to weigh in on any thoughts.

Mr. Bunton said thank you Doug. This plan is a good first step. They could have been stronger with these dimensions. He would like to suggest that we find a mechanism that can be used to put this into the Plan.

Mr. Wiman said we sent in a round of revisions and they were never considered.

Chair Romero-Wirth said at Finance she said she was going to offer an amendment to the Resolution in Public Utilities. There was some concern in Finance that this plan was something we were

going to move forward with on all fronts. It has huge implications for staff and budget. This is a huge lift. The City has a number of huge lifts right now. In the FIR there was language adopting the plan as a guidance document. The idea was to put that kind of language in the Resolution that this is a guidance document and will not take over what the city does immediately when this is passed by Council. We will use these strategies as ways we could move forward, That was accepted and will be part of the document tomorrow night at Council. There are three things we could do to incorporate this. We could offer this all as an amendment to the Sustainability Plan. She wonders how well that would go over with Council. It would have been better at a committee level and to have gotten the buy in of the Sustainable Commission as well. It could be offered, but it might derail the adoption of the plan while this is considered by the Sustainability Commission and perhaps another committee then goes back to Council. She doesn't know what that would do to the plan itself. At Finance there was some push back to not delay it. She doesn't know why. Given how long it has taken to get this done she is sure they don't want to delay. Third is to take formal action here and prepare some sort of formal letter that is passed out to the Councilors at the meeting tomorrow. We would need that tomorrow night. It could say something like we know you are adopting this tonight, but want you to know The Water Conservation Committee sees some things that should have been included. We could request that the letter get included as part of the final distribution of the plan and it that it gets incorporated into the plan.

Ms. Randall asked is there a timeline built into the plan for review. Is there any wording as to when this would be reviewed. If there is no time frame of when revision is allowed that is worrisome.

Chair Romero-Wirth said somewhere in here it said they want to continue with the Commission and she does not know if that will happen. She presumes that is a Council decision and a budget decision. How we move forward she does not know. She does not know what happens next.

Mr. Michael said he has been told he speaks to candidly about this Commission. He would rather not say anything that would cause this Commission to have any longer life than it has. He doesn't see any reason to pursue this. Let's get City Council to approve the plan and go off and do something else. He does not support any place this is going except to lead to the sun setting of that Commission.

Mr. Kirk said he supports Doug's position here, but is concerned about trying to amend the plan. He doesn't think that is going to happen. As an alternative it is not as strong as it should be in terms of water quality. We could ask to keep the door open to that point.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked you don't see value of writing this up in a letter format. Just so it is in the record somewhere. This is not a day by day document. There will be more conversation around things we decide to do. When those conversations come up having this formalized in some way gets it included.

Mr. Bunton said he agrees completely. As he understands it the plan is going tomorrow night before City Council and the City is going to formally endorse and accept this report. That leaves us in a position that we feel there are deficiencies in it and we want those corrected. Maybe we could propose an amendment to make these changes before Council acts on it. At the very least we need to do a letter.

Mr. Kirk said this is not a general statement of support, just a list of corrections. Shouldn't we give

at least support to what we believe in that is in this report.

Mr. Pushard said we have been asking for a year to have input and were not given an opportunity. Now it is going to City Council for approval. This group has not had a chance to be involved. We are the water advisory group for City Council and we have not been able to have input. The water section which we are in charge of is wrong and that is what bothers him the most. This report is going to walk around the City and be used in ways we cannot imagine. It is going to be "this was approved by City Council". The whole guidance thing is not in this report.

Chair Romero-Wirth said it is in the Resolution. We could move to have the Resolution included in the plan.

Mr. Pushard said we should be the ones providing input on an annual basis to this report. He agrees with at least a letter.

Mr. Michael said he does not understand the specifics. If there is a letter it needs to be a letter that looks right. How do we approve a letter. He is still not getting how that will work.

Mr. Wiman said they sent up draft asking for comments. He spent a lot of time on that and he doesn't see any of his feedback there.

Chair Romero-Wirth said so there was never a sit down with anyone.

Mr. Chavez said we did send in input and that did not get included.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked what if we, with Scotts help, take this and make it a formal letter on your behalf saying something to the effect of this Committee membership has tried to offer suggestions has not seen anything incorporated in this plan. The following is an outline of some of the that this Committee believes should have been included in the plan.

Mr. Michael said he would like to be more positive. Comment that in these general areas there are important things to be considered in this document. Why say because of the of response.

Mr. Pushard said we need to be forceful.

There was extensive discussion around wordsmithing the letter.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Pushard, seconded by Mr. Wiman, to support in general this document of some of the changes we would like to see put into the plan and that these items be linked to the letter.

Mr. Michael said he cannot support this motion. The letter should not be directly related to this list.

Mr. Bunton called the question.

VOTE ON CALLING THE QUESTION The vote to call the question passed by a vote of 3 abstentions and 3 yes votes.

VOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION The vote on the original motion passed on a voice vote of 5 yes and 1 no. The no vote was from Mr. Michael.

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Bunton, seconded by Mr. Pushard, to create a letter to memorialize Doug's suggestions and that it be given to the City Councilors at the Council meeting.

Mr. Pushard offered an amendment to state in the letter that the Committee approved a partial list of suggested changes at the Water Conservation meeting held on November 13th.

Mr. Pushard asked that his list not be attached as it is a rough list.

Mr. Bunton agreed to the amendment. Mr. Michael seconded the original motion.

VOTE The amended motion was passed unanimously by voice vote.

12. FORMATION AND APPOINTMENTS TO WATER CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE GROUPS

This item was postponed to the next meeting.

Chair Romero-Wirth asked to add Kathryn Mortimer to the agenda for the next meeting to talk about the WERS program..

13. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Otto gave the Committee details about the upcoming Winter Watershed Benefit.

14. MATTERS FROM STAFF

Ms. Chavez said they selected Andrew Erdmann for Karyn's position. We are hoping he can start on the 19th. We are going to readvertise for Patricio's position.

15. MATTERS FROM COMMITTEE


There was discussion around the meeting date.

16. **NEXT MEETING**
DECEMBER 11, 2018

17. **ADJOURN**

There being no further business before the Committee the meeting adjourned at 6:22 pm.



Councilor Romero-Wirth, Chair

Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer