

**GREENFERRY WATER DISTRICT  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
December 21, 2020 4:00 PM, via Zoom**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chairman Stephen Tanner opened the meeting via Zoom at 4:08 PM. A roll call confirmed Vice-Chair Carol Rassier, Rex Grace, Ron Utz, and Bob Stiger were also present. Staff present were Stephanie Mueller, Water District Accountant, Bob and Ian Kuchenski, Water Operators, and Roger Glessner, Engineer. Guests were Caitlin Kling, the Water District Attorney, Ashley Williams, Engineer from Welch Comer Engineers, Bob Haynes, RAFN Consultant, David Shults, and Jane Morgan.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Chairman Tanner moved the subject of the Bayshore Letter to Developer to the top of the Agenda to allow for Ms. Kling to speak and then be able to leave the meeting. Chairman Tanner also indicated the need to add Greenferry Terrace to the Agenda with the recognition that discussion only can be held and no action can be taken. He noted everyone was emailed a copy of the final draft of the letter to the Bayshore developer. Mr. Grace commented that he prefers the word "early" be removed from the estimated timeline in the body of the second paragraph to allow for maximum flexibility for the District. With that minor amendment, the letter was unanimously approved following a motion from Mr. Stiger and a second from Mr. Grace.

Next, Ms. Kling reminded the Board that to add an Agenda item they would need a motion, a second, and a roll call vote. It may be added for discussion only, and not any action. She then had to leave the meeting. Chairman Tanner called for a motion to add Greenferry Terrace to the Agenda. It was passed unanimously after a motion by Mr. Grace and second by Ms. Rassier.

Chairman Tanner then had the subject of the Water Facility Plan moved to the next subject in recognition that Ms. Williams has another meeting at 6PM. Ms. Williams briefly reviewed the agenda of her power point presentation (attached and incorporated in meeting minutes) on the draft WFP information. The agenda includes review of the existing system, growth projections, and deficiencies and potential improvements, and then future demand and production and next steps and schedule.

Ms. Williams said the existing EDUs were analyzed by using a period of June 2019-May 2020. All connections are residential and therefore are one EDU each. The results showed a total of 397 connections, or 397 EDUs. Of those 397 they are broken down as 340 active residential, 11 inactive, and 46 vacant. The 46 vacant lots are reserved for the remaining obligated Bella Ridge connections (20) and the remaining Riverview connections (26) and the inactive accounts represent paid connection fees historically who don't actually draw water. It was noted that remaining Cedar Creek lots are not included in the count of 397 because as of the date of this report, they have not yet paid their capitalization fees. The summary of the demand was analyzed for the period of June 2019-May 2020. With the total current EDU's of 397, there is an average daily production of 163 gpm, maximum daily production of 483 gpm, and a peak hourly production of 1,068 gpm.

Next, the current source capacity figures were presented. The requirements state that the District assume only one pump operates at a time and that the District further assume that it is the smaller of the two pumps available in order to present a safe representation of how many gallons per day the District can produce.

This calculation shows the District has very little deviation between the number of connections possible and the number of connections being served at an average rate of 774,769 gallons produced per day. Therefore the District should not connect any more until after the contemplated construction projects are completed in the near future.

Ms. Williams explained a graphic for the concept of Dead Storage Capacity, which is part of the WFP. This calculation takes into consideration the height of the storage tank compared to the height of the highest elevation of the meter the District serves. There are four houses with meters that could be at risk of being unable to meet the DEQ storage requirement and options to address this are presented later in the report. Chairman Tanner asked Ms. Williams if the storage and flow numbers present a moratorium for the District and she said the issue being discussed is more related to fire flow and not ultimate capacity so concern about a moratorium is not applicable to this subject based on the angle of concern being from fire flows.

Next, she discussed current deficiencies in the system. With the Highland Booster Station being only a little under the requirement of 5gpm when using the smaller pump, District storage is undersized by 111,375 after dead storage consideration, widespread fire flow distribution system issues, and peak hour distribution issues in Riverview South, Upper Highland, and Cedar Creek. Options to address this are also presented later in the presentation.

The presentation then moved on to growth scenarios. Three scenarios were considered where Growth A included the existing outstanding will serve letters to Bayshore and remaining Cedar Creek, Growth B included all properties within District boundaries who are not currently served, and Growth C which included the same as Growth B but with the assumption of the maximum level properties could be legally subdivided under current rules. The calculations showed an estimated growth rate of 63 EDUs for Growth A, 91 for Growth B, and 67 for Growth C. When added to the existing 397 EDUs, it makes for a total of 460, 551, and 618, respectively. However, it is to be noted these estimates are spread out over a timeframe of 23 years and up to 2043.

Ms. Williams then briefly addressed RAFN concerns, noting Mr. Haynes is also on the Agenda and will also have comments, but it was noted that our current water right of 2.05 cfs according to our licenses and permits and our total RAFN right of 4.63 cfs are both higher than our current calculated needs of 1.76 cfs so the District is well covered. However, she said it is a good thing to continue securing rights for future growth.

Returning back to growth scenarios, when current system deficiencies are examined in consideration of future demand it shows that the current system is undersized by up to 317 gpm pumped by the well, booster pumps undersized by up to 77 gpm, storage short by 241,024 gallons, and continued peak and fire flow distribution issues. The presentation then turned to presenting options to address the identified deficiencies.

Source issues of pump capacity could be addressed by either upsizing the existing pumps and adding a generator or by adding another well for an estimated \$700,400 or \$945,000,

respectively. Upsizing would add an additional capacity of 287 EDUs and a new well would add 539 EDUs but the largest projected growth rate called for a need of an additional 221 EDUs.

The Highland Dead Storage concern could be addressed by increasing the height of the tank to allow for the dead storage, relocate the tank further up the hill, reconfiguring the Highland Booster to feed the subject houses, requesting DEQ allow individual booster stations instead with a waiver from the Fire District for reduced fire flows on the subject houses.

Another solution is the installation of a recharge booster to configure and feed the four houses. Requesting a waiver from DEQ is the least expensive with an estimated cost of \$57,500 but more coordination necessary and a higher risk of burden to District users. Chairman Tanner asked if the District is required to maintain the booster pumps and Ms. Williams said yes, as long as DEQ specifically approved it first. The other option costs ranged from an estimated \$489,196 to \$655,700 but would also allow for additional District assets and better long-term solutions.

Options for Cedar Creek were to either relocate or reconfigure the Greenferry Booster Station and utilize the Greenferry Bypass for fire flow. Reconfiguration is really just a short-term solution and provides less gpm for fire flow coverage than relocation but would handle the need for now. The Greenferry Bypass is estimated to be \$95,000. Relocation is estimated to \$300,700 and reconfiguration is estimated to be \$269,500 in addition to the cost of the Bypass so the recommendation is to go with the long-term solution.

Next in the presentation was the proposed Capital Improvement Plan. It outlined the possible projects resultant from what was discussed above and provided a general timeline for each as 5-year, 10-year, or 20-year. Of all the possible projects, four are required by DEQ: well pump replacement/new well (est. up to \$945,000), Upper Highland Reservoir and Booster Station expansion (est. up to \$602,600), Greenferry Booster replacement (est. up to \$300,700), and the transmission line from the wells to Greensferry Road (est. up to \$498,125) and are recommended for completion in 5-10 years. But DEQ is not prioritizing funding projects where fire flow is the primary component, so based on that knowledge, the strategy is to recommend a de-prioritization of projects that are fire flow related.

Chairman Tanner noted that the deficiencies in the psi requirements for Cedar Creek will be addressed by the Greenferry Bypass. All of the Board would like to see Greenferry Terrace Upgrades be moved from 10-year to 5-year. Ms. Rassier, Mr. Utz, and Mr. Grace noted the delay in construction timeline but decision-making has had to change with the evolution of information. Mr. Stiger commented that he felt the Highland Replacement should be classified as 5-year, not 10-year, based on its deteriorated condition as noted in the WFP. Ms. Williams asked Mr. Glessner about any knowledge on a structural review of the tank and Mr. Glessner said it leaks but it operational and a more thorough study would need to be done to determine its expected remaining lifespan, especially the ground underneath it. Mr. Ian Kuchenski has also witnessed the leakage of the tank and knows it needs to be repaired or replaced soon. Ms. Williams recommends that we study the tank more formally so we are better able to assess what is needed to provide a long-term fix on leakage.

The projects slated for inclusion in the available funding of \$2.3 million are the Greenferry Bypass at \$95,000 and the Greenferry Terraces at \$1,056,000, leaving \$1,149,000 available for other projects. It is noted that the Greenferry Terraces project will significantly increase fire flows under current demands.

The schedule currently has Welch Comer submitting a draft WFP to the District in January 2021 with plans to submit to DEQ in February. DEQ may take up to six months to review the WFP, including potential requests for additional information during their process. DEQ's approval is anticipated in the Fall of 2021. Then the District can have a public comment period prior to adoption for submission back to DEQ in late 2021.

Ms. Williams informed the Board that she would need the Welch Comer contract to be added to the Agenda for the next regularly scheduled Board meeting to discuss contract amendments to address the differences between the original Scope of Work and the now-known Scope of Work given the needs of the District. Chairman Tanner directed staff to include on the Agenda as requested. Ms. Williams then left the meeting to attend a different meeting.

Next, Chairman Tanner had Mr. Haynes provide his RAFN update. Mr. Haynes noted to the Board that in the RAFN application, the numbers were based on the population projections as if sewer were also present. He is working with Welch Comer to see how those calculations will translate into the 2043 projections in the WFP. He also emphasized the importance to IDWR of water conservation which includes SCADA due to its real-time monitoring of the system to prevent water loss. Mr. Glessner noted that much of the equipment being installed over the last few years, for example, the Snowshoe and Tanglewood booster station improvements, are SCADA-ready. Mr. Bob Kuchenski has been a supporter of the idea to add SCADA for a long time. Mr. Haynes will work with both Mr. Bob Kuchenski and Mr. Glessner to develop the narrative on the District's water conservation efforts. Chairman Tanner asked Mr. Haynes to prepare a proposal for consideration at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Haynes recommended that the Board consider looking into the cost of technology for allowing both pumps to run at the same time since the District is currently only running one at a time and DEQ only allows us to use our smallest pump for calculation purposes. Chairman Tanner asked where IDWR is at in their timeline and Mr. Haynes said that IDWR is waiting for the District's response. Mr. Haynes provided a history on the water rights process.

Chairman Tanner wanted to get the contract with Mr. Haynes signed prior to the next Board meeting in order to allow him to do the calculations and work with Welch Comer as necessary. Ms. Rassier made a motion to allow Chairman Tanner to sign a contract with Mr. Haynes in an amount not to exceed \$2,250 so he may proceed on his RAFN application work once Mr. Haynes gets a contract to Manager John Austin for Chairman Tanner's signature. Mr. Stiger seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously. Should Mr. Haynes find that he needs additional time he may approach the Board for a contact amendment at a later date.

The next matter up for discussion by the Board was the petition to DEQ Board to recategorize the aquifer. Mr. Shults thanked the Board for their willingness to provide a letter of support to DEQ to request that the recognized boundary of the aquifer be re-aligned with the boundary as recognized by IDWR and therefore the area under Bayshore Estates would be considered over the aquifer. The letter of support needs to be submitted 14 days before the hearing on February 11, 2021. Chairman Tanner discussed a conversation with Ms. Jerri Henry at DEQ that he had regarding the lengthy process involved with changing the rules that the letter of support is targeting. Mr. Stiger made a motion for Chairman Tanner and Mr. Austin to prepare a draft testimony to bring before the Board at the next meeting to support the change so that the District's deep wells would be a protected water source.

Mr. Grace seconded the motion and the motion was passed unanimously. Mr. Utz would like Chairman Tanner to continue to report all conversations with officials regarding District business to the Board at the meetings for staff to capture in the minutes.

Chairman Tanner then brought the discussion back to approval of minutes from prior meetings. The minutes from the December 14, 2020 meeting need to be amended to reflect that Ms. Williams also discussed the deficiencies regarding water storage, fire flows, and pressure. This would best be added following the second sentence of the first paragraph under Old Business. Chairman Tanner would also like to add language to ensure it is clear the District has no more capacity according to DEQ, perhaps at the end of the first paragraph and also that the presentation is attached. It was suggested that the Welch Comer presentation be attached to both the minutes from December 14, 2020 and to the minutes for this meeting.

Mr. Utz questioned the need for a title for Mr. Shults and ask that it be removed. He would also like to see the changes made to the draft minutes and brought before the Board again. Also, he needs to have the minutes from the November 16, 2020 meeting brought before the Board for approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

The minutes from the November 12, 2020 meeting need to have Ian Kuchenski added in attendance, removal of the title used for Mr. Shultz, and to add the minutes behind the hour under the adjournment time. Upon these changes the minutes from November 12, 2020 were unanimously approved following a motion by Mr. Utz and a second by Ms. Rassier.

Next, Mr. Bob Kuchenski gave the Water Operator Production and Consumption Report for the month of November. Chairman Tanner requested that the report use only the active connections instead of all connections and Mr. Bob Kuchenski said he would update and submit this report to reflect that change and use it for all future reports. Mr. Ian Kuchenski noted that the membrane, fencing, and roofing projects for the Bella Ridge Reservoir will need to be done next spring, after the snow melts, and that the painting of the pump house pipes went well. He reported that there was an overflow issue at the Tanglewood Reservoir due to some faulty telemetry equipment. This caused some erosion damage to the neighboring property that will need to be addressed next spring and is expected to cost \$100-\$200 for repair but he will bring an estimate to the next regular meeting for repairs and for an estimate on creating a proper culvert. The reservoir had to be operated by manually flipping switches for a couple of days but it has been repaired and is fully automatic again. The Water Operator Report needs to be updated to reflect that 20, not 26, meters have been installed at Riverview. The other six meters were installed elsewhere. Following a motion to accept the Water Operator Production and Consumption Report by Ms. Rassier and a second by Mr. Utz, the report was unanimously approved.

Ms. Mueller presented the financial reports and Invoices for Approval List. The financials show the 12 months of activity for the most recently completed fiscal year (unaudited). Ms. Mueller said that the documentation for the FY 18-19 fiscal year is about to be submitted to the auditor and then FY 19-20 will be submitted shortly thereafter. Mr. Utz made a motion to accept the financial reports and Invoices for Approval List and Ms. Rassier seconded, the motion passed unanimously. Then Ms. Mueller presented the Delinquent List but it had accidentally not been emailed in advance to the Board members. Mr. Utz motioned that only reminder letters be sent this month and no turn off notices be issued. Ms. Rassier seconded the motion and it passed.

Chairman Tanner brought the snowplowing estimate to the Board for discussion. Mr. Bob Kuchenski noted that the Greenferry Booster station was not included in the estimate and that the District would need an updated contract. Mr. Grace made a motion to have Mr. Bob Kuchenski negotiate with the vendor directly and if an acceptable contract under \$500 can be negotiated for it to be brought to Chairman Tanner for execution and Mr. Stiger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Board then heard Mr. Glessner and the status of Greenferry Terrace. The original plans have changed a few times and currently he is working on putting water mains within the streets and leaving services to the houses as they are within the alleys. But the project has expanded to include Michael Way, Patrick Drive, and Rainbow Street up to Driftwood Drive.

Mr. Utz asked Mr. Glessner if the water main was increased from 3" to 8" will our pumps be able to keep up. Mr. Glessner responded that the pumps will be able to keep up with keeping the line pressurized and it will better handle fire flows. Mr. Grace asked when meters will be replaced if the project is no longer recommended to go down the alley's as previously thought. Mr. Glessner said we would probably have to wait until after this whole project is complete due to cost.

Mr. Glessner gave a review of the projects to be completed on Kelly Road (est. \$231K), Patrick Drive (est. \$80K), Bret Avenue (est. \$80K), Rainbow Street (est. \$113K), Riverview Drive (est. \$150K), and Michael Way (est. \$180K). The estimated total around \$900,000. The two most important projects are the ones for Kelly and Riverview. The project along Michael is expensive because it was discovered that the water-main jumps to the other side of the street halfway down so the upgrades will require a few connections to extend under the roadway regardless of which side of the street the project is ultimately installed on. There will be a couple dozen connections to re-connect following the improvements and additional hydrants will also be installed to increase safety. This project should address both pressure and fire flow issues.

Chairman Tanner asked what the most logical progression of this project should be. Mr. Glessner suggests bidding it all as one project in order to get the most economy of scale and uniformity in approach with one general contractor. The District can use alternates in the bid process to separate project costs to stay within budget. Chairman Tanner asked if it would be a good idea to add the Greenferry Bypass to this project since it is within the same proximity and a relatively small price tag. Mr. Glessner said yes and that he supports that idea, as does Mr. Utz. Mr. Stiger asked Mr. Glessner to provide a summary spreadsheet with a cost breakdown of all that had been discussed and Mr. Glessner agreed to email upon completion.

Chairman Tanner asked what would be needed to move ahead on this project if it were to meet Mr. Glessner's suggested timeline of going to bid in February. With funding availability, the District could do this project and do a replacement pump from the proposed Capital Improvement Plan, too. The expenses not discussed so far would be labor items such as construction staking costs, inspections, and as-built submittals to DEQ that would be estimated at \$30,000. Contingency is usually 10% and is not yet included in the original estimates. With authorization from the Board Mr. Glessner will finish his cost estimates. He will work with the cost estimates that Welch Comer are putting together, too.

Chairman Tanner said the Board has additional considerations to consider in early January. A meeting for January 4, 2021 at 2:00 PM via Zoom was set.

## **ADJOURN**

With no new business to discuss, Mr. Utz motioned for the meeting to be adjourned and Ms. Rassier seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously passed at 8:43 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Stephen Tanner, Chairman

---

Stephanie Mueller, Accountant