



**CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS**

455 N. Rexford Drive  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210  
City Hall Room 280-A

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

July 14, 2016

8:00 a.m.

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

Date/Time: July 14, 2016 / 08:02 am

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Felsenthal, Pressman, Shalowitz, Vice Chair Wolfe, Chair Aronberg

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Mark Cuneo, Vince Damasse, David Hillyer, Erick Lee, Logan Phillippo, Trish Rhay, Caitlin Sims, Michelle Tse, Audrey Wright

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Members of the public may address the Commission regarding any items not on the Agenda that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. By State law, the Commission may not discuss or vote on items not on the Agenda.

Speakers: None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

By Order of the Chair, the agenda was amended, placing Item 6 following Item 1.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. Consideration of the Minutes of the special meeting of June 2, 2016.

Motion: MOVED by Commissioner Shalowitz, SECONDED by Commissioner Pressman to approve the minutes as presented (5-0).

AYES: Commissioners Felsenthal, Pressman, Shalowitz, Vice Chair Wolfe, Chair Aronberg

NOES: None

CARRIED

## **REPORTS FROM PRIORITY AGENCIES**

### **Operations Reports from City Departments, Consultants and Outside Agencies**

- **Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Director**

Dr. Wunderlich provided an update. The 75th annual arrival of the first water from the Colorado River was June 13, 2016. MWD's purchase of delta area islands is tied up in litigation. MWD is going to the California Supreme Court; at issue is opposition concerning the completion of an environmental impact report, required for land purchase. MWD has revamped its rebate program; a pilot rebate for multifamily sub-metering is moving forward beginning in 2017 with cities that choose to participate. Funds will go to homeowners. MWD's Colorado River Hoover Dam trip is scheduled for November 4 – 6, 2016.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether MWD will have options as to the difference between separate, City-monitored meters and property owner-owned sub-meters where one is built and managed by the City, the other billed to the owner with the owner dividing costs and if the rebate addresses both or one of the scenarios. Dr. Wunderlich will look into the matter.

## **CONTINUED BUSINESS**

*(Out of Order)*

### **6. Sub-metering Ordinance**

Senior Management Analyst Caitlin Sims and Assistant Director of Public Works Services Trish Rhay provided an overview and PowerPoint presentation of a proposed ordinance requiring new multi-family construction projects to install water sub-meters. The following were discussed: Background; Alternatives; Metering; Sub-metering; Metering vs. Sub-metering; Examples; Recommendation; Multi-family Residential Remodel; Commercial Properties; Considerations; Landscape Metering; and Considerations. Also of consideration are impacts to West Hollywood (W. Hollywood).

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether the landscape ordinance assumes all properties greater than 5k square feet (SF). Staff noted there are additional requirements for commercial landscapes greater than 5k SF; it applies to projects requiring a permit and new projects. It is not retroactive.
- The number of properties that will be affected; staff can look into the matter.
- Whether the ordinance is in existence. Staff noted the landscape ordinance is in place with new parameters as of January 1, 2016. It requires separate meters and significant requirements for landscaping, design review for landscaping and irrigation.
- Whether a post-check is completed on properties once plans are finished to ensure they were done to specification.
- Whether the reports' reference to the Santa Monica Code is accurate; staff will look into the matter.
- Concerning leak detection, whether the City loses effectiveness with master vs. sub-meters. Staff noted leak notification would occur; point of origin would need to be detected.

- Concerning meter placement at property owner discretion, whether the City or property owners will decide.
- Concerning cost at six or more units, how many properties are affected; are most properties four units or less; whether a third party vendor can give the Commission a presentation; and whether multi-family includes condominiums or rental units. Staff noted most are 7- to 20-unit projects. The average multi-family project size has grown and development is on the rise; staff can check with Community Services. It is difficult to decipher exact costs; new construction is easier to incorporate changes. There will likely be significant cost with remodels. Staff can look into a presentation by third parties.
- Concerning the mechanics of plumbing, whether at issue are separate or stacked lines; staff noted it is an owner's design choice. Meters can be placed at each unit or in an all-in-one panel with separate lines.
- Sub-metering will add cost but that should not be the factor to not move forward. The focus has been on new construction. Concerning whether there is a recent example, staff noted there is conflicting information; staff will look into the matter. The City has both sub-meters and individual meters.
- One opponent to surcharges was multi-family units; this is a forward-looking solution. Instead of discussing sub-metering, perhaps the choice should be given to property owners and they pay costs; ongoing maintenance should not belong to the City. A concern about giving owners a choice is the City not wanting to place meters in the public right-of-way; an option is to specify in the ordinance the City will only do so if it is simple, otherwise sub-metering would be required.
- Whether the existing Beverly Hills Municipal Code (BHMC) can be modified instead of forming a new ordinance. Sub-metering carries bureaucratic and billing issues. Regarding the public right-of-way, there is no sense it is a serious consideration; the proper department will handle the matter of new projects with traffic mitigation issues. Staff noted the BHMC can be modified; currently nothing exists related to multi-family residential. Large numbers of meters in the public right-of-way cause safety risks.
- If the Commission is serious about separate metering, it has the right to request it. The cost of creating a plumbing infrastructure for a new building is small. With a 20-unit or greater building, the meter can be placed to the front or side set-back; the position of separate meters is irrelevant as the City could request developers dedicate space. Sub-metering has problems associated with it but is a cleaner method. The cost is not an issue if conservation is a priority. Meters do not have to be in the public right-of-way. Separate metering is supported. Staff noted the City must have access to meters.
- The City would have access to meters if it requires developers to dedicate space.
- Sub-metering dealt with the response to surcharges and accountability. Currently, the City is trusting property managers will care about conservation. With sub-metering there is no guarantee water consumers will see bills for their usage.
- The following were raised: Nearby cities' examples of going in a different direction is a yellow flag; three or four cities have chosen a different option. Whether there is a number of units that would make sub-metering impossible; would there be space for 75+ units. Sub-meters would not have to be accessible by the City; meters could be in each unit for property managers to access information.
- Whether sub-metering is worth it. Concerning space for a 75+ unit building, if meters are placed in set-back areas there is no problem; building requirements could include substantial set-backs.
- Whether the Commission can make a recommendation for separate metering with sub-metering as an exception. The Commission can state its preference for individual

meters and manage any pitfalls. The idea of separate meters with an appeal process for unique situations requiring sub-meters.

- Whether pool and landscaping water use is treated the same; is pool use an extraordinary one outside of basic need and excluded.
- The impact of multi-metering on W. Hollywood and whether the City has authority to require sub-metering in W. Hollywood. The City could require developers to complete a water impact study to establish the City's ability to produce and/or supply water. Staff noted the City manages connections to the water system and will clarify. W. Hollywood is looking to develop 130- and 48-unit buildings. Concerning legality, if W. Hollywood requests a Will Serve Letter (WSL), the City has the authority to dictate conditions.
- Sub-metering is conservation-related; it is less likely to have the effect of knowing that each unit is paying its share.
- The Commission can indicate its preference for individual metering and/or an appeal process, with a push toward individual metering.

Motion:                                MOVED by Commissioner Pressman, SECONDED by Commissioner Felsenthal that the Commission recommends moving forward with individual metering as presented by staff.

AYES:                                    Commissioners Felsenthal, Pressman, Shalowitz, Vice Chair Wolfe, Chair Aronberg

NOES:                                    None

CARRIED

*(Return to Order)*

## **2. Capital Assets – Capital Improvement & Major Projects**

City Engineer Mark Cuneo, Water Resources Manager Vince Damasse and Ms. Rhay provided an update and PowerPoint presentation.

### **a. Reverse Osmosis Water Treatment Plant Rehabilitation**

Substantial construction is complete and the project is in the integration and coordination phase. Final clean up and Plant floor coating remain. Staff has been in a testing and commissioning phase. Turnover to operations staff to occur the beginning of August.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether the Plant will be able to process water in October. Staff noted this is slated to begin the end of September/beginning of October, 2016.
- Concerning chemical feed work being computerized, whether the whole system will go down if there is a glitch. Staff noted it is a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system. The purpose is in safety and making adjustments. The Plant will be fully automated which frees up operators for other work. Staff can monitor processes, receive alarms if an issue occurs and conduct remote shut-offs. It will not take fewer people to operate the Plant. The plan is for overnight automation within the next year. Safety redundancy is built in. SCADA includes automated sampling, chemical feed after sampling and automatic shut down if there are problems.

- Whether the vendor-provided software is new or well-tested. Staff noted it is well-tested from Macro Automatics. Staff can look into how many water treatment plants are using the software but it is close to 100+.
- Whether the City is hiring someone from another plant already familiar with the software. Staff noted the City is expanding current software that staff is already familiar with. Operating parameters within each system are different; it is not possible to bring in someone who knows everything. The platform and the Plant must be understood.
- The number of re-deployed employees that will be dedicated to the Plant when it is online. Staff noted existing staff covered the vacancies. If the Plant is down, staff operates the system. The system is not down when the Plant is down. When the Plant is back online, it requires eight operators. If automated, five operators are required.

**b. Shallow Groundwater Wells**

Wells are complete, pumps have been installed and electricity has been hooked up. Water testing will occur over the next six months to one year. Water pumped can be used for municipal purposes. Contracts were approved for Tetra Tech and Hazen & Sawyer for conveyance system design and wellhead treatment and facilities. It should be a five to six month design process prior to construction.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether the pump takes water from the well to the containment center. Staff noted this has been completed.
- Whether it will take four to five months for conveyance system design and if water will not be used for another five to eight months. Staff noted design is for conveyance and wellhead. Staff is coordinating with the Department of Drinking Water (DDW) concerning using water piped to the Plant. Tetra Tech will be working on DDW approval.
- Whether it will take four to five months to design the conveyance system and another four to five to build it. Staff noted for any introduction of new water into the system, wellhead treatment facilities cannot be designed until water quality is known.
- Whether water can be used for watering medians. Staff will follow up with Mr. Pfalzgraf of Community Services to verify what is being done. The water has to be delivered and applied in a certain way; injecting water into the ground is acceptable, broadcasting without treatment is not allowed.

**c. Greystone Reservoir Rehabilitation**

The west basin is complete and work on the east basin has begun. Completion slated for October 2016.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether east basin water drained was used; staff noted it was used in 3 days.

**d. Cabrillo Reservoir**

A Request for Proposals (RFP) for design of non-potable distribution pipeline will go out July 18<sup>th</sup>.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether water cannot be used and if approval is ahead of the shallow wells' schedule. Staff noted the City is putting out an RFP for a non-potable system to deliver water to parks and create a distribution system. Water cannot be used to broadcast at this time.

- Water is now unused; with the conveyance system, whether water will be used to recharge the aquifer. A part of MWD's rebate program includes recharging aquifers; funds are available to reimburse costs. Staff noted the City is fast tracking the RFP for design and will look into grant funding.
- When doing the analysis and RFP, whether a mini-processing plant, which could process water and supply the 100-150 homes in that area instead of sending it to the Plant, will be considered as the water is close to potable.

(Out of Order)

**f. Metro Subway Extension**

The following were discussed: Project Overview; Metro Purple Line Overall Schedule; Section 1/La Cienega Station Phase; and Section 2/Rodeo Station. The biggest impact will be station construction. Mitigation measures will be implemented during construction; the Transportation and Parking Commission (TPC) plans that Little Santa Monica will be used more effectively during construction. Staff has analyzed options and will return to the TPC for an update to bring to the Public Works Commission (PWC).

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether location names are correct; staff noted renaming locations was discussed.
- The definition of 'lay down yard;' staff noted this is a term for 'staging area.' Once work is complete, they will become station portals or be redeveloped.

**e. Santa Monica Boulevard Reconstruction**

The following were discussed: Santa Monica Boulevard (SMB); Project Locations; Tentative Construction Schedule; Going Forward; and Contacts. Tentative start date is September for this eighteen month project.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Concerning repair of the section west of the Wilshire Blvd./Santa Monica junction, staff noted the City is working with developers who have an obligation to repair roads at project end. An allowance exists in the current contract; if time, the City will do rehabilitation work. The *One Beverly Hills* (One BH) project is in the early phase; work will not be complete by the time this project is done. Both One BH and Hilton/Waldorf have a responsible portion.
- Concerning the time in between Wilshire Boulevard is decked, while station construction is proceeding, whether there will be an impact to the street. Staff noted equipment will enter from the deck and there will be periodic street closures.
- Whether mature trees will be lost. Staff noted the City will look into replanting.
- The Commission was never fully engaged in the Santa Monica Boulevard Reconstruction discussion and is in charge of Public Works streets, lighting, water and sewer. It will be a nightmare narrowing two of three main City arteries at the same time; the Commission did not weigh in on whether this is smart or necessary. The construction team was questioned about managing traffic; email, signage and contacting merchants occurred, but there was no real mitigation answer. Traffic will likely veer into residential areas; Public Works should have a role in discussing whether to shut down two main thoroughfares and the cost of deferring SMB. Excavations will be disruptive. If discussions had taken place, the point could have been made that there is value in postponing one. Going forward, the Commission should be a part of the process and have a role in making decisions.

- Whether there is a way more funds might be spent to decrease project completion time and whether increased working hours are possible.
- Whether a member of the TPC can attend a future PWC Meeting, when staff returns with information, to provide a sense of what occurred at prior TPC meetings.

*The Commission took a recess at 9:52 am*

*The Commission reconvened at 10:03 am*

*(Return to Order)*

### **3. Solid Waste Franchise**

Ms. Rhay and Laith Ezzet from HF&H provided an update and PowerPoint presentation on the first draft solid waste franchise agreement. The following were discussed: Background; Overview of Request for Proposals (RFP); Key RFP Issues; and Next Steps/Schedule. The franchise transitioned one and a half years ago from Crown Disposal Company, Inc. to Recology Los Angeles (Recology). City Council directed staff to issue a RFP for services. The City is currently experiencing performance issues with Recology; staff is in Closed Session discussions with City Council concerning issues.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Concerning source separation, whether the 105 customers not charged for recycling pickup are receiving a financial benefit. Staff noted the 105 were grandfathered into a prior agreement and are receiving a benefit. Mr. Ezzet recommends separated recycling be picked up separately as it is cleaner; he suggests charging for the service.
- Concerning an article that stated recycling has plunged, whether there is profit in recycling. Mr. Ezzet noted paper volume has decreased due partly to the digital age. Prior to the decrease, there was always a cost to recycle; revenues offset some costs.
- Recycling is regulated; the City has a 75% diversion requirement and the State has a goal of 50% statewide. Whether the City's RFP can require a six-year base term. Mr. Ezzet noted agreements with base terms of 7-10 years are typical; requiring a six-year base term makes proposals difficult to compare.
- The difference between union and non-union; whether the majority of providers are union or non-union; and whether smaller providers are capable of good performance and are of adequate size to manage the City's needs. Mr. Ezzet noted union wages and benefits are often but not always higher than non-union; the majority of providers are union. Small operations are often non-union and large operations are union.
- Whether there is an economic disadvantage between having an 8-10 versus 4-6 year contract. Mr. Ezzet noted he can look into the matter.
- Whether a new provider will purchase trucks. Mr. Ezzet noted some providers will, then amortize costs over the length of the contract or the life of the vehicle.
- Oxnard and Camarillo went through this process and found a 20-40% difference in bid responses. Mr. Ezzet noted he has seen as much as 50-100%.
- Whether there is a common mechanism in the industry where if a provider is not performing, the contract can be canceled. Mr. Ezzet noted all contracts contain provisions for failure to perform. The City's current contract has financial terms that favor the City which will not likely be replicated.
- Concerning the 300k in damages Recology owes the City, staff noted it is due to not meeting performance requirements for disposal, recycling, reporting and timelines. The City does not have to sue for damages as terms are defined in the contract.

- Whether there is a reason the City would not extend the current contract to 2022 if it is good for the ratepayers. Mr. Ezzet noted the draft RFP is complete; the City has the ability to extend its current contract but performance issues exist. The City can seek proposals and if none are sufficient, remain with Recology.
- Concerning the current Recology contract, whether the City is subsidizing or breaking even. Mr. Ezzet noted the City receives bills and adds the City's costs; Solid Waste is an enterprise fund. Staff noted the 300k in damages will go into the enterprise fund.
- Whether the City allows restaurants to donate excess food and if there are current participants. Mr. Ezzet noted the City allows restaurants to donate; this is outside of the franchise agreement. Staff can look into options.
- Whether there will be a cost escalator if the City extends Recology's contract. Mr. Ezzet noted there will be a CPI-based escalator.
- Whether there are any issues with Recology other than performance. Staff noted no other issues exist.
- Whether there are any diversion concerns. Mr. Ezzet noted the issue needs to be vetted with City Council.
- Whether there is anything the Commission could do to help lower the cost of disposal for residents. Mr. Ezzet noted approval of an RFP allowing multiple proposers and a non-restrictive process to ensure the greatest amount of proposals will help lower costs.
- The Commission is comfortable with the presentation's recommendations.

*(Out of Order)*

#### **5. Water Supply Exaction Fee**

Water Resources Manager Vince Damasse, City Attorney James Markman and Consultants Steve Bucknam and Mike Whipple provided an update and PowerPoint presentation on the Water Supply Exaction Fee (WSEF). The following were discussed: Background; Determination of the WSEF; Cost of High Capacity Well; Cost of Coldwater Canyon Project; WSEF by Meter Size; WSEF for Redevelopment; WSEF Calculation Examples; Recommendations; Schedule of Adoption; and High Capacity Well Cost Comparison. Central to the City is reliability, local control, independence from MWD and local resources for new development.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Concerning mathematics, whether consultants added \$10M + \$4M then divided by the total amount of water that could be produced, expressed in acre feet per year, and came up with a reduced cost since most water comes from a more expensive area - then equalized it in the denominator - considering them of equal value, lowering unit cost. Mr. Whipple noted if Coldwater Canyon (Coldwater) water did not exist, it would be higher; based on input, additional alternative local supply was added.
- Coldwater water does not have to be included and should be removed; the City should analyze what to do for large growth. The price does not need to be diluted by Coldwater; only La Brea costs should be analyzed. Staff noted when the idea of developers paying for 100% was analyzed, it was determined they would be paying a larger portion of the water supply identified to date; as new developments arise they would pay it off sooner. Staff added supply so it would be available to new developers.
- The reason for dividing by one year's water; the project will last more than one year. Mr. Whipple noted when determining supply, acre feet (AF) is the measurement used as it is the amount used/required in a one-year period. The process included allocating capital costs to produce water supply which is measured by AF per year. Mr. Markman

noted the basic point of the legal basis for a fee is being missed. Calculating the cost of known projects to provide more water for growth, Coldwater and the extra well are identified projects reduced to a unit which can be charged on a pro-rata basis to cover all capital costs. It is a one-time fee, translated into acre feet. The City can charge a reasonably proportioned amount to developments. The process is legally driven under the laws requiring proportional exactions. It entails taking known projects impacted by a particular development and coming up with a fee based on unit calculations. If new projects surface, the fee can be recalculated. It is good for the City to have a reliable local source not impacted by the drought, the Delta or MWD.

- A key point is the fee can be changed. Mr. Whipple noted costs are estimates. The supply from Coldwater is not a limiting factor; the limiting factor is demand to irrigate parks. Estimated costs and projected water supply dictate cost per AF.
- The WSEF and the Water Capacity fee are one time charges.
- Whether new developers will pay a pro-rata share of 100% of water needed. Whether a water impact review is part of the formula. Consultants noted both are correct.
- Whether an analysis of units and fixtures to determine AF to get a figure based on unit cost will be done. With the water demand offset requirement, whether the City will collect enough money or water to not negatively impact its ability to supply current users.
- The WSEF will cost some individuals but is a win-win situation. Developers will pay funds the City will use to create additional water. If the WSEF is not adopted and developers request Will Serve Letters, the City will be bankrupt as it will not have water. The WSEF ensures the success of the City and the development.
- The discomfort and concern that the legal argument for justification of the WSEF was based on the idea of a mandated 25% water independence goal; the WSEF must be reworked without it. The first page of the presentation states 25% independence as the goal. Mr. Bucknam noted 25% was a prior goal; they are now working with Mr. Markman to reword the ordinance. 25% independence was not a City policy; it was based on covering existing demand based on the new three well La Cienega system which did not include new developments. Mr. Markman noted it is a City policy to be only 75% reliant on MWD water. The current direction is that the City requires new developers to pay for all additional water that exceeds the 75/25% based on present demand.
- The questions as to why the 75/25 concept was included and why additional water would not use MWD as the cost basis. The prior reason was maintenance of 75/25 independence. MWD has not told the City it cannot supply water. Staff noted this is subject to change; the City decided to change from a water management policy of 90% MWD dependence. The Water Enterprise Plan set direction for the City to develop projects. It was assumed rate payers would pay for three new wells. The desire is for developers to pay for the 4th well to ensure the City is not jeopardized by new development. The City determined the goal is 75/25 dependence.
- A goal of 75/25 is the same context as maintaining 75/25. The Commission looked for projects to develop at a reasonable cost; three were chosen which ended up being 75/25 but was this was not an outright goal set by the Commission. It is understood that City Council directed staff to develop and that any future growth would require additional sources, not MWD water. Mr. Markman noted new projects dependent on water from MWD is not desired; a local water source is best.
- Moving forward, as a prudent water policy, any additional supplies are to come from sources other than out of State.

Motion:            MOVED by Commissioner Felsenthal, SECONDED by Vice Chair Wolfe  
                         that the Commission recommends staff present the Water Supply

Exaction Fee to the Beverly Hills City Council Liaison/Public Works Commission Committee and the Liaison Committee recommend the concept to City Council.

AYES: Commissioners Felsenthal, Pressman, Shalowitz, Vice Chair Wolfe, Chair Aronberg

NOES: None

CARRIED

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **7. Review and Recommendation on Water Capacity Charge (WCC) Implementation Issues**

Mr. Damasse provided an update on the implementation of the Water Capacity Charge including payment plans, enforcement actions and fire service charges. Staff is receiving developer questions regarding fees and is contemplating the consideration of installment payment plans and mitigation of fees. The charge was generally adopted and included all meters based on size; no distinction was made between fire and domestic services. Staff recommends charging a fire service fee for the physical connection, not an additional capacity fee. Staff is currently using the Will Serve Letter Process; prior to connecting to the City's system, conditions of approval must be met.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Min Kang, Murray Fischer

The Commission discussed the following:

- Whether some developers are seeking connection after the WCC was adopted. Two groups should be discussed; those who were unaware of the WCC and those who were.
- Whether the lateral connection fee is the actual cost of opening the street, tapping into the City's main system and has nothing to do with the WCC discussion.
- Whether staff is suggesting there is a duplicate charge; that the Water Capacity Charge includes the fire service fee.
- Whether the City accepts installment plans; staff can return with a recommendation. Staff noted installment plans are a mechanism for charging fees and recommends the Commission recommend such in accordance with the City system. The Department will evaluate what it takes to implement installment plans.

Motion: MOVED by Commissioner Pressman, SECONDED by Vice Chair Wolfe that the Commission recommends there be no incremental charge for a water capacity fee for a fire service connection.

AYES: Commissioners Felsenthal, Pressman, Shalowitz, Vice Chair Wolfe, Chair Aronberg

NOES: None

CARRIED

#### **4. Conservation Program & Policy Update**

Water Conservation Administrator Debby Figoni and Planning & Research Analyst Michelle Tse provided an update. The State Water Resources Control Board (Board) extended emergency water conservation regulations through the end of January 2017. The City, as a water supplier, performed a supply and demand stress test to determine if it would be able to provide water under current drought conditions; the City came out with a 0% target. Information was given to the City Council Liaison/Public Works Commission Committee, City Council and the Board. City Council approved suspension of penalty surcharges in lieu of a fine/fee system to promote efficiency and desires to continue existing conservation efforts. The City is keeping the two day a week watering schedule. Waterwise Workshops were held and staff has ramped up continuous flow outreach and notification of too-often watering.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Concerning 'minimum' conservation efforts, staff noted City Council discussed that the City has been conserving roughly 20% and would like this to continue.
- There is no policy related to a percentage; an issue is there is no longer a strict financial penalty from the State. Penalty surcharges were removed while other use restrictions remain in effect - Stage D requiring a 30% use reduction and water use efficiency. The Conservation Subcommittee is planning a smaller water wasting fine.
- A request for an additional column in Table 1 of the Memorandum comparing water usage of the same month, one year earlier showing 2013, 2015 and 2016.
- There is no longer a penalty surcharge and all other Stage D requirements are in place; whether customers are paying for additional water at a higher rate without an additional penalty.
- The possibility of Ms. Figoni becoming part of Mr. Damasse's team in the future.

*(Return to Order)*

#### **8. 2015 Consumer Confidence Report**

Water Quality Specialist David Hillyer transmitted information regarding the City's 2015 water quality Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) which was available at the end of June. Staff received roughly 30 requests for hard copies which were granted. The following were covered: Background; Meet and Exceed Regulatory Requirements; Additional Information in the Consumer Confidence Report; and Brief Summary.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Correcting the Report's stated start time for the PWC meeting to 8:00 from 8:30 a.m.
- Page 2 of the Memorandum states, "In 2015, the City of Beverly Hills delivered 3.4 billion gallons of high quality drinking water to our customers from both our treatment plant and the Metropolitan Water District." Whether the Plant contributed any water. Staff noted the Plant contributed water in January and February.
- Under *Sources of Supply*, in the CCR, the second paragraph states, "An assessment of the drinking water source(s) for the City of Beverly Hills was completed in July 2002." Whether this will be updated. Staff noted DDW is in the process of reevaluating as the Plant comes back online.
- Efforts to improve tend not to receive attention; staff's behind the scenes hard work is appreciated.

## **PROJECT UPDATES & STATUS ITEMS**

Chair Aronberg noted Items 9 and 10 are informational; staff will respond to questions.

### **9. Public Works Commission Ad-Hoc Subcommittees**

A list of current Subcommittees was provided.

### **10. Specific Information and Department Updates**

The report transmitted responses to questions that were posed at prior Commission meetings; a synopsis of the Department's items for the most recently completed and upcoming City Council meetings as well as an update on the status of the Department's master plans.

## **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE COMMISSION**

- Chair's Report – *None*
- Mayor's Cabinet Meeting – Chair Aronberg attended the meeting of July 11, 2016; minutes are available online.
- Comments from Commissioners
  - Commissioner Felsenthal raised the following:  
The Robertson project is not a current City Council priority; he requests the Commission receive project information and be able to provide input on decisions and processes.

[Commissioner Pressman exited the Meeting at 11:59 a.m.]

## **COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF**

- Director's Report – *None*
- Upcoming Events  
National Night Out with City Fire and Police Departments is August 2, 2016. The annual Household Hazardous Waste and E-Waste Roundup event is Saturday, September 17, 2016, on Foothill Road, in front of the Public Works Building.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Date / Time: July 14, 2016 / 12:04 p.m.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY of AUGUST, 2016

---

Sandra Aronberg, Chair