

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE BUEL *BBB*
DATE: FEB. 9, 2009

**AGENDA ITEM
E-7
FEB. 11, 2009**

**DISCUSS OPTIONS TO FUND
HIGH-EFFICIENCY WASHER REBATE PROGRAM**

ITEM

Discuss options to fund high-efficiency washer rebate program [PROVIDE POLICY GUIDANCE].

BACKGROUND

The District's Water Conservation Program includes a high-efficiency clothes washer (HEW) rebate program. The HEW program assists our customers in decreasing water consumption, and fulfills Water Conservation Best Management Practice 3 for the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC), the Memorandum of Understanding of which the District is a signatory.

The District's HEW rebate program is currently being administered by the CUWCC. This approach has proven beneficial to the District by saving the District money (these rebates are 50% subsidized by a State Grant, and the administrative fees are subsidized 35%, also by a State Grant, saving the District \$75 per each \$150 rebate and \$19.12 of the administrative fees), and by saving the District the employee hours which would otherwise be utilized in administering the program.

The District purchased 100 rebates initially and, on 12/10/2008, the Board authorized an additional purchase of 100 rebates. As of the end of December 2008, 53 rebates had been sent to NCS D customers. To date, \$15,000 has been paid by NCS D for purchase of the rebates. As of the end of December, there was, of NCS D funding, \$11,205 remaining in the CUWCC HEW rebate program.

On January 28, 2009, we were notified by CUWCC that all funding from the DWR was suspended until further notice due to the funding difficulties of the State of California.

If we wish to continue providing rebates for our customers through the CUWCC, we may elect to fully fund our rebates ourselves.

COSTS OF HEW REBATES, WITH DWR FUNDING AND WITH FUNDING FROM NCS D ALONE			
Rebate Item	Previous Cost NCS D (w/DWR Funding)	Future Costs (NCS D Funded)	Difference
Rebate Cost	\$ 75.00	\$150.00	\$ 75.00
Processing Charges	\$ 33.39	\$ 52.51	\$ 19.12
TOTAL:	\$ 108.39	\$ 202.51	\$ 94.12

Should we elect to continue the program through the CUWCC, fully funding it ourselves, the total additional costs per rebate would be \$94.12.

Recently, questionnaires were sent to 45 recipients of HEW rebates. Of the ten returned, all of the answers reflected satisfaction with their purchases and the rebates/process. The majority of the recipients indicated that they accessed the CUWCC program via the CUWCC website. All but one respondent indicated that they would "definitely" participate in a future CUWCC-administered rebate program; one indicated "possibly."

All respondents reported using less water, detergent and fabric softener with the new HEW. The majority indicated that their reason for selecting the HEW model was energy and water conservation. All, except for one respondent, indicated that the new HEW performed "much better"; one respondent replied "somewhat better." All indicated that energy and water conservation was "very important" to them.

FISCAL IMPACT

There are sufficient funds remaining on deposit with the CUWCC to pay for an additional 54 HEW rebates (at the NCSD fully-funded rate).

There are sufficient funds remaining in the FY 2008/2009 Water Conservation Budget for HEW rebates to pay for an additional 106 HEW rebates (at the NCSD fully-funded rate).

\$\$ Deposited with CUWCC for 200 Rebates	\$15,000
\$\$ Paid for Rebates as of 12/2008	\$3,975
\$\$ Remaining on Deposit w/CUWCC as of 12/2008	\$11,025
\$\$ in FY 2008/2009 WC Program for HEW Rebates	\$36,500
Cost for Each HEW Rebate (Fully Funded by NCSD)	\$203
# of NCSD Fully-Funded Rebates Possible from Remaining Funds Deposited with CUWCC	54
\$\$ Remaining in FY08/09 Budget for HEW Rebates (after \$15,000 paid to CUWCC)	\$21,500
# of NCSD Fully-Funded Rebates Possible from Remaining FY08/09 WC Program Budget	106

RECOMMENDATION

Provide policy guidance.

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE BUEL *BB*
DATE: FEB. 6, 2009

**AGENDA ITEM
F
FEBRUARY 11, 2009**

MANAGER'S REPORT

ITEM

Standing report to your Honorable Board --*Period covered by this report January 22, 2009 through February 4, 2009.*

DISTRICT BUSINESS

Administrative

Maria Vista Estates has set a total of ten water meters.

Doug Wood is responding to the nine comments received on the Waterline Intertie Project. Staff expects that your Honorable Board will hold a hearing on the Final EIR on April 8, 2009 and consider certifying the Final EIR on April 22, 2009.

Staff mailed the attached comment letter on the County's Draft Permanent Bio-Solids Ordinance on January 28, 2009. Staff has been meeting with a working group comprised of City and Special District Representatives to develop input to the County.

The CCC completed all work on the Hetrick Right of Way on 1/30/09.

Staff has mailed the RFP for design of the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrade Project and expects to request Board selection of a consultant at the 2/25/09 Board Meeting.

Staff expects to mail the RFP for preparation of the Southland WWTF Upgrade Project EIR on February 9, 2009. Staff will present proposals for Board consideration at the 4/8/09 Meeting.

Staff expects to mail notices to Blacklake Sewer Customers on February 9, 2009 regarding their option to pre-pay their share of the loan.

Safety Program - No injuries or accidents occurred in this period.

Project Activity - Staff will provide a verbal projects update to the Board at the Board Meeting.

Conservation Program Activities - Staff has initiated implementation of the Water Conservation Program. 46 NCSD customers have used the high efficiency clothes washer rebate program.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff seeks direction and input from your Honorable Board.

ATTACHMENTS

- Staff letter to County re Draft Permanent Bio-Solids Regulations

NIPOMO COMMUNITY

BOARD MEMBERS

JAMES HARRISON, PRESIDENT
LARRY VIERHEILIG, VICE PRESIDENT
CLIFFORD TROTTER, DIRECTOR
ED EBY, DIRECTOR
MIKE WINN, DIRECTOR



SERVICES DISTRICT

STAFF

BRUCE BUEL, GENERAL MANAGER
LISA BOGNUDA, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER
JON SEITZ, GENERAL COUNSEL

148 SOUTH WILSON STREET POST OFFICE BOX 326 NIPOMO, CA 93444 - 0326
(805) 929-1133 FAX (805) 929-1932 Website address: NCSD.CA.GOV

January 28, 2009

Richard Lichtenfels, R.E.H.S., M.P.H.
SLO County Health Agency – Environmental Health Services Division
P. O. Box 1489
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406-1489

SUBJECT: DRAFT PERMANENT TREATED SEWAGE SLUDGE/BIOSOLIDS ORDINANCE

Dear Mr. Lichtenfels,

NCSD staff believes that a permanent biosolids ordinance could be beneficial in regulating “out of County” dumping, but the draft, as currently structured, limits the beneficial reuse of biosolids generated in the County. NCSD supports an ordinance with a stated goal of developing a biosolids management system where biosolids generated within San Luis Obispo County can be beneficially reused within this County. We see biosolids as a resource and we see the ordinance as a potential tool to encourage local wastewater agencies to develop cost effective and healthy approaches to the reuse of that resource. To this end, any ordinance must allow for flexibility in developing alternative solutions on the reuse of biosolids.

Both the US EPA and the SWRCB have studied the land application of biosolids for decades. The Part 503 Regulations and the General Waste Discharge Requirements provide a comprehensive roadmap for the discharge of biosolids to land application as soil amendments for agriculture, silvaculture, and horticulture and land reclamation. In addition, exhaustive research at universities across the nation has documented the benefit that biosolids and biosolids compost provide to soils and crops. Recycling biosolids to land enhances soil and crop production by improving moisture retention and increasing fertility. Many San Luis Obispo soils would benefit from the organic matter and nutrients found in biosolids as opposed to inorganic fertilizer. In the case of Nipomo’s sludge, lab samples indicate almost no heavy metals and chemical pollutants, in stark contrast to the current language in the first paragraph of the purpose section of the ordinance.

In addition to the purpose section of the draft, NCSD staff questions the prohibition against applying non-exceptional quality biosolids to the land, to the 1,608 cubic yard aggregate annual limitation on application, and the definition of composted biosolids prohibiting non-exceptional quality composted biosolids use as feedstock. All of these provisions will continue to reinforce the message to local wastewater agencies that our only option is to export biosolids generated in San Luis Obispo County

Name: Richard Lichtenfels
Subject: Biosolids
Date: January 28, 2009

Nipomo Community Services District
Page 2 of 2


to Kern or Kings for disposal. We should be encouraging local agencies to reuse this resource within our County and not force them to ship out the resource.

We look forward to the publication of a revised draft and request the opportunity to comment further this fall.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me at 929-1133.

Sincerely,

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT



Bruce Buel
General Manager

CC: The Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Board of Supervisors
NCSD Board of Directors
Jon Seitz, NCSD Legal Counsel
Tina Grietens, NCSD Superintendent
Peter Sevcik, NCSD Engineer
Chronological File

T:\DOCUMENTS\STAFF FOLDERS\BRUCE\LETTERS\090128Bio-Solids.DOC

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BRUCE BUEL *BB*
DATE: FEBRUARY 6, 2009

**AGENDA ITEM
G
FEBRUARY 11, 2009**

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ITEM

Review Committee Matters.

BACKGROUND

The Supplemental Water Project Committee met at 1:00pm on Monday January 24, 2009.

The Water Conservation Committee is scheduled to meet again at 10am on Monday February 23, 2009.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that your Honorable Board discuss the meetings as appropriate.

ATTACHMENT

- SUPPLEMENTAL WATER PROJECT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

T:\BOARD MATTERS\BOARD MEETINGS\BOARD LETTER\BOARD LETTER 2007\COMMITTEE REPORTS 090211.DOC

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009

1:00 P. M.

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES SUPPLEMENTAL WATER PROJECT DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ED EBY, CHAIR
CLIFFORD TROTTER, MEMBER

PRINCIPAL STAFF

BRUCE BUEL, GENERAL MANAGER
LISA BOGNUDA, ASSIST. GENERAL MANAGER
DONNA JOHNSON, BOARD SECRETARY
JON SEITZ, GENERAL COUNSEL
PETER SEVCIK, DISTRICT ENGINEER

MEETING LOCATION

**District Board Room
148 S. Wilson Street
Nipomo, California**

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairperson Eby called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and led the flag salute. Committee members Trotter and Eby were both present. Also present were General Manager Bruce Buel, District Engineer Peter Sevcik, District Superintendent Tina Grietens, AECOM/Boyle representatives Mike Nunley and Cesar Romero, DWA representative Doug Wood, Fugro representative Jonathan Blanchard, Wallace representative Kari Wagner and two members of the public.

2. REVIEW STATUS OF WATERLINE INTERTIE PROJECT

General Manager Bruce Buel summarized progress in advancing the Waterline Intertie Project and Mike Nunley reviewed his monthly update. Committee discussion followed on the status of negotiations with the City of Santa Maria, the Woodlands, Golden State Water Company and Rural Water Company. There was no public comment.

3. REVIEW DRAFT HDD GEO-PHYSICAL TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Cesar Romero summarized the Technical Memorandum and Mike Nunley and Jonathan Blanchard answered Committee questions regarding the process for retention of the HDD Contractor, the cost of HDD, the suitability of the geology to support HDD, and the likelihood of encountering oil. Bruce Holliday commented on the size of the bore hole and the use of liquidated damages to encourage timely performance.

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
MONDAY, JAN. 26, 2009
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
SUPPLEMENTAL WATER PROJECT
DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

- 2 -

4. DISCUSS POLICY ISSUES RAISED BY WIP EIR COMMENTS

General Manager Buel proposed that the Committee focus on the comment letters submitted by SLO LAFCO and the SLO County Agricultural Department. The Committee agreed to focus on these comment submittals. Bruce Buel distributed a draft memo from AECOM proposing responses to the Agricultural Department Comments. The Committee agreed that changing the routing was not practical and that Doug Wood should explain the reasons why other routes were not chosen. The Committee also asked Doug Wood to work with AECOM to determine which mitigation measures were feasible and to report back on the cost of implementation of those feasible measures. There was not public comment.

In regards to the SLO LAFCO Comments, Ed Eby distributed proposed edits to the adopted project Objectives for Committee Consideration and explained his logic. Doug Wood explained how he would respond to the comment if the Board were to adopt revisions to the Objectives. Following additional discussion, Cliff Trotter moved to recommend that the Board consider adopting the Objectives edits submitted by Ed Eby at the February 11, 2009 Board Meeting. Ed Eby seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. There was no public comment.

5. DISCUSS CAPITAL FUNDING BASIS OF ASSESSMENT RESEARCH

General Manager Bruce Buel summarized the discussions on this topic to date, recommended that the District retain the Wallace Group to perform additional research on options for calculating the assessment, and introduced Kari Wagner from the Wallace Group. The Committee reviewed the proposal and the process for presenting an assessment role to the property owners. Ed Eby indicated that he wanted more information so that the assessment was defensible in court and understandable to the property owners. Cliff Trotter asked staff to research the legality of recording deed restrictions against the title of property owners who opted to pay assessments based on a lower than permissible level of development. Ed Eby requested that the Wallace Group correlate water use to meter size and Kari Wagner indicated that she was willing to do so. Cliff Trotter asked for a calculation of developed acreage and undeveloped acreage within the District. Cliff Trotter also requested that the caption for Exhibit A be redrafted to read Charge Rates instead of Hourly Compensation. The Committee agreed, by consensus, that the research was necessary. There was no public comment.

6. SET NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING

The Committee agreed to have another meeting on Monday, March 23, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. to discuss the Basis of Assessment and status of the design. There was no public comment.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.