

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
August 17, 2023
RUBIDOUX COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

DIRECTORS PRESENT: Bernard Murphy
John Skerbelis
F. Forest Trowbridge
Hank Trueba, Jr.
Armando Muniz (part of the meeting)

DIRECTORS ABSENT: Armando Muniz (part of the meeting)

STAFF PRESENT: Brian Laddusaw, General Manager
Kirk Hamblin, Director of Finance and Administration
Ted Beckwith, Director of Engineering
Martha Perez, Customer Service/Accounts Payable Manager
Miguel Valdez, Director of Operations
Melissa Trujillo, HR Generalist/Safety and Facilities Coordinator

Call to order: the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rubidoux Community Services District by President Murphy, at 4:00 P.M., Thursday, August 17, 2023, by teleconferencing at District Office, 3590 Rubidoux Boulevard, Jurupa Valley, California.

Director Murphy made the motion to adjust the agenda and strike Items 9 and 12 from the agenda to be added to the September 7th meeting, and to add Item 16A, Committee Meeting Report.

Roll call:

Ayes – 5 (Muniz, Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)
Noes – 0
Abstain – 0
Absent – 0

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of Minutes for August 3, 2023, Board Meeting.

Director Skerbelis moved, and Director Muniz seconded to approve the August 3, 2023, Regular Board Minutes as presented.

Roll call:

Ayes – 5 (Muniz, Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)
Noes – 0
Abstain – 0
Absent – 0

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 5. Consideration to Approve the August 18, 2023, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Consideration to Approve the August 18, 2023, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Director Skerbelis moved, and Director Trowbridge seconded to Approve the August 18, 2023, Salaries, Expenses and Transfers.

Roll call:

Ayes – 5 (Muniz, Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)
Noes – 0
Abstain – 0
Absent – 0

The motion was carried unanimously.

ITEM 6. PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGE OF NON-AGENDA MATTERS

There was no one in attendance.

ITEM 7. CORRESPONDENCE AND RELATED INFORMATION

There was nothing to offer at this time.

ITEM 8. MANAGER’S REPORT

Operations Report:

Miguel Valdez reported on the water/wastewater report for the month of July, production was an average of just under 5 mgd per day and an average of 1.71 mg/day was the wastewater flow to Riverside. On average 0 mg/day of water to JCSD. The projected sales to JCSD are at zero sales currently. Well No. 1 produced 9% of the water, Well No. 2 produced 0%, Well No. 4 produced 16% and Well No. 6 produced 17%, Well No. 8 produced 33% and Well No. 18 produced 25% of the water.

Miguel Valdez gave a Hard Water Presentation which had been requested by the board.

The definition of water hardness is the amount of dissolved calcium and magnesium in the water. Hard water is high in dissolved minerals, largely calcium and magnesium. Water hardness originates from geological formations and the dissolution of minerals in the earth's crust. Rubidoux Community Services District is 100% groundwater reliant.

The Effects of Water Hardness: Formation of scale, a mineral deposit that accumulates in pipes, appliances, and surfaces. Hardwater reduces the effectiveness of soaps and detergents, leading to more consumption of cleaning agents.

Water Softening Methods: Ion Exchange, Lime Softening, Reverse Osmosis

Ion Exchange:

- Exchanges calcium and magnesium ions in the water with sodium ions.
- Water passes through a resin bed containing tiny resin beads coated with sodium ions.
- As the hard water flows through, the calcium and magnesium ions are attracted to the resin beads and are replaced with sodium ions.

Challenges with Ion Exchange

- Regeneration Waste
 - The ion exchange process involves periodically regenerating the resin bed with saltwater (brine). The resulting waste brine contains concentrated hardness minerals and requires proper disposal, which can be environmentally challenging and costly.
- High Salt Usage
 - Regeneration requires the use of salt, contributing to elevated sodium levels in the treated water. This could be a concern for those on sodium-restricted diets and may impact the water's taste.
- Space Requirements
 - Ion exchange systems necessitate space for resin tanks, brine storage, and associated equipment. This can be a limitation in urban environments where space is limited.
- Operating Costs
 - Ongoing maintenance and resin replacement costs can add up over time. Skilled personnel are needed to monitor and manage the system, leading to increased labor expenses.

Lime Softening:

- Adds chemicals such as lime (calcium hydroxide) or soda ash (sodium carbonate) to the water.
- These chemicals react with the calcium and magnesium ions, causing them to precipitate out of the water as solid particles that can be removed through sedimentation or filtration.

Challenges with Lime Softening

- Residual Chemicals

- Lime softening involves adding lime (calcium hydroxide) or other chemicals to the water. If not properly managed, residual chemicals can remain in the treated water, affecting its taste and quality.
- pH Fluctuations
 - Lime addition significantly raises the pH of the water. This alteration can impact the stability of the distribution system and potentially cause corrosion of pipes and infrastructure.
- Sludge Disposal
 - The process generates sludge as a byproduct, containing the precipitated calcium and magnesium compounds. Disposing of this sludge requires proper handling and may involve additional costs.
- Space Requirements
 - Lime softening systems require space for chemical storage, mixing, and reaction tanks. Adequate space availability is essential, particularly in urban areas.
- Maintenance and Costs
 - Ongoing maintenance and monitoring are necessary to ensure optimal performance. This includes equipment upkeep and chemical resupply.

Reverse Osmosis (RO)

- RO is a more comprehensive water treatment method that removes a wide range of contaminants, including minerals that cause water hardness.
- An RO system uses a semipermeable membrane to filter out ions, minerals, and other impurities, producing softened water as a result.

Challenges with RO

- High energy consumption
 - RO systems require significant energy to push water through the semipermeable membranes against the osmotic pressure.
- Low recovery rate
 - A Significant amount of water is rejected as waste during the filtration process.
- Waste disposal issues
 - The concentrated brine generated as a byproduct of the RO process contains the removed minerals and contaminants that would need to be disposed of.
- Costs
 - Implementing and maintaining reverse osmosis systems can be expensive. The initial setup costs for large-scale systems, as well as ongoing maintenance, membrane replacement, and energy costs, can strain municipal budgets.

Factors Influencing Hard Water Treatment at RCSD

- Hard water is not a health risk
- Operating Costs
- Space required for treatment processes

There was some discussion after the presentation. Director Murphy would like to see if the other districts that we compare with include reverse osmosis in their price.

Emergency and Incident Report:

Chief Otterman reported the Incidents Reported for the month of July 2023 and Special District Rubidoux CSD. Station 38 had a total of 258 calls. 168 calls were medical aides. Additionally, there was a report for the City of Jurupa Valley. There were 30 False Alarms, 7 Other Fire, 8.1%, 4 Public Service Assist, 1 Standby, 11 Misc., 15 Traffic Collisions, 1 Vehicle Fire, 0.4% and 8 Wildland Fires, 3.1%. The average response time was 4.5 minutes.

Manager's Report:

Krysta Harper, from Harper and Associates Engineering gave a Detailed Presentation for a Corrective Action Plan: State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water Report dated June 29, 2023

There was an HAE Evaluation of the Four Reservoirs in February 2020 for Corrosion, Structural, Safety, and Seismic. Discussion with District: Funding, Timeframe, Ability to take reservoirs out of service.

Based on Updated 2023 Costs, the total estimated budget for all four reservoirs is over \$5,000,000.

Based on the HAE reports and the District's constraints, the recommended work for each reservoir has been broken down into VII Phases.

- Phase I - Cal/OSHA Safety Upgrades Four Reservoirs
- Phase II - Atkinson Coating & Structural Repairs
- Phase III – Hunter I Rehabilitation
- Phase IV – Watson Coating & Structural Repairs
- Phase V – Perrone Coating & Painting
- Phase VI – Atkinson Seismic & Exterior Painting
- Phase VII – Perrone Seismic & Watson Exterior

Phase I: Cal/OSHA SAFETY UPGRADES (Fiscal Year 23-24)

- Self-Closing Gate: All 4 Reservoirs
- Roof Hatch with 30-inch head clearance: Atkinson and Hunter
- Secondary Hatch/Vent: Hunter
- Interior Fiberglass Ladder: Hunter
- Exterior Ladder/Modify Ladder: Hunter, Watson, Perrone
- Int/Ext. Ladder Safety Systems: All 4 Reservoirs
- Vent Screening: All 4 Reservoirs
- Roof Fall Restraint System: All 4 Reservoirs

Phase I Grant Funding: HAE recommends the District pursue grant funding for the seismic upgrades needed on the Atkinson and Perrone Reservoirs and upgrade or replace the Hunter Reservoir. The seismic upgrades for these three reservoirs are 40% to 48% of the rehabilitation cost for each reservoir.

Phase I CBC & AWWA D100 Updates:

- Standards have updated since 2020 evaluations
- Prior to seismic upgrades for each reservoir, the calculations should be updated to reflect current standards
- Freeboard
- Foundation and Anchorage

Phase I Freeboard:

The District can control the water level by SCADA, allowing an increase in freeboard which in turn will eliminate the need for near term structural modifications for increased seismic resiliency of the reservoirs.

The level of the water in each reservoir fluctuates throughout the day and furthermore throughout the year depending on the demand.

Changes in the water level will need further investigation into how this change affects the operation of the District's wells given the reduced storage capacity in the reservoirs.

Phase II Atkinson Coating/Structural Repairs (Fiscal Year 24-25)

HAE understands the primary criterion for long-term life of a reservoir is the condition of the coating on the interior roof and structural members.

Atkinson Reservoir is already experiencing severe corrosion and metal loss on the rafters and center support plate and there is random severe corrosion and metal loss on various structural connections.

- Coating System 24 Years Old
- Structural Modifications Required
- Interior Coating and Structural Repairs - \$624,600
- Exterior Can Wait

Phase III Hunter I Rehabilitation (Fiscal Year 25-26)

Pipeline replacement will need to be done so that there is adequate pipe capacity to allow Hunter reservoir to be out of service while the pressure zone is served from storage in the other reservoir.

Webb and Associates working on best option for the Hunter Reservoir

- Rehabilitation of the existing reservoir and add a sister 0.5 MG reservoir (\$950,000, excluding site/earthwork)
- Replace the existing reservoir with a larger 1.0 MG Reservoir (\$1.5 MG Reservoir (\$1,500,000, excluding site/earthwork)

Reservoir is already experiencing severe general corrosion.

- Coating System has far exceeded the life expectancy
- Structural Modifications Required
- Interior Coating and Structural Repairs - \$330,400
- Exterior Painting - \$130,000
- Seismic Upgrades - \$311,000

Phase IV Watson Coating (Fiscal Year 26-27)

Reservoir is already experiencing severe corrosion on the vents and moderate corrosion on the structural members.

- Coating System has exceeded the life expectancy
- Anticipate Some Structural Modifications Required
- Interior Coating and Structural Repairs - \$845,000
- Exterior Painting Could be Postponed - \$435,000
- No Foundation or Anchor Bolts Required
- Seismic Upgrades – Flexible Coupling on piping \$65,000

Phase V Perrone Reservoir (Fiscal Year 27-28)

Experiencing moderate corrosion on the center support plate and structural members and connections

- Coating System has exceeded the life expectancy
- Anticipate Minor Structural Modifications Required
- Interior Coating and Minor Structural Repairs - \$435,000
- Exterior Painting is in aesthetically fair to poor condition - \$220,000

Phase VI Atkinson Seismic & Exterior Painting (Fiscal Year 28-29)

Foundation & Anchor Bolts - \$390,000

Weld Straps to Shell - \$210,000

Flexible Coupling of Piping - \$65,000

Exterior Painting - \$305,000

Interior Coating Repair - \$130,000

Phase VII Perrone Seismic & Watson Exterior Painting (Fiscal Year 29-30)

Foundation & Anchor Bolts - \$310,000

Weld Straps to Shell - \$175,000

Flexible Coupling on Piping - \$36,000

Coating & Paint Repairs - \$170,000

Watson Exterior Painting - \$435,000

There was some discussion after the presentation.

ITEM 9. Consider Adjustments to Agenda Format. DM 2023-79.

Item 9 Struck from the agenda.

ITEM 10. Consider Proposed Revisions to Pretreatment Fees and Charges. DM 2023-80.

BACKGROUND

Pretreatment wastewater discharge fees are instrumental in ensuring industries operating within the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) adhere to established environmental regulations and guidelines. These fees are intended to cover the costs associated with monitoring, inspecting, and managing the proper treatment of industrial wastewater before it enters the District’s wastewater collection system. While the importance of these fees remains undoubted, their value has eroded over time due to inflation and increasing operational expenses.

The District operates its pretreatment wastewater discharge program, in its current fashion, under the authority of Ordinance No. 105 adopted by the Board of Directors (“Board”) in June 2003. Ordinance No. 105 is the backbone of the program and sets the rules and regulations governing the program for which all industrial users must follow. Fees for permits, inspections, sampling, etc. as it relates to the program are set by Resolution. Adjustments to the fee schedule were last made in 2003, with the adoption of Resolution No. 728. Resolution No. 728 provided grammatical adjustments to the schedule as it relates to proper referencing, revised permit classes, and revised descriptions and did not adjust the fees themselves. The fees associated with the District’s pretreatment program were last adjusted in 1991, with the adoption of Resolution No. 612.

The District has not adjusted its fees for over 30 years. With the increase in operational costs during this time, the pretreatment program is almost completely subsidized by the District’s residential and commercial sewer users. In a desire to shift some of the burden of funding the pretreatment program away from residential and commercial users to the regulated industrial users, the Board in 2022 authorized work on a proposal received from Krieger and Stewart (“Krieger”) to perform a comprehensive review to address the following concerns:

1. **Inflation Impact:** Since the fees were last adjusted in 1991, the cumulative effects of inflation have significantly diminished the purchasing power of these fees. The resulting gap between revenue and operational costs needs to be addressed to maintain the sustainability of the District’s operations.
2. **Operational Expenses:** The costs associated with pretreatment program administration, monitoring equipment, laboratory testing, and compliance enforcement have escalated over the years. Failing to reflect these increased costs in the District’s fee structure jeopardizes the District’s ability to provide effective waste management services.
3. **Equity and Fairness:** An adjusted fee structure ensures that industries contributing to higher pollutant loads and necessitating more intensive monitoring contribute their fair share toward the proper treatment of their wastewater, promoting environmental equity.

Recently, Krieger completed their analysis and recommended the District consider the following:

1. Update the routine fees and charges of the District’s industrial users; and
2. Expand the fees and charges that can be applied to industrial users to allow the District to recover costs incurred through implementation of enforcement activities.

Table 1 below highlights some of the proposed fee adjustments for industrial users. It’s worth noting, the District does not have significant industrial users from year to year, currently about 20, and the proposed increase in fees will never truly cover the cost of the District’s pretreatment program, but in a lesser extent should help mitigate the impacts inflation has had on the District’s pretreatment program, but in a lesser extent should help mitigate the impacts inflation has had on the District’s operational costs over the last 30 years.

TABLE 1						
Permit Class	IU Description	Permit Duration	Resolution 612 (1991)	Resolution 728 (2003)	Resolution 2023-908 (Proposed)	
			Annual Permit Fee	Annual Permit Fee	Annual Permit Fee	Initial Permit Application Fee
I	Significant Industrial User: Annual avg. 25,000 gals/day	2 yrs.	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 5,000
II	Industrial User: Annual avg. 10,000 - 24,999 gals/day	2 yrs.	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000
III	Industrial User: Annual avg. 1 - 9,999 gals/day	2 yrs.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 500
IV	Storing hazardous substances on-site	Less than 2 yrs.	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 1,000
V	Temporary user	Less than 180 days	N/A	\$ 500	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000

Additionally, Krieger is proposing adjustments to inspection, noncompliance, and pretreatment plan check fees. A full listing of the proposed fees is detailed in draft Resolution No. 2023-908 and included as Attachment 1 to this Memorandum.

Based on staff communications with Krieger and the Senior Water Resource Control Engineer with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (“Santa Ana Water Board”), increases to the District’s fee schedule via Resolution No. 2023-908 do not constitute a “Substantial Program Modification” but nonetheless the District must follow the proper adoption timeline compliant with the requirements of the Santa Ana Water Board. Understanding their requirements, staff is proposing the following timeline for Board consideration:

1. August 17, 2023 – Board authorization to submit letter to Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board requesting review of program changes. Begins 45-day review period.
2. No later than September 5, 2023 – Notice of Public Hearing to all affected industrial users to receive comments and respond. Thirty (30) day notice period.
3. October 5, 2023 – Public Hearing to adopt Resolution No. 2023-908.

Staff acknowledges the potential impact of fee increases on the District’s industrial users. However, given the absence of fee adjustments for over three decades, the District must now take proactive measures to ensure fair and sustainable financial practices that support the evolving needs of the District.

Director Skerbelis moved, and Director Trueba seconded the Board of Directors:

1. **Authorize the General Manager to submit a letter to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board requesting their review of changes made to the District’s pretreatment program.**
2. **Mail notice of Public Hearing to affected industrial users no later than September 5, 2023.**
3. **Schedule Public Hearing for October 5, 2023.**

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried 4-0-0-1.

ITEM 11. Consider Course of Action for Customer with Excessive Water Use. DM 2023-81.

BACKGROUND

Water is undeniably one of the most precious and essential resources on the planet. Its value extends far beyond its availability in our daily lives, as it underpins the health of ecosystems, the well-being of communities, and the sustainability of industries. Recognizing water as a valuable resource necessitates proactive responsible management for its conservation and use by current and future generations.

In 1960, the Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) Board of Directors (“Directors”) adopted Ordinance No. 38, an Ordinance establishing rates and rules and regulations governing water service in the District. Although aspects of Ordinance No. 38 have been amended over the years, Part 5 *Protection Measures* and Part 5 *Penalties* have remained relatively unchanged since the original Ordinance adoption. The applicable sections of these parts read as follows:

Part 4 Section 3 states *“No consumer shall permit leaks or waste of water.”* (Attachment 1 – Page 13)

Part 5 Section 1 states *“For the failure of any consumer to comply with all or any part hereof and any ordinance, resolution or order fixing rules and regulations....service shall be discontinued and the water shall not be supplied said consumer until he [they] have complied with the rule or regulation.”* (Attachment 1 – Page 15)

In the District’s ongoing efforts to promote water conservation, in alignment with the District’s commitment to sustainable water resource management, staff has identified a customer, whose water consumption patterns have raised concerns with District staff.

Since March 2021, this customer has exhibited consistently high-water usage which surpasses normal residential levels. The data indicates a potentially significant leak which gives rise to water waste and the need to ensure responsible water usage. In the twelve months immediately preceding March 2021, the customer never used more than 15 units of water. One unit of water

equates to 748 gallons. For comparisons, the average monthly water consumption for a residential customer in the District with a family of four is approximately 18 units. In the months since, the customer has averaged hundreds of units of monthly consumption. In June 2023, the customer was billed for 465 units of water. For perspective, 465 units of water is 347,820 gallons, or 8 gallons per minute of continuous usage. A common measurement of water is the unit acre-foot (“AF”). An AF of water is 325,828.8 gallons, or equal to a one-acre (43,560 SF) lot covered with one foot of water. The customer’s lot has a total lot area of 16,177 SF. Based on June 2023’s water bill, the volume of water going through the meter would cover the entire lot 2.7 feet deep.

District staff understands occasional spikes in water usage can occur due to various factors, such as minor leaks, irrigation practices, or maintenance needs. However, the sustained and excessive nature of this customer’s consumption prompted the District to take a closer look at the situation.

District staff first contacted the customer in April 2021, informing the customer of a potential leak. The customer was responsive at first and informed District staff they intended to fix the leak soon. Over the next couple of months, based on monthly meter reads, the customer’s leak appeared to worsen. Additional communication efforts were made by the customer service staff and field staff highlighting the severity of the leak, but the customer’s responsiveness declined. Eventually, the customer was unable to pay their monthly bill and soon carried a balance. The balance grew month-over-month as the customer’s monthly payment was not sufficient to cover any past-due amounts plus new charges. Ultimately, the customer agreed to a payment arrangement to educe their balance. Nonetheless, the customer’s leak is still persistent and recent efforts to communicate with the customer to fix the leak have been futile.

Over the last two years, District staff have made multiple attempts to engage with the customer and offer support to identify any potential issues which might be contributing to excessive water usage. The goal being to assist them in rectifying the situation, promote responsible water management, and foster a collaborative approach to water conservation. Unfortunately, the District has been unsuccessful in getting the customer to address this problem.

To ensure sustainable resource management, the District must act to reduce water waste, which unfortunately includes up to discontinuation of water service as described in Ordinance 38 and consistent with Resolution 2023-907 which revised the District’s Water Shutoff Policy to its most current version. Below is a timeline of step-by-step procedures to solicit compliance prior to discontinuation. Staff hopes the customer takes remedial steps prior to getting their water shutoff. Staff is seeking concurrence from the Board on this course of action, which is fair, transparent, and aligns with the District’s values.

1. Letter – First Attempt – No later than August 31, 2023 (Attachment 2):
Will inform customer of leak and responsibility to address the leak in a timely manner.
Will request a corrective action plan by September 15, 2023.
2. Letter – Final Attempt – No later than September 15, 2023:
If the issue is not remediated and no corrective action plan received, will inform customer shutoff procedures (SB 998) will commence on October 1, 2023.
3. Letter – No later than November 1, 2023:
Will inform customer they are subject to discontinuation in 30 days if leak persists and no efforts have been made to fix it.

4. Red Card – No earlier than November 20, 2023:
Will post red card on door notifying customer of impending the discontinuation on December 1, 2023.
5. Discontinue Service – December 1, 2023

Discontinuing water service for a customer is not the preferred outcome the District wants but being a community water system, with 6,500 connections, servicing 38,000 residents and counting, the District has an obligation to ensuring this valuable resource is protected from waste.

Director Skerbelis moved, and Director Trowbridge seconded the Board of Directors concur with the timeline above to address a customer’s water waste.

Roll call:

Ayes – 3 (Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 1 (Murphy)

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried with a vote of 3-1-0-1.

ITEM 12. Consider Purchase of Tablets and Support Services for the Board of Directors. DM 2023-82.

Item 12 Struck from the agenda.

ITEM 13. Consider Awarding a Professional Services Contract to Ruhnau Clarke Architects (“RCA”) for Preparation of Plans and Bid Documents for the Replacement of the Roof at Fire Station 38. DM 2023-83.

BACKGROUND

The Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) is responsible for providing Fire Protection Services within the District’s boundary and provides this service through a contract with Riverside County Fire/CalFire (“County Fire”) for staffing and equipment. Fire Station 38 property and building are District owned and as the owner, the District is responsible for its ongoing upkeep. Funding to pay County Fire for contract services and ongoing expenses related to upkeep of Fire Station 38 comes from the District’s share of property taxes paid by property owners within the District service boundary. The District retains reserves from this funding source for upkeep and improvements to Fire Station 38.

In 2020 pursuant to DM 2020-76, the District executed a contract with Orkin to fumigate Fire Station 38 which was done in early 2021, choosing to not include the tile replacement option of their proposal. During the heavy rains in late 2022 and early 2023 it was discovered that the roof was leaking and that a large percentage of the roof tiles were either broken or dislodged or both.

Staff has determined that the best course of action is to replace the roof of the Fire Station in its entirety and included funding for this effort in the Fiscal Year 2023-24 fire and Weed Abatement Fund Budget, Line Item #18 in the amount of \$250,000. To award a contract for this scale of work the District needs plans and specifications such that roofing contractors will be bidding on the same scope and effort. The District has received a proposal of \$25,000 to prepare plans and specifications from RCA. RCA is a local architectural firm located in Riverside, has performed architectural services on behalf of the District recently and is well suited to prepare the necessary plans and bid documents. Staff desires to have this work completed before the on-set of the winter rains and needs to go to bid on the work in the next two months to meet this goal.

As funds were already included in the Fiscal Year 2023-24 Budget for this effort no budget amendment is necessary to pay for this work.

Director Murphy moved to:

- 1. Authorize Ruhnau Clarke’s proposal in the amount of \$25,000 for plans and bid documents related to the roof at Station 38.**
- 2. Authorize an additional \$5,000 to hire a Building Inspector to inspect the entirety of Station 38, focusing on the roof and crawl spaces to determine the extent of the roof damage as well as highlight other areas of the building that may need repair work.**

For lack of a Second, the motion Failed.

ITEM 14. Consider an Agreement between Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) and Western Municipal Water District (“Western”) with the District as a Subrecipient of a Grant Awarded to Western in the United States Bureau of Reclamation (“USBR”) Drought Resiliency Grant Program. DM 2023-84.

BACKGROUND

In May 2022, the District Board of Directors (“Board”) adopted Resolution No. 2022-890, a resolution which applied for a joint grant with Western Water and Riverside Highlands Water Company (“Riverside Highlands”). The District was notified of receiving the award of this grant in March 2023 in the amount of \$1,457,500 from the United States Bureau of Reclamation (“USBR”) for the construction of Well 25 and related treatment facilities. Well 25 is a Master Planned Well Facility with an expected cost including associated treatment facilities of approximately \$2,915,000 and this matching grant will cover about half of the cost of developing this well and associated treatment.

On July 10, 2023, Western Water received the Notice of Award of the Grant for which the District was a subrecipient in the amount of \$1,457,500 for the project. This is a matching grant by which the District must expend at least the amount of the award (50%). The District has in its Fiscal Year 2023-24 budget \$1,700,000 in Water Capital Improvement Budget Line Item #12 in anticipation of receiving this grant.

As Western Water is the lead recipient of the grant and the District is a subrecipient, Western Water has prepared an agreement establishing the terms between the two parties which is attached. The terms of the agreement between Western Water and the District require the District

to meet the terms of the USBR Grant as if the grant was awarded directly to the District. The attached notice of award for the grant specifies the terms of the grant to which the District will be bound. In brief, the terms require the District to submit certain performance reports to USBR during construction of the well and related treatment and to award the contract for the construction by November 2024 with completion of the project by the end of September 2026. The District is currently working with its consultants to prepare the plans and bid documents for the construction of the well and related treatment. Staff expects to bring this action to the board in September 2023.

Western Water is bringing this agreement to Committee on September 5, 2023 and to its full board on September 20, 2023. Since the next meeting of the district's Board of Directors is not until September 7, 2023 this agreement should be signed now so the District signed version can be presented to Western Water's committee at the September 5, 2023 meeting.

Director Skerbelis moved and Director Trowbridge seconded approval to authorize the General Manager to enter into an agreement with Western Water as a subrecipient of a grant awarded to Western Water in the USBR Drought Resiliency Grant Program.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried 4-0-0-1.

ITEM 15. Consider Approval of a California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Notice of Exemption (“NoE”) for Construction of a Backwash Supply Pipeline at the Leland Thompson Water Treatment Facility (“Thompson Plant”) and Authorize Staff to File it with the Appropriate Agencies. DM 2023-82.

BACKGROUND

The Thompson Plant treats ground water from Wells 1A, and 18 for Manganese and PFAS and Well 8 for PFAS only. As part of the Manganese Filtration Process, the filters are cleaned of Manganese by a backwash process which reverses the flow in the system at regular intervals. There are current issues with pressure surges in the Water Distribution System when the back wash occurs attributed to the impact forces (water hammer) of the water flow reversing direction. Well 2, in the parking lot of the District Administration Building is treated on site for PFAS and TCP-1-2-3 and then blended with water from the Thompson plant before entering the system to bring Perchlorate and Nitrates below the Maximum Contamination Level (“MCL”) for the blended water. When Well 2 is running a valve in 34th Street must be closed and a backwash is done water is drawn from only one side of the system relative to the Thompson Plant, greatly increasing the water hammer in the system.

The Rubidoux Community Services District (“District”) has contracted with Krieger and Stewart Engineers (K&S”) to prepare plans and bid documents for the construction of a pipeline in 34th Street to bypass the valve and allow it to be open when Well 2 is running so water can be drawn

from both sides of the system relative to the Thompson Plant, reducing the water hammer without introducing raw water into the potable system.

Statutory exemptions are identified in Section 15282 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) Guidelines as *“The installation of new pipeline or maintenance, repair, restoration, removal, or demolition of an existing pipeline as set forth in Section 21080.21 of the Public Resources Code, as long as the project does not exceed one mile in length.”*

To determine whether a project is statutorily exempt from CEQA, certain findings must be made for a project to verify it qualifies for a specific exemption class and can appropriately be exempted from the requirement for the preparation of a higher-level environmental document.

As this pipeline is in a relatively less traveled existing public street which by its nature is already environmentally disturbed, the District finds that the installation of this pipeline will not have significant effect on traffic or on the environment and has determined that the project is therefore exempt from CEQA by statute, namely as indicated in the California Public Resources Code Section 21080.21.

When a project is determined to be exempt from CEQA a Notice of Exemption (“NoE”) needs to be filed with the County Recorder’s office and the State Clearinghouse. As noted on the State Clearinghouse website, the State Clearinghouse is at the center of State agency involvement in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review process and serves as the State “Single Point of Contact.” Staff has filled out the NoE but Board action is required to file it. A copy of the NoE is attached to this Board Memorandum.

Director Murphy moved and Director Skerbelis seconded the Board of Directors:

- 1. Find in its sole discretion the Project meets the requirements for a Statutory Exemption under CEQA Section 15282(k) as appropriate for the project.**
- 2. Authorize the General Manager or designee to sign the NoE.**
- 3. Direct staff to file the NoE with appropriate agencies.**

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried 4-0-0-1.

ITEM 16. Receive and File Statement of Cash Asset Schedule Report Ending July 2023. DM 2023-86.

BACKGROUND

Attached for the Board of Directors' consideration is the June 2023 Statement of Cash Asset Schedule Report for all District Fund Accounts. Our YTD interest is \$263,251.98 for District controlled accounts. With respect to District "Funds in Trust", we show \$5,842.94 which has been earned and posted. The district has a combined YTD interest earned total of \$269,094.92 as of July 31, 2023.

The District's Operating Funds (Excluding Restricted Funds and Operating Reserves), we show a balance of \$13,171,884.78 ending July 31, 2023. That's **\$987,847.97 LESS** than July 1, 2023, beginning balance of \$14,159,732.75.

Further, the District's Field/Admin Fund current fund balance is \$771,896.97.

Submitted for the Board of Directors consideration is the **July 2023, Statement of Cash Asset Schedule Report** for your review and acceptance this afternoon.

Director Trowbridge moved, and Director Murphy seconded to Receive and File the Statement of Cash for the Month of July 2023 for the Rubidoux Community Services District.

Roll call:

Ayes – 4 (Murphy, Skerbelis, Trowbridge, Trueba)

Noes – 0

Abstain – 0

Absent – 1 (Muniz)

The motion was carried 4-0-0-1.

ITEM 16A. Committee Meeting Reports.

Director Murphy reported about the RAC meeting. There are three cost inputs that are increasing significantly for sewage treatment. There is the cost to haul off the biosolids, and it will continue to increase. Next is the cost for chemicals. They have to use chemicals to treat the fluid. We use chlorine, as do they. The cost of chemicals has gone up significantly. They do not have a handle on how much the cost inputs are going to increase. They are going to re-evaluate it quarterly and let us know. If there's going to be a special RAC meeting to authorize a higher rate, they will have that. There's a third cost and that's natural gas. Recently the cost of natural gas has not been uniform. From November to December, there was a spike in the cost of natural gas. The Public Utilities Commission has not considered having steady utility rates to be a significant thing. It's very difficult for them to determine the cost of what natural gas is going to be because of the input of the commission. Our cost increase could go up 10-15% when we thought it might go up just 3-5%. The city has increased their sewer and treatment rates at a rate of 7% per year for the next five years. Of the three cost inputs they talked about, there's nothing they could have done about gas.

Director Skerbelis reported that at the Ad Hoc Building Meeting it was decided that the cost of renovating the building is ridiculously expensive and they are proposing that they table it right now and start over with a clean slate and look at it with a fresh set of eyes. \$3.6 million is more than double, almost triple, than what was originally thought. No decisions have been made, only

suggestions have been made. Staff's directions are that there are new players in the field. There are new staff members at the district and so new Ad Hoc committee members.

Director Murphy commented that putting a note on the door at 2:30 was a bad idea. There was a public Ad Hoc Committee Meeting with locked doors. He stated that he showed up before 2:30 and was escorted to another room.

ITEM 17. Directors Comments

Director Murphy adjourned the meeting at 6:40 PM.