

Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Items – Meeting January 26, 2021

Agenda Item 3 – Presentation

2 – Public Comments

Supplemental Packet Date: January 26, 2021

D. Gallegos

Supplemental Information:

Any Agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available in the City Clerk's Office, 501 Poli Street, Room 204, Ventura, during normal business hours as well as on the City's Website - <https://www.cityofventura.ca.gov/716/Water-Commission>.



2020 Water Shortage Event Contingency Plan Update

Jennifer Tribo
Management Analyst II

Water Commission Meeting
January 26, 2021



www.cityofventura.ca.gov



@CityofVentura



@CityofVenturaGovernment

WSECP History

- 2014 Drought
 - Governor imposed water usage restrictions
- Ventura City Council created Water Shortage Task Force
 - Developed water rate structure for water shortages
 - Updated Water Shortage Event Contingency Plan
- WSECP
 - Framework to address a range of potential events that could result in serious water shortages, including drought, earthquakes, or water system failures.
 - Six stages of action to respond to water shortage events to reduce demand by up to 60%.
 - Compares normal year supply projection to the current year supply projection to determine the water shortage stage

New WSECP Requirements

- Key attributes of its water supply reliability analysis
- Six standard water shortage levels corresponding to progressive ranges
- Locally appropriate “shortage response actions” for each shortage level
- Procedures for conducting an annual water supply and demand assessment with prescribed elements.
- Communication protocols and procedures to inform customers, the public, and government entities of any current or predicted water shortages and associated response actions.
- Monitoring and reporting procedures
- A reevaluation and improvement process

Proposed Revisions to WSECP

- Expand information on water supply reliability analysis
- Add procedures for annual supply and demand assessment
- Replace comparison of normal supply and current supply with comparison of current supply and current demand.

Revisions to Water Shortage Stage Triggers

STAGE	EXISTING TRIGGER	DEMAND REDUCTION GOAL	PROPOSED TRIGGER
Stage 1	Annual Supply Projection is 10% below Normal Year Supply Projection	10% Voluntary	Annual Supply Projection is 10% below Demand Projection
Stage 2	Annual Supply Projection is between 10% and 19% below Normal Year Supply Projection	10% Mandatory	Annual Supply Projection is between 10% and 19% below Demand Projection
Stage 3	Annual Supply Projection is between 20% and 29% below Normal Year Supply Projection	20% Mandatory	Annual Supply Projection is between 20% and 29% below Demand Projection
Stage 4	Annual Supply Projection is between 30% and 39% below Normal Year Supply Projection	30% Mandatory	Annual Supply Projection is between 30% and 39% below Demand Projection
Stage 5	Annual Supply Projection is between 40% and 49% below Normal Year Supply Projection	40% Mandatory	Annual Supply Projection is between 40% and 49% below Demand Projection
Stage 6	Annual Supply Projection is below 50% of Normal Year Supply Projection	50% Mandatory	Annual Supply Projection is below 50% of Demand Projection

Comparison of Past Stage Determinations

CWRR	Stage Declared	Baseline Demand	Projected Water Demand	Existing Supply	% Supply Above (+) or Below (-) Demands	Stage Under Proposed WSECP
2013	none	17,601	17,755	19,600	9.41%	None
2014	10-20% reduction	17,343	17,501	19,600	10.71%	None
2015	3	17,167	17,328	14,888	-16.39%	2
2016	3	16,693	16,859	15,100	-11.65%	2
2017	3	17,111	17,270	14,988	-15.23%	2
2018	3	16,515	16,676	15,321	-8.84%	None
2019	3	16,035	16,304	15,651	-4.17%	None
2020	2	15,605	15,789	15,744	-0.29%	None

Sensitivity of Stage to Baseline Demand

- Stage Calculation based on existing WSECP = Stage 2
(Annual Supply – Normal Supply)/Normal Supply
 $(15,744 - 19,600)/19,600 = -.1967$
- Stage Calculation Based on proposed WSECP using same assumptions as 2020 CWRR (10 year average baseline demand) = No Stage
(Annual Supply – Annual Demand)/Annual Supply
 $(15,744 - 15,789)/15,744 = -.0029$
- Stage Calculation Based on proposed WSECP using 5 year average baseline demand = No stage
 $(15,744 - 14,227)/15,744 = .096$

Proposed Schedule

Activity	Date
Draft WSECP Provided to Water Commission	February 16, 2021
Water Commission Presentation on Draft WSECP	February 23, 2021
Final Draft WSECP Provided to Water Commission	March 16, 2021
Water Commission Approval of WSECP	March 23, 2021
City Council Approval of WSECP	April 12, 2021

CWRR and UWMP Schedule

Activity	Date
Draft CWRR	March 23, 2021
Draft UWMP	March 23, 2021
Final Draft CWRR	April 27, 2021
Final Draft UWMP	May 25, 2021

Questions?

Public Comment from Joe Richardson

Water Commission Regular Meeting Tues. Jan 26 2021 Item 4 speaking against

Joseph Richardson, 8778 Tacoma St. Ventura 93004, Past production supervisor of the City of Ventura Water Dept. Retired Professional Water Treatment and Water Distribution Grade 4 licensee, 21 year professor of Water Science at Ventura College

What is or makes up an “Abuse of Power”

Improper use of authority by someone who has that authority because he or she holds a public office.

This commission is empowered to investigate, plan, and provide input to the City Council on matters relating to the domestic water/wastewater operations of the city.

It is guided by City staff, outside consultants, and its own members with professional qualifications to investigate and evaluate ‘facts’ related to those operational plans.

This commission is and has been in receipt of ‘factual’ evidence that the city staff and their chosen consultants are providing data that is NOT TRUE and yet appears to be willing to base decisions on the false data provided, despite knowing or being informed about the TRUE facts.

The actions and directives of the city staff, consultants, and this commission relying on the expected lack of a majority of the city water system consumers to object (as allowed by law) to the “ILLEGAL” taking of fees from the consumers based on ‘FALSE’ data. Such reliance, on this matter, of public perceptions and willingness to not challenge the city due to accepting that the chosen experts would do the right thing:

CONSTITUTES AN ABUSE OF POWER ... the illegal taking of fees based on false data in this case

Prop 218 clearly states, and ALL PREVIOUS challenges and lawsuits have taken the position, that fees for service must be based on “COST OF SERVICE TO THE PARCEL”

That is clearly NOT the basis for the current or future water rates which clearly are based on quantity used and NOT the cost to the parcel, ignoring the fact that consumers in the lower elevations are paying excess fees related to electrical costs currently included in rates equally for all, when in fact the highest electrical costs are for those users at the highest elevations. Further that ALL water consumed at each elevation has a FIXED cost of electricity based on THAT elevation and quantity used has no bearing on that cost.

The full engineering and hydraulic data related to this discussion have been provided to the commission in numerous fashions and clearly understood by some members as factual.

And yet, the commission allows the legal opinions from city staff to guide them to ignore these FACTS as it is assumed the 218 challenge by consumers will not occur.

SO, maybe the thought of being charged with an “Abuse of Power” might make some impact, and slow down this rush to approve a rate structure that is clearly ILLEGAL.

Debra Gallegos

From: burt handy <burthandy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 1:46 PM
To: burt handy
Subject: -EXT- Questions for Agenda Item # 4

Questions for Ventura Water and Ventura Water Commission

Honorable Commission Members, Ventura City Staff, Ventura Water Staff and public

After reviewing the Final Rates and Shortage Rates Study, a few questions came up..

Question...

What is the cost of the Saticoy operation vs the cost per customer?

How much are the Ventura City Residents subsidizing (If at all) the Saticoy residents cost of their water system?

Many residents who have built or completed a major remodel have fire suppression systems in their houses. According to Ventura City Fires Automated Fire Sprinkler Handbook, the flow required for the fire suppression system and the water demand in the house is computed by the fire flow plus 5 GPM for the house.

Question

How many customers have a 1" meter instead of a ¾" meter at a cost of \$8.66 per Month (Page 15) (\$103.92 per year) when for a 1" fire line charge (Page 6) of \$3.58 or a difference of \$5.08 per Month or \$60.96 Per Year??

Is there a way of charging all customers the fire line charge in lieu of the higher charge for the 1" meter, since the cost per meter goes from 9.7% for a ¾" meter to a negative increase (Page 15) for the larger meters?

Discrepancy between Single Family Residential and Multiple Family Residential per dwelling water cost

On Page 9 it lists the costs for a single family residence for 2, 4, 8, 10, and 14 HCF

The costs per household go up between 7.3% and 10.5%. with the cost ranging per household from \$24.33 to \$77.33

On Page 11 it lists the costs for a multiple family residential unit (consisting of 10 units) for 20, 30, 40, 60, and 80 HCF.

The costs per Multiple family range from \$133.09 to \$364.97. If one divides these numbers by 10 to make it equivalent to the Single Family Residence it ranges from \$13.31(82% lower) to \$36.48 (112% lower) per dwelling unit?

Question Why are the charges per dwelling unit so far apart? It appears the single family residential customer is subsidizing the multiple family residence!

Question

What is the comparison for the total bill for the per dwelling cost for the combined water and sewer bill for Single Family Unit and Multiple Family Unit??

The cost is listed as MFR and SFR. What do these charges relate to?

Is the MFR charge a single charge for all the units (ie 11.72 for all the units) and a flow charge is based on total water use, or is it based on the number of dwellings (ie 10* 11.72) and a flow charge for water use?

Either way the SFR is still paying much more than the MFR for the same service???

Burt Handy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Ventura. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.