March 23, 2015 UAC meeting.

Present: Andy Maron, Jeff Kanter, Steve Johnson, Nancy Nolan

Absent: Emily Sato

Also present: Public Works Director Barry Loveless, Councilmember Val Tollefson, Steve Leach, Jay Kinney (BIMPRD Commissioner)

1. Commissioner Kinney said that representatives of the Metropolitan Park District would like to provide its view of the SSWM fees to the UAC at some point. It was decided that BIMPD representatives would be invited to a future meeting to do so.

2. Notes from March 11, 2015 meeting were approved.

3. The Committee continued its review of discretionary programs in SSWM. Three main programs discussed were Water Quality Monitoring, Kitsap Conservation District Farm Assistance, and street sweeping/spoils handling.

4. Committee discussed at some length the question of what programs are properly funded from SSWM, with focus on difference between requirements of the NPDS permit and the scope of the Utility as set out in City Ordinances.
   a. Assuming it is legal to fund these programs out of SSWM (and Barry pointed out that the practice was largely consistent with other jurisdictions’ practices), the Committee then discussed the details and merits of the individual programs at length.
   b. Water Quality Monitoring is certainly consistent with the Comp Plan, but could benefit from periodic reporting and a clearer demonstration of usefulness.
   c. The Farm Assistance program should be revisited when the Committee discusses the rate structure, as it might make sense for the farms, themselves, to bear this cost.
   d. The Spoils issue will diminish in financial significance with the use of the Loveseed decant site. Accounting could be revised to treat allocation of labor expense and materials handling consistently.

5. Barry will be making a number of changes to Chapter 5 of the draft plan as a result of the discussion.

The Committee then turned to the capital program of the SSWM utility. Barry discussed the way infrastructure is catalogued and desired/needed maintenance/upgrades/capital improvements are tracked in Chapter 6 as a lead in to discussing the Capital Needs dealt with in Chapter 7. He explained that it was much more difficult to forecast capital projects for the SSWM utility than for the sewer utility. He suggested an approach might be to choose a percentage of revenue to devote to capital projects, suggesting that something in the 25-40% range seems to be the norm based on his experience.

Andy Maron, Chair