

Strategic Water Supply Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #2
Minutes
August 6, 2012
Multi-Purpose Room
12:00 P.M.

Attendance

- Presenters: John Rehring and Amber Wooten, Carollo and Ken Komiske, City of Norman
- Councilmember: Roger Gallagher
- Staff: Mark Daniels, Chris Mattingly, Charlie Thomas, Gay Webb
- Ad Hoc Committee Members: Andy Sherrer, Curtis McCarty, Judith Wilkins, Lynne Miller, Mike Pullin, Roger Frech, Stephen Tyler Holman
- Public: Jacy Crosbie, Joy Hampton, Howard Haines

Presentation

Mr. Komiske thanked everyone for attending the meeting and asked John Rehring with Carollo to begin the presentation. Mr. Rehring introduced Ms. Amber Wooten, Carollo Project Engineer. Attendees introduced themselves and explained their role on the project.

Mr. Rehring explained the goal for the meeting today is to collect committee member priorities for the objectives of the Strategic Water Supply Plan (using the paired comparison worksheet) and give attendees an opportunity to ask questions related to the project. The project team is continuing to evaluate individual supply options. The next step will be to screen the individual supply options and present findings to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Prior to the meeting, information on the objectives was distributed to committee members. Mr. Rehring explained the evaluation process and each of the following objectives:

- Affordability
- Long-Term Supply Reliability
- Phasing Potential
- Timely Implementation and Certainty
- Efficient Use of Water Resources
- Environmental Stewardship
- Treated Water Quality Aesthetics
- Community Recreation and Aesthetic Benefits

Questions Asked

- What is the role of the Ad Hoc Committee? Mr. Rehring explained it is to understand and support the recommendations that come from the Strategic Water Supply Plan (SWSP) project. Information gathered from the paired comparison worksheet completed by each committee member will be aggregated to determine which objectives are most important to the Ad Hoc Committee. This will enable us to meet our SWSP project goal of finding a water supply portfolio that meets a range of interest and needs. It is a consensus based process, not a voting process.
- Will tribal issues be considered in this process? Mr. Rehring provided an example of how tribal issues for southeast Oklahoma water might affect scoring for the timely implementation and certainty objective.
- What percentage of our water supply comes from Lake Thunderbird and water wells and what is the cost? Mr. Komiske explained we get about 2/3 of our water supply from Lake Thunderbird and about 1/3 from water wells. Currently well water is about half the price of lake water, but this can change as new regulations are established.
- Can heavy metals such as chromium be removed from the water supply? Mr. Komiske replied yes, but it is costly.
- How is this process going to intersect with the Oklahoma Comprehensive Water Plan? Mr. Rehring explained the SWSP project uses pertinent data from the 2012 Oklahoma Comprehensive Water Plan (OCWP). The SWSP is focused on more local planning (that was beyond the scope of the OCWP).
- How does our unaccounted for (non-revenue) water loss amount compare to other cities. Mr. Komiske indicated an average water loss of about 10% and explained losses come from not only leaks in the system but other sources such as inaccurate meters and water line and fire hydrant flushing. Mr. Rehring stated The American Water Works Association established 10% water loss as the standard for communities to aim for. Ten percent is a reasonable number.
- A concern was raised that control of water hardness was more important than control of taste and odor issues. Mr. Rehring noted that all of the proposed projects will meet mandated drinking water requirements. The treated water quality aesthetics objective will evaluate projects that treat water to a quality beyond current regulations (for example, taste and odor and hardness). He noted that more emphasis can be placed on sub-objectives.
- How do private wells in the east affect the water supply. Mr. Komiske explained municipal water wells are drilled and completed deeper than most residential water wells. Water bearing zones for municipal wells are typically screened from approximately 350 to 650 feet below ground while private wells typically are 100 to 200 feet in depth so they are generally in different aquifers.

- How is any water resource not renewable? Mr. Rehring discussed the Garber Wellington aquifer recharge rates as an example. The recharge rate is about 6 to 12 inches per year while the temporary state permit allows withdrawal at 24 inches per year; this would be “mining the aquifer” and if continued would not be renewable over the long term. Recharge rates vary depending on location.
- Is dredging the lake a possibility? Staff noted it is typically less expensive to acquire more property and construct a new lake than to dredge a large reservoir. Dredging small ponds or navigable waterways is more cost effective. Mr. Frech noted Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District looked at dredging Lake Thunderbird and found that it was not economical.

Alternative Portfolios Evaluation

Members were asked to complete the paired comparison worksheet. This exercise requires each participant to compare each objective to another and choose which objective is more important to them.

Action Items and Next Steps

Mr. Rehring stated the next Ad Hoc Committee meeting is anticipated in mid to late September. Results of the paired comparison worksheets will be presented and utilized on the individual source screening. The next public meeting will be held in late September to present the individual source screening results. Subsequent public meetings will be held to present water supply portfolio development and portfolio evaluations.

Committee members not present at today’s meeting will be asked to complete and submit the paired comparison worksheet.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 P.M.

Items submitted for the record:

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, Norman Utilities Authority 2060 Strategic Water Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting, August 6, 2012
2. Carollo Project Memorandum dated July 27, 2012 Revised List of Evaluation Criteria and Proposed Performance Measures