

City of Bishop
WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION AGENDA

Date: May 13, 2008
7:00 P.M.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC:

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need Special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk (760) 873-5863. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT: NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: This time is set aside to receive public comment on matters not calendared on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- (1) Minutes of the Water and Sewer Commission meeting held on March 11, 2008 subject for approval.
- (2) Minutes of the Water and Sewer/City Council Joint meeting held on March 24, 2008 subject for approval.

NEW BUSINESS

- (3) RFP for water and sewer rate study

OLD BUSINESS

- (5) Master Plan Update
- (6) Progress on ESCSD/Tribe Agreement
- (7) Well 3
- (8) Public Works Report for March and April

STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS

ADJOURNMENT: The next regularly scheduled meeting will be July 8, 2008 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers, 301 West Line Street, Bishop.



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514
Post Office Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515
760-873-8458 publicworks@ca-bishop.us
www.ca-bishop.us

MINUTES

Water and Sewer Commission
March 11, 2008

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Martin called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Martin

COMMISSISONERS PRESENT:

Martin, Cross, Bhakta and Underhill

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Mathieu

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dave Grah, Public Works Director
Deston Dishion, Public Works Superintendent
Kathy Lehr, Secretary

PUBLIC COMMENT: NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC: This time is set aside to receive public comment on matters not calendared on the agenda.

There was no public comment.

(1) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

MOTION:

Vice Chairman Cross moved to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2008 meeting as written.

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS:

(2) City Council Retreat – discussion regarding rate study

Mr. Grah stated that one of the items discussed at the City Council retreat was the water and sewer rate study. The discussion focused on (1) Whether to do a rate study as required by ordinance, and (2), if it's done, should it be contracted; and (3) if it is contracted, how much should be spent. He stressed the importance that the commissioners should be included in the discussion and it was suggested that a joint meeting between Water and Sewer Commissioners and City Council be set up. The outcome was that the City Council seemed to support continuing with the rate study. They supported contracting the study; and if necessary, spending of more than the \$15,000 the commissioners had set as a limit. He noted that Nolte's estimate was \$30,000 plus. City Council was suggesting we take a new updated look at rates, make any adjustments that need to be made and then do an automatic cost of living increase. The joint meeting of the Water and Sewer Commissioners and City Council is scheduled for 5:30 PM the evening of the next City Council meeting on March 24th. The focus will be on the three numbered points.

(3) Hospital Water and Sewer billing

Chairman Martin said that the hospital water and sewer bill is currently based on beds. Mr. Grah said that one of the issues that has been discussed is that over time, with the addition of new wings, administration buildings, and the rural health clinic facility, the bed-based fee developed for the hospital a long time ago was probably not appropriate. On top of these long term changes is the addition of the support and radiology buildings and the reconstruction of the hospital including a decrease in beds. Currently 3 hospital beds equate 1 SFRUE. The reason for this discussion is to consider what kind of adjustment could be made to make the water and sewer fees for the hospital more equitable. Commissioner Bhakta put together an outline of his suggestion for the hospital billing for discussion (attached). Commissioner Cross said that before we get too involved with this, what are the legalities of doing something like Commissioner Bhakta's outline without doing a full rate study? Mr. Grah distributed a handout (attached) with an approach to the hospital water and sewer fees based on the existing fee structure. With this approach there would be no changes to the fees themselves but the hospital would change from a per bed basis to a per toilet basis as almost all commercial buildings are handled. Since the laundry at the hospital is a major user of water and a producer of wastewater another approach is to just add laundry fee on to the bed count fee. No rate system can be completely equitable, especially a flat rate system. If we moved to a per toilet at the hospital structure we would be staying with our present philosophy for a flat rate structure and probably bring the hospital a lot closer to what is equitable. Commissioner Cross brought up the fact that if you are charging by bed, one of the things that should be brought into account is the laundry, the more beds you have the more laundry you have. The staff working in surgery and OB has their laundry done by the hospital. Other nurses and employees do their own.

Commissioner Underhill asked how hospitals in other city charge and most other cities charge by meter. Mr. Grah said that the hospital infrastructure has changed much since the "per bed" rate system was put into place. Commissioner Bhakta suggested taking a hospital from a different

area that uses meters, find out how many beds they have, figure out consumption of water and convert to gallons per bed and in theory come up with SFRUE. Chairman Martin liked his idea, but with some modification. He feels that the hospital should be charged by more than just toilets. A facility survey was also suggested to include other fixtures (sinks, garbage disposals, washing machines, etc.). Mr. Grah said that a per toilet count would not be the most conservative, but would be more consistent. Some say that our commercial accounts carry more of a load on water usage, but during the summer months, residential (for irrigation) use is higher. Again, no flat rate system is equitable and fair. Chairman Martin said maybe we need to think about re-vamping the entire SFRUE system especially if the Council does not want to move to meters. This is something to be talked about at the joint meeting on the 24th. There are approximately 3,300 connections we supply right now and Chairman Martin asked how much water each SFRUE is using. Mr. Dishion said he didn't have the figures with him but would get them. However, we do know that we are 5 times over the national average in water usage. Before we look at re-structuring the SFRUE system, we need move to a more rational system – meters. We need to either perfect and make our SFRUE system more equitable or move to meters. Mr. Grah said we probably need to make some adjustments like we are talking about with the hospital. Because it's going to be difficult for the City to “swallow” meters, we could move in the direction of “optional” meters for those customers that want them and build up some experience. After 5 or 10 years we may be confident that meters really aren't the worse thing in the world and that there are benefits to them and then begin to move away from the flat rate system. Chairman Martin said if he were a “hospital or car wash” he wouldn't want to opt for a metered system if he's getting a flat rate based on a low value for a SFRUE – what incentive is there to want a meter? Essentially, it's the City Council that needs to decide what the fees are with the Commission's input. So far the City Council has been pretty cool to the idea of meters. So if we get some history they can make a decision.

Mr. Grah said that we need to better approximate the Hospital's use and be consistent with the philosophy of the flat rate system and still suggests going to a toilet-based fee of all the hospital on July 1st. Because of the number of service connections that make up the hospital complex, Mr. Grah doesn't feel the hospital is a good candidate for a meter at this time. We need to make sure as the construction of the hospital continues, that meters are added, as we do on any new construction. Chairman Martin asked how we would approach the hospital about the change in fees. Staff has increased over the last 5-10 years, plus the added buildings, so it seems there should be an increase in water and sewer bills with the expansion. Mr. Dishion said that additional buildings keep getting added on, and the hospital continues to get charged by beds only. Mr. Grah suggested sticking with the per bed charge and include a laundry, which is 3 SFRUE's. Chairman Martin said that perhaps charging by toilet, however excluding toilets associated with actual rooms (bed), and charge for toilets and fixtures used in administration, radiology, etc.

Commissioner Cross said that in Mammoth they used to charge by the fixture count (sinks, toilets, showers, washing machine, etc.). It is more accurate than just charging by toilet. It would take a lot more work in getting it set up as you would have to do a physical survey. It seems like a more rational way to charge and we would do this for the hospital only. The commissioners agreed that the hospital water and sewer charges seem to be on the low side.

OLD BUSINES

(4) Continued discussion on possible new billing system

Mr. Grah said this item could refer to both a move to contracted billing and collection, as included in the master plans, and to an update of the existing billing system with general improvements as well as to allow a metered option. We need to get through the rate study discussion with the City Council and the rate study before we spend too much time updating our billing system. Because of the time involved and the importance of the subject, any update will not happen by July 1st that date being when changes are normally made to city fees. It seems that all the discussions on excessive water use and charges come back to meters being a good solution and the Commission seems to concur. He feels that through discussions with City Council, even though they are exposed to the wrath of some constituents, they will become more receptive to the idea of meters over time.

The matter was again brought up about shutting water off to vacant property or houses and again the commission agreed that we don't do that. Commissioner Bhakta said he spoke to three different property owners and they said that if the property is vacant you should not have to pay for the water. He suggested charging to shut it off and then charge again to turn it back on. It's difficult to monitor when people move in or out. You would have to replace the valve with valves with locks and we are not staffed to be going back and checking valves.

(5) Master Plan Update

Mr. Grah said that we have 4 completed bound sets of the Final Water Master Plan and it is posted on the internet. The Sewer Master Plan is about 2 weeks away from being completed.

(6) Progress on Well 3

Mr. Dishion reported that the monitoring well has been completed. Samples were taken last week. We went down to 540 feet. There were 4 good aquifers – each 2,000 gallons per minute. If the water samples come back good we should have a good well site. It will take approximately a month to get a report back with the well design. It should be available by our next regular meeting.

(7) Public Works Reports for January and February

Mr. Dishion highlighted the reports for January and February.

- * Well 2 test. Shut off well 4 the day prior and let the tank run down a bit and the next day started up well 2. It proved that we can fill the storage tank from town.
- * Tested and ran 300 KW Generator at Well 2.
- * Conducted a backflow survey and review of all commercial accounts.
- * Ordered sewer camera with ESCSD.
- * Completed fourth task in the Sanitary Sewer Management Plan.
- * Had only one water leak and only one plugged sewer during the two-month period.

STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS:

The commissioners were pleased with the recent press releases.

Mr. Grah stated that ESCSD is working out an agreement with the Tribe to increase flows from the tribe into their system. Their plant is at capacity and the hope is that we will make arrangements to take some of their flow and treat it with the extra capacity at our plant.

Chairman Martin adjourned the meeting at 8:30 P.M. to a joint meeting with City Council at 5:30 PM on Monday, March 24, 2008 in the City Council Chambers. Our next regularly scheduled meeting will be May 13, 2008 at 7 PM in the City Council Chambers.

Clarence Martin, Chairman

Kathy Lehr, Secretary

MINUTES
JOINT MEETING OF
Water and Sewer Commission and City Council
March 24, 2008

Mr. Pucci called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM

COMMISSISONERS PRESENT:

Cross, Martin and Bhakta

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Mathieu, Underhill

OTHERS PRESENT:

Smiley Connolly, Mayor
Susan Cullen, Mayor Pro Tem
Frank Crom, Council Member
Jeff Griffiths, Council Member
Bruce Dishion, Council Member
Dave Grah, Public Works Director
Deston Dishion, Public Works Superintendent
Denise Gillespie, Assistant City Clerk
Kathy Lehr, Secretary

Mayor Connolly stated that this is a joint meeting with the water and sewer commissioners relating to a water and sewer rate study required in 2008 pursuant to Resolution No. 07-11.

Mr. Grah said that this is a topic discussed at many of the Water and Sewer Commission meetings and appreciated the Commission and City Council's time to get together to talk about it. There are basically three questions to be answered about the rate study: (1) Confirm that a rate study is desirable and something that we want to see through as provided for in that resolution. (2) If we do the rate study as called for in that resolution, how do we want to accomplish it – with City staff or Contract staff? (3) If we decide to contract it, how much do we want to spend to do the work? These have all been discussed a number of times at the Commission meetings. Council Member Crom asked what the decision was. Chairman Martin said it was the consensus of the Commission that once the Water and Sewer Master plans are completed, a rate study should be done, and should be done by a consultant. It's not that Staff doesn't have the experience, but it

would take the time out of things that they should be doing. Council Member Crom said that we had a rate study done five years ago and we are still working off what we learned from that study. He would like to see an increase of maybe a dollar or two each month and doesn't see why we need another rate study. Is the rate study just for a rate increase or will it be to get other information?

Chairman Martin stated the master plans are just now being completed. With that in place we will be in a better position to tell where we are with the reserves. It is premature to tell whether we need a rate adjustment or not. Council Member Crom feels we need a rate increase to keep up with inflation. Mr. Grah said he doesn't know whether the study would show whether the rates would be higher or lower. The water account seems to be a little more financially healthy than the sewer account. He suggests taking a new look at the rates, having gone through rate increases and having started work on some of our backlogged work, we now have some experience that may put us in a position to make some adjustments, either up or down, in water and sewer. If we do make adjustments based on a new study, then we could look to use sort of inflation increase into the future.

Council Member Dishion said that it seems that we have bigger problems that what may be a questionable need for another study and wants to know what this rate study is going to include. There are a lot of inequities going on. We have some people using very little water and some using a lot of water and we keep raising everyone's rate the same. We need to address business like Kmart and the Hospital that can use an extreme amount of water.

Chairman Martin said that he is not convinced that we are where we need to be right now with rates. Council Member Crom feels we are still under funded. The last rate study suggested an increase to close to \$100 a month for water and sewer, which was something we couldn't possibly do. How much is the rate study going to cost? Mr. Grah said that at discussions at the Water and Sewer Commission Meetings, on whether to do the study with staff or contract out, the consensus was that we contract out the study, but put a reasonable cost limit of \$15,000. Nolte seems to be in position to do the rate study cheaply as they are just finishing the water and sewer plans, and the proposal from them was over \$30,000. Council Member Crom understood that we had to raise the rates in order to qualify for federal grants and loans and asked Mr. Pucci if we were at that point. Mr. Pucci said yes and that the City Council felt we had to raise the rates, and as part of that rate increase, they were adamant that after 5 years another rate study be done. We all know that there are discrepancies in the system and the only true value system would be to go to meters. Since we are not going to meters you have to constantly look at our system to see what is viable. Without getting into an \$85,000 study there are ways you can look at the way we charge.

Chairman Martin sees the concerns. The study was done 5 years ago and the previous one 16 years before that. For the last one we were paying for the education of the consultant (so they could get familiar with the city's circumstance) to come up with the study and there are huge dollars associated with that. Since that time Nolte has done the

Water and Sewer Master Plans. With the completion of those plans we now have a fairly comprehensive documentation of what has to be done. We needed to have a target to see where we are headed and not just raise the rates without knowing what the target is. We could under fund now and have to come back later and raise the rates again. He feels that it would be better to be more informed – see where we are and where we need to go.

The scope of work that Nolte put together was for a review of the rates but using the existing flat rate system. A flat rate system by nature is not equitable. Even with the numerous benefits of a metered system, he knows that it's too ambitious to look at converting to a metered system right now. Still, movement in that direction in whatever ways are possible will have benefit. Council Member Crom asked if we can place meters on commercial property and not residential. Mr. Pucci said that the biggest users are the flood irrigators.

Council Member Griffiths asked about our original estimate of \$15,000 for the rate study and if we had another upper limit. Chairman Martin said we didn't press it any further. There are so many things that can be added in to a rate study. You are trying to do a "mixed bag" here - flat rate, meters, flat rate residential, etc. It could be as complicated or as easy as we want to make it. The rate study could be a combination of City staff, City Council and Consultant.

Mr. Pucci feels that City staff is capable of doing the study, however, when it is city staff presenting a study they did to the public on a topic that is essentially money in their budget, that there can be a lot of credibility lost. If staff does the study and presents it, it amounts to the staff telling the people that they need more money. When we used Boyle for the last study, they had objective views and didn't care if we raised the rates or not. Council Member Griffiths feel that Staff is really busy with street projects and suggests using a consultant.

Mayor Connolly explained how costly it would be to put meters in, probably \$1,000 to \$1,500 per house. He thinks it would be a big mistake to put meters in except maybe in laundromats. Mayor Connolly asked about the ordinance saying that the City cannot charge for water, only for maintenance. There during the "water wars" there was a Resolution that stated that water will be "forever free". However, since that time, there have been subsequent resolutions that have put in place fees. The old resolution is interesting from a historical and heritage standpoint, but it has been superceded a number of times since. Mayor Connolly said he would like to see a raise of 1% or 2% per year for several years and build up a reserve, but is still against paying another \$86,000 for a rate study. Council Member Cullen feels that we do need to do a rate study to see where we really are. If we are under funded and we just raise it 1% it will get out of proportion again. It was agreed that a study needs to be done, but would like first to get specific answers to specific questions.

Mr. Grah suggested putting together a draft Request For Proposals for the rate study so Council could see what exactly would be included. If it meets Council approval, then we could release it. He would hope to have it available by the next City Council meeting. We can see what sort of proposals we get and the costs from other firms. Council Member Crom asked what we are going to do in the meantime about a rate adjustment. He feels we should have an increase starting July 1. It is not mandatory that we raise the rates July 1st. Council Member Dishion said he would like to see us go with the cost of living index and would still like to see how we are going to address issues with high water user commercial accounts like the hospital and Kmart. Council Member Griffiths said he was comfortable with waiting until the rate study is complete before adjusting the rates. Mr. Pucci stated that you can implement a rate increase any time you want; it doesn't have to happen just on 1 July of any year. It's important to know that this is not a rate study like the last one. We have enough base information from the master plans that it can probably be done in 60 days.

Mayor Connolly asked if it looked like we need an increase in rates. Mr. Grah said that financially the water account is pretty good, but looking at our current rates it will be a long time until we can build a well. Sewer is not in as good a position as water. But this is where a consultant can help us out. Something that always comes up at the commission meetings is equity. We are always trying to work on that and meters will help us in the longer term. Public Works has recently done a billing inventory of all our commercial properties. This is something that will really help us in the equity area. We found areas where we were either over or under charging. In doing this, we took a good look at the rate structure and how it is set up, to determine how we can deal with places like Kmart irrigation. Due to this inventory, without changing our rate structure or even our rates, we will be making some substantial gains in an equity standpoint.

Council Member Cullen asked about metering the Hospital. We are installing meters as the new construction is being done; however we don't have a mechanism for billing based on a meter. Council Member Griffiths asked what the commission thought about optional, voluntary metering. The Commission would like to see more meters installed, however, depending on how many are put it at once, it can be very costly. Chairman Martin said that in the future the State of California is going to require meters, especially if you are looking for grant or loan monies. If there was an incentive built into the billing system, people might be more willing to pay for their own meters.

Mr. Pucci suggested doing both - moving forward with a "reasonable" rate study and looking at accounts that we know are inequitable that possibly should have a meter installed. Meters are costly and some day will be mandatory so we need to start moving in this direction.

In conclusion, Mr. Grah will draft up an RFP for the rate study to have available for the Council's review at the April 14th meeting. If it meets City Council approval, we will release it. It was also agreed that the rates should be looked at every 5 years.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Tuesday, May 13, 2008 at 7:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers.

Clarence Martin, Chairman

Kathy Lehr, Secretary



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514

Post Office Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515

760-873-8458 publicworks@ca-bishop.us

www.ca-bishop.us/CityofBishopPublicWorks.htm

Request For Proposals

2008 Water and Sewer Rate Study

Release: 1 May 2008

Closes: 1 June 2008

Contact: David Grah, Director of Public Works

General: The City of Bishop requests proposals from consultants to conduct a review of water and sewer rates. The primary objectives of the study are to determine if a rate adjustment is warranted and to explore inflation basis for future rate increases.

Background: The City of Bishop is a general law city that has a permanent population of about 3,500. Bishop is located in a remote rural part of the State of California. The City's economic base is mostly recreation and government.

The City of Bishop has owned and operated the water and sewer system for city residents since about 1903, the year the city was founded. Through these systems and related administrative and financial processes, the city intends to provide water and sewer services responsibly and economically as possible today and into the future. Water and sewer rates in the City of Bishop are "flat rate" and based on Single Family Residential Unit Equivalencies (SFRUE). Although Bishop has a flat rate system, there are about 50 meters, installed on both residential and commercial accounts, but the meter information is not used for billing or rates. There are currently billings for about 3,300 SFRUE's.

A "Water and Sewer Service Charges Study" was done in 2003 by Boyle Engineering in response to financial concerns with both the water and sewer funds at that time (<http://www.ca-bishop.us/PublicWorks/2003BoyleRateStudy.pdf>). Based on that study and based on comments received, a series of four rate increases was put in place starting 1 July 2004 and ending 1 July 2007. A provision of the rate increase series was that "In 2008 the [Public Works] department will provide a comprehensive [water and sewer rate] review including

engineering, capital improvement program and progress toward meeting capital funding programs." This Request For Proposals (RFP) is to provide this required rate review.

The City of Bishop has just completed master plans for its water and sewer systems (<http://www.ca-bishop.us/Misc/WaterMasterPlan2008.pdf> and <http://www.ca-bishop.us/Misc/SewerMasterPlan2008ForWeb.pdf>). The master plan process identified current deficiencies, identified alternatives to address these efficiencies, and suggested capital improvement to address the deficiencies. In addition, in late 2007 the Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC) performed a limited financial review of Bishop's water and sewer programs (<http://www.ca-bishop.us/PublicWorks/RCACStudy.pdf>). Other data, including financial statements, is available for the consultant's use for this study.

For the purposes of this study it should be assumed that the existing SFRUE flat rate system continues. A rough budget of \$20,000 has been established for the consultant work on this project.

General Scope of Work:

1. Represent city on the subject of the rate study at public meetings and hearings including Water and Sewer Commission and Bishop City Council meetings. Present the study at these meetings. At least two meetings should be included in proposal.
2. Research, gather, and review existing information including revenues and liabilities.
3. Use about a 10 fiscal year time horizon. City of Bishop fiscal years are July to June.
4. Summarize existing City of Bishop rate structure.
5. Present rates structures and rates for comparable agencies.
6. Develop assumptions for levels of outside grant funding through time.
7. Present two options to automatically escalate rates for inflation.
8. Review cost estimates presented in master plans for capital projects and suggest adjustments as necessary.
9. Obtain City of Bishop business license (about \$50).
10. Follow generally accepted industry practices for cost-of-service studies guidelines such as those suggested in American Water Works Association

publication "Avoiding Rate Shock: Making the Case for Water Rates" and presented in the State Water Resources Control Board Division of Clean Water Programs Revenue Program Guidelines (March 1998 Revision).

11. Present study in the report form.
12. Allow for two review and revisions cycles including report outline and draft report.
13. Provide report in both paper and electronic formats including editable files.

Proposal: A qualifying proposal must include:

1. Brief description of firm, contact person, address, telephone number, and e-mail address.
2. Description of approach to work, of report, and how proposed scope compares to general scope of work described in this RFP.
3. Resumes of staff involved.
4. Examples including projects, dates, and scope of similar work, especially on similar projects for small agencies.
5. Three references.
6. Proposed work schedule.
7. Estimate of cost.

Proposals must be received no later than 1500 (3 pm) on the closing date for this Request for Proposals. Send proposals to:

David Grah
Director of Public Works
City of Bishop
377 West Line Street
Bishop, California 93514
publicworks@ca-bishop.us

Proposals shall be submitted either in a sealed envelope (3 paper copies and 1 electronic copy) or by email which is clearly marked with the title of the Request for Proposal.

Selection Process: The consultant will be selected based on the experience and ability of the firm and staff to accomplish the scope of work, based on the proposal, and considering the effective use of City funds. The City is particularly

interested in receiving proposals from female, minority, and locally-owned small businesses. Each firm will be rated using the following criteria and rating schedule.

Evaluation Criteria	Possible Rating Points
Experience with similar work for small municipalities.	20
Quality of proposed products.	20
Able to deliver product cost effectively and in a timely way.	20
High level of technical expertise and able to dedicate qualified staff to effort.	20
Able to maintain excellent client service over life of project.	20
Total	100

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals. The City will attempt to negotiate a contract with the highest rated firm. Interviews, perhaps by telephone, are anticipated about 3 weeks after the RFP close. The highest rated firm is expected to be identified about a week after than followed by contract negotiations and contract approval by the Bishop City Council at one of its regular meetings that are twice a month.



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514

Post Office Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515

760-873-8458 publicworks@ca-bishop.us

www.ca-bishop.us/CityofBishopPublicWorks.htm

Public Works News Release

Bishop Well 3 is a Good One

To prepare for a future municipal water production well, the City of Bishop drilled a test well about 500 feet deep near Sunland Drive. The test well shows the water to be good and to be plentiful enough at the site for a future municipal production well there. The new well will be called Well 3.

The existing City of Bishop water production wells produce enough excellent water to meet even the extremely high water demands of summer. On the other hand, if there is a problem with even one of these wells during the summer, there wouldn't be enough water to meet peak demand and emergency restrictions on water use would almost certainly be needed. To avoid this possibility, Bishop needs an additional source of water.

With the confirmation that the Well 3 site is a good site for a new well, the city and its Water and Sewer Commission will weigh the costs of developing a new production well against the possibility of using an existing standby well. The standby well has water with fluoride in concentrations slightly above state limits. The cost of a production well at Well 3 is about \$3 million. To bring the standby well into production would require the support of the water customers and approval from the state, but would cost little.

In the next few months the City of Bishop staff, commissions, and council will be considering the options for a new water source. Customers and other interested parties are encouraged to get involved in the discussions. The city will do what it can to foster this involvement.

In the mean time, as a result of the test well work done there, the Well 3 site on Sunland Drive has been confirmed to be a good site for new production well.

For more information contact City of Bishop Public Works at publicworks@ca-bishop.us or 760-873-8458. Press releases posted at <http://www.ca-bishop.us/Advertisements/Releases/Releases.htm>



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514
Post Office Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515
760-873-8458 publicworks@ca-bishop.us
www.ca-bishop.us

PUBLIC WORKS REPORT

March 2008

WATER

1. Completed the development of a test well at the Well 3 site.
2. Began Annual Main Line Valve exercising program.
3. Took monthly readings of all water meters.
4. Took routine Bacteria Samples.
5. Started annual testing of Residential Backflow Valves.
6. Nolte completed the Water Master Plan and submitted it to us.
7. Flushed Well 2 and took investigative samples in preparation for that well to start producing water as demand to the system increases with warmer weather.

SEWER

1. Cleaned plugged sewer at Iris Street.
2. Irrigated the 40 acre Pasture south of the Sewer Ponds.
3. Made routine inspections of Grease interceptors.
4. Generated a No Spill Certification for the State and reported the same.
5. Performed routine Main Line cleaning in trouble areas.
6. Cleaned Grit Drying beds.
7. Installed Backflow device at the Waste Water Treatment Plant.
8. Performed routine cleaning of sewer mains on South Main Street.
9. Relocated Flow Recorder to assure more accurate readings.

STREETS

1. Assisted Craig Chudy Concrete with concrete removal at 681 West Pine Street. This work was done through the City's Sidewalk Safety Program.
2. Provided weed control on city streets and alleys
3. Continued with a very comprehensive Sidewalk Safety Inspection. Minor repairs were made wherever possible by City forces.
4. Completed annual Crack Seal operations. The following Streets have been completed:

Rome Drive, Lagoon Street, Edwards Street, Mac Iver Street, Grove Street, and First Street, Jay Street, South Third Street, and Pioneer Lane.
5. Repaired and or replaced various Street Signs.
6. Patched Potholes and gutters where needed.
7. Swept city streets and alleys.
8. Painted " Pedestrian Traffic Only" symbols on the sidewalk at intersections and every 250 feet on Main Street.
9. Made repairs to the shoulder at the intersection of West Pine and North Warren Street.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Assisted the Chamber of Commerce by providing cones and barricades for the Blake Jones Trout Derby.
2. Visually went out and verified physical addresses at various locations to make all aspects of city business more efficient.
3. Trimmed trees and cleaned trash and debris from Shop planters.
4. Hauled off trash and debris from the Fowler Street trash pit.
5. Made minor repairs and performed maintenance to Light Trucks and Heavy Equipment.
6. Assisted Park Crew with removal of a concrete footing in the park.



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514
Post Office Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515
760-873-8458 publicworks@ca-bishop.us
www.ca-bishop.us

Public Works Report

April 2008

Water

1. Repaired water leaks at the following locations:
 - 250 Willow Street (leak was on 3/4" copper service)
 - 330 Clarke Street (leak was on 3/4" copper service)
2. Continued Annual Main Line Valve exercising program.
3. Took monthly readings of all water meters.
4. Took routine Bacteria Samples.
5. Continued annual testing of Residential Backflow Valves.
6. Ran Back-up motor at Well 1 and flushed it at the same time.
7. Installed Valve boxes at the following locations:
 - 462 Clarke Street
 - 151 Mac Iver Street
8. Public Works Crew attended a Well Pump and Pump Maintenance class provided by California Rural Water Association.
9. Installed a 2" water service at 171 Mac Iver Street.
10. Prepared Request for Proposals for 2008 water and sewer rate study.

Sewer

1. Nolte completed the Sewer Master Plan and submitted it to us.
2. No plugged sewers to report this month.
3. Irrigated the 40 acre Pasture south of the Sewer Ponds.
4. Made routine inspections of Grease interceptors.

5. Generated a No Spill Certification for the State and reported the same.
6. Performed routine Main Line cleaning in trouble areas.
7. Cleaned Sludge Drying beds.
8. Conducted velocity tests in the Grit chamber to better calculate and adjust flow recording device at the Waste Water Treatment Plant.
9. Performed routine cleaning of sewer mains on South Main Street.
10. Reviewed sewer camera purchase documents.
11. Met with Eastern Sierra Community Services District to investigate, plan, and construct more robust interties between sewer systems.

Streets

1. Began construction on the TE portion of the Mac Iver Street Improvements Project.
2. Provided weed control on city streets and alleys.
3. Began annual Traffic Painting program.
4. Repaired and or replaced various Street Signs.
5. Patched Potholes and gutters where needed.
6. Swept city streets and alleys.
7. Completed painting of " Pedestrian Traffic Only" symbols on the sidewalk at intersections and every 250 feet on Main Street.
8. Replaced broken wheel-stop in parking lot in front of the Public Works Shop.
9. Began the process of creating an inventory of all City Street Signs and Traffic Markings.
10. Worked on ongoing negotiations with Caltrans for the Wye Road Intersection Improvement project.
11. Held public meeting for Bus Stops project.
12. Responded to issues from Home Street federal audit.
13. Discussed Caltrans concerns about banners over Main Street.
14. Commented on Inyo Local Transportation Commission Overall Work Program.
15. Worked on acquisition of easement on North Third Street.

16. Submitted City of Bishop Proposition 1B plan to state.

17. Issued the following press releases:

- Mac Iver Street Construction Update 11, 25 April 2008
- Bishop Sidewalks, 18 April 2008
- Bus Stops Project Meeting, 11 April 2008
- Mac Iver Street Construction Update 10, 8 April 2008
- Grove Street Sidewalks Funded, 7 April 2008

Miscellaneous.

1. Trimmed trees and cleaned trash and debris from Shop planters.
2. Hauled off trash and debris from the Fowler Street trash pit.
3. Made minor repairs and performed maintenance to Light Trucks and Heavy Equipment.
4. Provided weekly Safety Meetings for Public Works Crew.
5. Discussed flood mapping project with Mono County.
6. Performed routing updates of city web site.
7. Received draft Geographic Information System data for Bishop land use and dam inundation.
8. Attempted to get maps from Southern California Edison outage areas used during rolling blackouts.
9. Finalized updated language for Public Works fees.
10. Worked on adoption of new building code.
11. Issued the following press releases:
 - Bishop Well 3 is a Good One, 25 April 2008