

6/24/2008 BOS Comments – Stonehouse Reclaimed Water.

The Reclaimed Water study presented at today's BOS Work Session deserves to be trashed and redone right. One could easily review the current study and draw the conclusion that it was designed to make such a project seem infeasible.

With the limited time I have tonight I wish to make two points either of which would turn this report around to show that such a project is feasible.

Point 1 – the value assigned to water produces was \$4/1000 gallons. This water would be used for irrigation of lawns etc. Our current inversed block rate schedule currently charges more than twice this amount for large water users (irrigation). There is even expressed interest in raising the \$8.50/1000 gallon rate for over 30,000 gallon/quarter typically assessed to households that irrigate.

Point 2 – No value was assigned to the potable water that the reclaimed water would replace. The study estimated average daily consumption for irrigation at Stonehouse alone would amount to 2.08 mg/d during peak watering season (July/August). Within this peak month the peak weekly rate or peak daily rate would likely top out at 3.00 mg/d. Thus to meet this demand would require 3.00 mg/d of potable water to replace the lost reclaimed water should this project not be built. Using the \$25 million/ 2mg/d cost of water purchased from NNWW this amounts to \$37.5 million left out of the study.

Either of these points would turn the tables on the conclusion of the existing report. There are many more concerns that come to mind about how flawed this report was.

We need to approach reclaimed water piecemeal, just like sidewalks are built. Sidewalks are 100% subsidized and we build sidewalks that lead to nowhere knowing that long range plans call for an interconnected system. Same goes for large scale public transit.