

# CITY OF RIVERSIDE PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT

1 of 5

Minutes of: Agricultural Water Rates Task Force, Meeting #13  
Date of meeting: April 25, 2019  
Time of meeting: 5:30 pm  
Place of meeting: Mayors Ceremonial Room, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor City Hall  
3900 Orange St., Riverside, CA 92501

## **Meeting was called to order by Chair Wilson**

Chair Wilson opened the meeting by reminding the Task Force of their mission. He welcomed the three alternates sitting in for the meeting. He provided the planned dates for the final rate recommendation to both RPU Board (May 21) and City Council (June 4 or June 11).

## **Pledge of allegiance to the flag was given by Rick Moslenko**

## **Roll Call**

Present: Seth Wilson (Chair)	David Crohn (Vice-chair)	Michele Sheehe
Jason Gless	Darleen De Mason	Ed Adkison
Rose Mayes	Tom Evans	Steven Robillard
Gurumantra Khalsa	Rick Moslenko (alternate for Barbara Croonquist)	
Scott Simpson (alternate for Sharon Mateja)		
Cecelia Arias (alternate for Gilberto Esquivel)		

Absent: Jason Hunter, Scott Andrews, Dale Sexton

## **1. Citizen Participation**

Riverside Public Utilities General Manager Todd Corbin spoke about all of the great work and effort that the Task Force and staff have done on this project and thanked everyone for their work. He stated how the Task Force recommendation does not have any direct or indirect impacts on the Gage Canal Company or its shareholders.

## **2. Approval of meeting minutes for March 28, 2019 meeting and reaffirm approval of revised minutes from Feb. 21, 2019 meeting**

Motion: Mayes                      Second: Robillard

Ayes: All present.

Motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Open Discussion**

The Task Force began to go through the list of Points of Consideration (POC) starting at #3 of the POC. The following vote outcomes coincide with the respective POC listed.

#### **POC # 3 – Applicability to entire RPU Service Area:**

Motion: De Mason                      Second: Adkison

Ayes: All present.

Motion passed unanimously.

#### **POC # 4 – Separate qualifying criteria for new customers:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

#### **POC # 5 – Add minimum qualifying parcel size of ½ acre in DEFINITIONS 1.c:**

Motion: Gless                      Second: Evans

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, De Mason, Sheehe, Wilson, Crohn, Mayes, Gless

Noes: Moslenko, Simpson, Khalsa, Robillard

Motion passed 9 to 4.

#### **POC # 6 – DEFINITIONS 1.c becomes “...pasture with livestock...”:**

Motion: Adkison                      Second: Evans

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, De Mason, Sheehe, Wilson, Crohn, Mayes, Gless, Moslenko, Khalsa, Robillard

Noes: Simpson

Motion passed 12 to 1.

#### **POC # 7 – RPU Board to develop irrigation BMPs:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

#### **POC # 8 – Audit timeframes:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

#### **POC # 9 – Audits conducted randomly:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

**POC # 10 – No business or Ag production permits needed:**

3 of 5

Motion: Moslenko                      Second: Evans

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, Simpson, De Mason, Sheehe, Wilson, Gless, Moslenko, Khalsa, Robillard

Noes: Crohn, Mayes

Motion passed 11 to 2.

**POC # 11 – Greenhouses:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

**POC # 12 – Warehouses:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

**POC # 13 – Variances:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

**POC # 14 – Accept fixed area approach in DEFINITIONS 3.a and use 100 square feet area allocation for vines in 3.b:**

Motion: Evans                      Second: Gless

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, De Mason, Sheehe, Gless, Moslenko, Khalsa, Robillard, Mayes

Noes: Simpson, Wilson

Abstain: Crohn, Arias

Motion passed 9 to 2.

**POC # 15 – Vine area allocation:**

Handled in motion under POC # 14

**POC # 16 – No restrictions for properties receiving Gage water:**

Motion: Moslenko                      Second: Adkison

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, Simpson, De Mason, Sheehe, Wilson, Gless, Moslenko, Khalsa, Robillard

Abstain: Crohn, Mayes

Motion passed 11 to 0.

**Chair Wilson called for a 10 minute break.**

After the break Member Evans brought up a concern about how the actual water volume allocation will be determined from the current statement in No. 4 of the DEFINITIONS of v2.11b. A discussion followed regarding how particular crop factors will need to be determined in order for the volume of water to be allocated based on the fixed area allocation for the given agricultural activities on a property. The idea of a subcommittee to handle the crop factor determination was suggested. It was suggested to bring back Table 1 back from previous proposal versions regarding the crop factor application and method of calculating the monthly CCF allocation. Chair Wilson suggested outside review of crop factors. Member Evans suggested using standard published crop factors in determining water allocations and cross checked against actual usage volumes of growers in the area to validate volumes are good. Vice-chair Crohn suggested that usage patterns of horticultural operations be reviewed to confirm what crop factors horticultural activities should be assigned. Member Adkison made a motion that was clarified by Chair Wilson.

**Recommendation for outside validation of crop factors for agricultural purposes, and, for horticultural purposes a review of past water use practice in determining the water use allocations.**

Motion: Adkison      Second: Evans

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, De Mason, Moslenko, Sheehe, Wilson, Crohn, Mayes, Khalsa, Gless, Robillard

Abstain: Simpson

Motion passed 12 to 0.

**Motion that dwarf tree species be allocated an area of 100 square feet of irrigable area.**

Motion: Crohn      Second: Wilson

Ayes: Wilson, Crohn, Khalsa

Noes: Adkison, Evans, Arias, Simpson, De Mason, Moslenko, Sheehe, Mayes, Robillard

Not present: Gless

Motion failed 9 to 3.

**POC # 1 – Preferred base rate of \$1.16/CCF with Council approved rate increases starting July 1, 2019:**

Motion: Moslenko

Second: Adkison

Ayes: Adkison, Evans, De Mason, Sheehe, Gless, Moslenko, Khalsa, Robillard, Mayes

Noes: Simpson, Wilson, Crohn

Abstain: Arias

Motion passed 9 to 3.

**POC # 2 – Should existing customers have transitional rates:**

No vote taken since no change to v2.11b as presented.

**4. Discuss Schedule of Meetings and Topics of Discussion**

Staff explained anticipated upcoming schedule and potential future meeting topics. Discussion followed regarding any need for additional Task Force meetings. The Task Force decided that no additional meetings were needed and that the regularly scheduled meeting on May 23 be cancelled.

**Motion to keep WA-3 and WA-9 rate structures in place and allow transitional rates over time.**

Motion: Moslenko

Second: Simpson

Ayes: Moslenko

Noes: Adkison, Evans, De Mason, Sheehe, Wilson, Crohn, Mayes, Khalsa, Gless, Robillard

Abstain: Arias, Simpson

Motion failed 10 to 1.

**Meeting was adjourned by Chair Wilson**

By: 

Richard Small, Secretary for Agricultural Water Rates Task Force

**Attachments:**

- (1) Points of Consideration.

**Reminder that all Ag Task Force meetings are videotaped and available for viewing at:**

**<https://riversideca.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>**

## WA-Hybrid proposal v2.11b Points of Consideration

#	Item for Consideration
<b>RATES</b>	
1	Is \$1.16, \$1.31 or \$1.39 the preferred rate?
2	Should existing customers have transitional rates?
<b>TERMS &amp; CONDITIONS</b>	
3	Is Territory Inside City Limits, or entire Service Area?
4	Should the Qualifying Criteria be different for new customers?
5	Should there be a minimum qualifying property size?
6	Is pasture allowed?
7	Should RPU Board develop irrigation BMPs?
8	Should onsite audit timeframes be every 2 or 5 years?
9	Should onsite audits be conducted randomly?
10	Should a new customer be required to show proof of a City business license and one Ag production license?
11	Is rate applicable to greenhouses? If so, any limitations?
12	Is rate applicable to warehouses? If so, any limitations?
13	Should requests for variance be allowed?
<b>ALLOCATION METHOD</b>	
14	Should tree and vine allocations be by fixed or measured approach?
15	What should vine area allocation be?
16	Should there be restrictions for properties receiving Gage Canal non-potable water?