I. CALL TO ORDER

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

1. Public Works Commission - Regular Meeting - Jul 7, 2020 4:00 PM

III. AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introduction to the Reduce and Reuse Program
   Presenter: Peter McCullough, Randi Walkins, Natalie Monro
   Estimated Time: 30 Min
   ACTION REQUESTED: Information Only

2. Used Water COVID-19 Testing Updates
   Presenter: Steve Burgos, Haley Falconer
   Estimated Time: 30 Min
   ACTION REQUESTED: Information Only

IV. ADJOURNMENT
I. Call to Order

PRESENT: Crowley, Quick, Gravatt, Hilton, Thorne, Reading, Nink
ABSENT:

II. Minutes Approval

1. Public Works Commission - Regular Meeting - Mar 4, 2020 4:00 PM

RESULT: ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Renee Quick, Commissioner
SECONDER: Crispin Gravatt, Commissioner
AYES: Crowley, Quick, Gravatt, Hilton, Thorne, Reading, Nink

III. PWC Agenda Requests

1. Water Renewal Utility Plan Recommended Approach

Steve Burgos, Public Works Director, reviewed the information that was presented at the June 23rd and June 25th Water Renewal Utility Plan (WRUP) Commission Work Sessions.

Mr. Burgos read the policy questions that were presented at the WRUP Commission Work Sessions with the revisions proposed by the Commissioners:

1. Should Boise pursue this significant advancement in the management of resources?

2. Should the city proactively and prudently invest in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures?

3. Should the utility continue to explore new methods of financing projects and consider changes to our business model and rate structure?

Mr. Burgos asked the Commissioners if the WRUP recommended approach
addresses the policy questions adequately.

- Commissioner Thorne stated she felt the changes to the questions reflect the discussion at the meetings and the requests for changes made by the Commission.

Mr. Burgos asked specifically if the Commissioners feel the recommended approach is meeting the intent of the policy questions.

- Commissioners Quick and Gravatt answered yes, and Commissioner Gravatt added the questions are, as the work of the Public Works Department is, focused on the end user with a mind toward external benefits for the end user.

Mr. Burgos asked the Commissioners if they agree that public input was effectively integrated into the decision-making process, and into the final recommended approach.

- Commissioner Gravatt answered that he is satisfied with the level of outreach the city did in developing the plan but it’s important that public education and outreach continue to be an integral part of the plan in the future.

- Commissioner Crowley added the team did a great job of meeting the community’s expectations and priorities and melding them into the plan.

- Commissioner Quick commented public participation and involvement will be more important than ever given climate change, growth and other factors.

Mr. Burgos presented a suggested motion for the Commissioner’s consideration:

*I move that we endorse staff’s recommended approach for the future of water renewal services to include pursuit of a shift in the management of resources to include recycled water, proactive and proven investment in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures, continued investigation of innovative ways to finance projects and changes to our business model and rate structure, and recommend it be presented to Boise City Council for their consideration/approval.*

- Commissioner Gravatt asked if the material presented at the WRUP Commission Work Sessions will be given to Council in its entirety. Mr. Burgos answered they will receive all the information in a different format to address time constraints, i.e., instead of topical presentations, Council will receive the information via multiple memorandums. Regarding the fees that are imposed, Commissioner Gravatt asked if those proposals will be presented with context of competitive rates from other areas of town. Mr. Burgos replied
that when we begin to move forward with the specifics on a cost of service study, we’ll bring the details to the Commission. The information would include an analysis of benchmarking of what other utilities are charging for their services, today and potentially in the future.

- Commissioner Thorne expressed concern about the wording regarding rate structure in Policy Question 3. Mr. Burgos clarified our intention is to continue to investigate potential changes to funding approaches and the wording in the policy question might not reflect that accurately.

- Commissioner Crowley suggested the wording be changed to, “Should the utility continue to explore new methods of financing projects and consider changes to our business model and cost structure”. Mr. Burgos agreed the cost of service study is in effect getting into cost structure and how you’re allocating costs.

- Commissioner Crowley suggested a change in the order of the policy questions would better represent the priorities of the WRUP. He also felt that using the word “shift” in the suggested motion doesn’t accurately reflect the intention of the plan.

- Commissioner Quick suggested a statement similar to, “To better manage our resources to include recycled water”, instead of, “…to include pursuit of a shift in the management of resources” would be more representative of the intent.

- Mr. Burgos agreed with the suggestion to reorder the policy statements and the rewording of the suggested motion changing “shift” to “manage or optimization of the resource”.

Commissioner Thorne made a motion incorporating the suggested changes:

I move that we endorse staff’s recommended approach for the future of water Renewal Services to include proactive and prudent investment in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures, optimize the management of resources to include recycled water, continued investigation of innovative ways to finance projects and changes to our business model and cost structure and recommend it be presented to Boise City Council for their consideration/approval.

Commissioner Quick seconded and the motion carried.
2. FY 2021 Budget Summary

Heather Buchanan, Public Works’ Chief Administrative Officer, briefed the Commission on the estimated impacts COVID-19 has had on the current FY 20 budget and the projected FY 21 budget and the changes that were made to the Water Renewal, Solid Waste and Geothermal Enterprise Funds since the budget presentations to the Commission earlier this year.

- Commissioner Reading asked if the adjustments requested from the Water Renewal Fund have been mostly from large or small commercial customers. Ms. Buchanan answered the school district has been the largest commercial account requesting an adjustment so far. Other requests have been from businesses that were closed for a while, such as bars and restaurants downtown.

- Commissioner Gravatt asked if the money that may be available from FEMA for costs related to COVID-19 is related to the Federal Care Act funding that could be disbursed to municipalities in response to COVID-19. Ms. Buchanan explained the funds would be related to the purchase of supplies, masks, cleaning supplies, etc., and the trailers we’ve purchased to use at our water renewal facilities to help with social distancing. Any funds we would be reimbursed are not factored into the budget estimates.

- Commissioner Quick asked if we know when the City could receive any reimbursements. Ms. Buchanan explained we haven’t applied for any funds yet, but she suspects any reimbursements we receive would be at the end of the fiscal year.

- Commissioner Thorne asked if we plan to communicate information on our planning and decision-making process to the public, possibly as a bill insert. Ms. Buchanan answered we are working with Community Engagement to communicate that information. Information on rate increases is always sent as a utility bill insert and we can educate the public on the impact COVID-19 has had on rates with that information.

- Commissioner Gravatt asked if there have been issues around trash collection due to the increase in residential volume and decrease in commercial volume. Ms. Buchanan replied that Republic Services has been able to adjust their routes and has not encountered any issues with collection.

- Commissioner Quick asked if we’ve considered the possibility that people will
continue to work from home which would impact each of the fund’s recovery from the impacts of COVID-19. Ms. Buchanan answered we’ll need to be flexible and adjust as conditions warrant. Ultimately, we may have to charge for the services we provide. Mr. Burgos added right now we don’t have data showing the amount of increases in service demands we’ve experienced. As that data becomes available, we’ll know how services have been impacted and we can start making decisions and consider changes to our services.

- Commissioner Thorne asked if we have contacted any of our larger customers to find out how they plan to deal with the impacts of COVID-19. Ms. Buchanan answered, with the exception of geothermal customers, we have not started that dialogue yet. At present we don’t have enough data to identify trends and have a meaningful discussion.

- Commissioner Gravatt commented that it’s important to ensure the budget recommendations include adequate funds to protect or compensate employees whose scope of work has changed and are at an increased risk for contracting COVID-19. Mr. Burgos answered we are asking employees who are at high risk of contracting the virus to self-identify and the City is accommodating them whenever possible. Ms. Buchanan added employees who are required to be at work are being paid appreciation pay for being on the front lines and continuing to provide essential services.

IV. Director’s Reports

1. Billing Collection Status
2. Education Programs
3. General Fund Capital Projects
4. Geothermal Irrigation Projects
5. Water Renewal Fund Capital Projects
6. Water Quality Regulatory
7. Materials Management Program
8. Stormwater Regulatory Program
9. Sustainability Air Quality Program

V. Director’s Announcements

Mr. Burgos briefed the Commissioners on the closure of City facilities and employees working from home. He praised Public Works employees for adjusting
to the situation and continuing to get the work done. The Lander Street project is proceeding as planned with very specific safety measures in place and constant monitoring of the COVID-19 situation.

- Commissioner Gravatt asked how the Commissioners will be kept informed of developments and issues requiring their attention before they are passed on to Council. Mr. Burgos answered that is still being discussed but with the use of technology the hope is that more meetings similar to the Water Renewal Utility Plan Commission Work Sessions can be held. Abigail Germaine, Civil Deputy City Attorney, added that the requirement to have one person onsite is a requirement by state code. The Governor suspended those requirements for a period and that suspension has ended requiring us to use the hybrid meeting format. If we return to more restrictive stages, it’s possible the Governor would consider reissuing a suspension of those onsite meeting requirements.

- Commissioner Crowley asked for an update on the testing for COVID-19 at the water renewal facilities. Mr. Burgos answered the testing is continuing and the data are showing correlation with the recent increase in COVID-19 cases. We have started daily testing and are working with the University of Missouri, where we send the samples for processing. We are investigating the possibility of testing our own samples to give us more timely data. Hopefully, we will have more information for the Commission at the August meeting.

VI. Motion to adjourn the Public Works Commission meeting.

Commissioner Gravatt made a motion to adjourn, Commissioner Quick seconded, and the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Crispin Gravatt, Commissioner
SECONDER: Renee Quick, Commissioner
AYES: Crowley, Quick, Gravatt, Hilton, Thorne, Reading, Nink
DATE: June 23, 2020
RE: Water Renewal Utility Plan Stakeholder Engagement Meeting Minutes

ATTENDANCE
*This meeting was conducted via Zoom.

Commission: Larry Crowley, Crispin Gravatt, Jake Nink, Renee Quick, Don Reading, Thomas Robbins, Judy Thorne (Absent: Julia Hilton)


Legal: Abigail Germaine

Other: Cody Cline, Chris Cleveland, Matt Cooper, Matt Gregg, Erin Hudson, Bonnie Krupp, Jon Matthews, Tyler Resnick, Brad Watson, Chris Webb

Call to Order

The Public Works Commission Chair, Larry Crowley, called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

1. Welcome and introduction

Steve Burgos, Public Works Director, welcomed the Commissioners and explained the purpose and desired meeting outcome. He presented three questions for consideration by the Public Works Commission during the presentations on June 23rd and June 25th:

- Should Boise pursue this fundamental shift in the management of the resource?
- Should the city proactively invest in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures?
- Should the utility fundamentally shift how we finance projects and consider changes to our business model and rate structure?
2. Infrastructure Condition and System Capacity

Jim Pardy, City Engineer, reviewed the information on Infrastructure Condition and System Capacity that was presented at the March 4, 2002 PWC meeting. Mr. Pardy explained the City has been proactive in the maintenance and replacement of aging infrastructure in the past and is considering ways to continue to be proactive. Future regulatory requirements and growth will affect system capacity and the City is considering options to address current and future capacity concerns in a proactive manner.

Amanda Watson, Atlas Strategic Communications, asked the Commissioners for their reaction to the City’s proactive approach to replacing assets and planning for implementation of new assets built for growth and how that approach relates to community values.

The Commissioners favored a proactive approach and asked for clarification of financial and regulatory items. Mr. Burgos clarified the proposed amount to pay for the plan is a combination of four pieces of the plan; Replacement, Level of Service, Regulatory and Climate Change. Mr. Burgos added we will likely shift how we execute work to a program management approach similar to how the project at Lander Street is being managed.

There was discussion around COVID-19 funds that might be available for use. Mr. Burgos explained that we are identifying projects that might qualify for COVID-19 funding and they are ready to go if funds are released. Commissioners questioned why they aren’t being asked to consider the budget component of staffing for the project. Mr. Burgos explained the staffing question will be addressed later in the presentation.

3. Regulatory Requirements and Climate Change Impacts

Haley Falconer, Environmental Division Sr. Mgr., briefed the Commissioners on the efforts in Water Renewal Services to cost effectively meet current and future regulatory requirements while continuing to meet citizen’s expectations.

Ms. Falconer outlined the steps we are taking to proactively address climate change issues that could affect our water and our ability to provide a drought-proof water supply, manage our water locally and our ability to adapt to changing conditions.

Ms. Watson asked for the Commissioner’s thoughts on how the department has handled regulatory requirements historically and the proposed plan to handle them in the future; how that approach correlates with community values; and how it correlates with their personal values.

The Commissioners approve of the way Public Works staff has adapted to changes in the regulatory environment to meet community expectations. The Commissioners
believe that growth in the valley will continue to be a challenge to proposed plans for increasing capacity and meeting and exceeding regulatory requirements. Mr. Burgos explained Public Works is working with Planning and Zoning (of the Planning and Development Services department) and other departments to identify growth trends to best adapt our water renewal planning needs.

4. Financial Capacity and Affordability Approaches

Heather Buchanan, Chief Administrative Officer, explained the fiscal policies related to the Water Renewal Utility Plan; financial capacity at the utility level and affordability at the individual level. The City's goal of providing quality affordable water renewal services to its residents will require the consideration of different funding models in the future. Ms. Buchanan reviewed the capital funding approaches being considered, cash funding, debt funding, or a combination of the two. The Commissioners were interested in other funding sources the City has considered such as user fees. Ms. Buchanan answered that impact fees are an option under consideration as a future revenue source. Mr. Burgos added state statutes limit what fees we can charge.

Ms. Watson asked the Commissioners what considerations, other than affordability, should be taken into account when discussing ways to fund the utility, and which of the funding models (cash funding, debt funding or a combination) do they consider to be the best option. The Commissioners are in favor of exploring alternate funding options and would like an opportunity to review the numbers and data before deciding. Commissioners feel that growth should pay for growth. Ms. Buchanan assured them that connection fees and service fees are structured so that this is the case.

5. Stakeholder Engagement

Colin Hickman, Communications Sr. Mgr., briefed the Commissioners on the Public Involvement and Community Expectations component of the Water Renewal Utility Plan. The effort to involve the public included gauging the public’s knowledge of the utility and their expectations of future water use and engaging the community in helping to shape the plan.

Ms. Watson asked the Commissioners for their reaction to the community engagement process and for ideas on how it can be improved for future efforts. The Commissioners commended the efforts thus far and the process of the Water Renewal Utility Planning (WRUP) team to involve the public in the plan. They reiterated the importance for the City to be transparent its planning efforts in order to gain the support of the public. Because of the restrictions placed upon society by COVID-19, Commissioners would like to see more virtual learning opportunities to educate the community on the City’s role in water renewal.
6. Next Steps

Mr. Burgos gave an overview of what will be covered at the Thursday, June 25th meeting and advised the commissioners a recommended approach will be presented for their consideration. Specific actions/motions won’t be needed until the July 7th Public Works Commission meeting.

Commissioner Quick moved to adjourn. Commissioner Robbins seconded, and the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.
Call to Order

The Public Works Commission Chair, Larry Crowley, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Steve Burgos, Public Works Director, welcomed the Commissioners and explained the purpose and desired meeting outcome. He reviewed the three questions for consideration by the Public Works Commission during the presentations on June 23rd and June 25th:

- Should Boise pursue this fundamental shift in the management of the resource?
- Should the city proactively invest in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures?
- Should the utility fundamentally shift how we finance projects and consider changes to our business model and rate structure?
2. Business Case Evaluation Process

Mr. Burgos explained the Business Case Evaluation (BCE) process used to arrive at the BCE and the benefits and value derived from the process. Community engagement, balancing risk factors with benefits and considering the monetary implications all factor into the process and identify the costs necessary to implement the Water Renewal Utility Plan (WRUP).

Mr. Burgos further pointed out that the Water Renewal Utility Planning (WRUP) process will continually include stakeholder engagement and level-of-service refinement; even at the implementation stage, it’s an ongoing process. He stated that the Business Case Evaluation (BCE) process is focused on selecting a preferred approach that meets the unique expectations for Boise; accounts for risk and benefits aligned with community interests; and delivers the least lifecycle costs.

The BCE process was reviewed, pointing out three steps in particular: aligning decisions with community expectations, accounting for future risks and benefits, and monetizing the decision process. All this information was then rolled into a net present value analysis, and it then should select a preferred alternative that balances affordability, the total asset costs, with the expectations of the community.

Mr. Burgos then discussed how the City has leveraged stakeholder feedback throughout the process. For example, the community was clearly interested in pursuing multiple water uses so we included benefits for industrial reuse and aquifer recharge. We also heard that continued protection of the river and environment is paramount and included a risk cost for future regulations in surface and groundwater. We heard that the community wanted the City to be proactive when looking to future regulations.

Staff then reviewed the different alternatives and began to quantify the risks and benefits and Mr. Burgos reviewed the risks and benefits that stood out across the various portfolios. In monetizing the costs, the City develops funding approaches for the direct costs (capital, O&M, repair and replacement) and then the risks and benefits are the differentiators across the portfolios (i.e., Direct Costs + Risk Cost + Benefit Costs = Total Investment needed for the alternative).

A portfolio represents different levels of implementation for the investment options. Each portfolio leverages our existing assets, solves the capacity issues, and has some form of recycled water; the difference is the amount of recycled water. The portfolio spectrum range is very broad (similar to today to how we potentially pursue innovative approaches like local food production).

Mr. Burgos discussed portfolio themes and how there was a need to balance the amount of interest in certain options with costs. It was also noted that solutions need to be a year-round solution. A high-level portfolio overview was provided.
Portfolio A
- Most closely aligns with Advisory Group perspective
- Diversifies the facilities
- Four new facilities
- Potential to deliver up to 27 million gallons a day of recycled water
- Includes all investment options discussed

Portfolio B
- Similar to Portfolio A, but only delivers recycled water for any new capacity we bring on (i.e., it doesn’t start to take water from Lander or West Boise Water Renewal Facility to the southeast)
  - More water going to the river; more enhancement opportunities for the river

Portfolio C
- Similar to Portfolio A but focuses on scaling local food production making it more feasible

Portfolio D
- Portfolio A without neighborhood scale solutions

Commissioner Nink asked if there is already a master list of projects for a portfolio. Mr. Burgos indicated a portfolio is a subset of the options that includes conceptual projects that could move in/out of the portfolios. The projects are not being proposed yet but rather being developed to help inform costs. Approval of any specific projects will come at a later date.

Commissioner Thorne inquired as to how much local control is embedded in each portfolio. Mr. Burgos indicated we have example projects, but we would determine how to accomplish the objectives once strategic direction is set.

The City’s BCE analysis was over a 40-year period because some capital projects are being added at the end of the 20-year period; this will capture not only the O&M costs but also the repair and replacement costs of capital projects added late in the 20 year investment cycle. The BCE is a decision-making tool, it’s not a tool to identify funding needs. It was noted that capital cost is a huge driver in the decision-making process. Portfolios B.2 and B relatively have the lowest capital cost. Portfolio A has the highest capital costs; the most recycled water associated with it; and the highest staff addition (approximately 60 additional FTEs). Portfolio B.2 has the lowest staff addition (approximately 30 FTEs), however the bigger driver on operations and maintenance costs is not staffing but energy usage.

There was discussion about how the risks and benefits were calculated and Mr. Burgos indicated a key component of a BCE is counting something as either a risk or benefit,
but not both. Matt Gregg further explained that benefit costs were subtracted from the overall costs of a specific portfolio.

Mr. Burgos informed that the portfolios were tested against future conditions and how each would react: 1) Climate Change & Resiliency, 2) Changing Community Interests, 3) Economic Downturn, 4) Continued Growth. After this analysis, it appeared Portfolio B.2 performed best under the different risk and benefit conditions.

Commissioner Reading asked what measure was used in neighborhood scaling in adjustments in Portfolios B through D. Mr. Burgos explained the neighborhood scale solutions came down to closed loop systems. There was interest from the Advisory Group in pursuing closed loop systems, possibly in a new planned development, but at this time a closed loop system wouldn’t be cost effective. If the value of water increased to certain levels in the future, then such a system could become cost effective and potentially be pursued by the city.

Ms. Watson asked the Commissioners if there were any themes or takeaways related to how community feedback was applied throughout the BCE. The Commissioners felt the community needs and expectations were recognized and incorporated into the portfolios. They appreciated the effort that was made to involve a large, diverse section of citizens.

Ms. Watson asked for feedback on how the decision process is monetized in the BCE process. Commissioner Crowley asked how the numbers that were presented Tuesday relate to the numbers being presented tonight? Mr. Burgos answered the costs that were shared on Tuesday represented costs associated with the utility plan; repair, replacement of existing assets proactive repair, replacement of existing assets. The costs presented tonight are relative comparisons amongst the alternatives that included things like risk and benefit cost and would not be used to establish funding needs through rates.

Ms. Watson asked the Commissioners to consider the BCE process as it relates to forming a plan for the community’s water future.

3. Recommended Plan

Mr. Burgos presented the recommended concepts for the Water Renewal Utility moving forward. The recommended plan involves a pivot in the way we manage water to meet the expectations of our community. The components of the plan include using recycled water as a resource for our community, enhancing the health and uses of the Boise River, reinvesting in existing infrastructure and balancing affordability for our community.

Ms. Watson asked the Commissioners about their initial reactions to the proposed changes the way the utility is managed. The Commissioners expressed they feel the plan is very well done and moves the utility forward while addressing community expectations and affordability concerns.
Ms. Watson asked if the Commissioners agree with the first policy question, “Should Boise pursue this fundamental shift in the management of resources?”

Abigail Germaine, Civil Deputy City Attorney, reminded the Commission the item is for discussion only, no motion is required.

The Commissioners agree that Boise should move forward with the idea expressed in the question but believe the language should reflect the change is a continuation and enhancement of what is already being done to manage the resource, not a complete shift, thus replacing the word “fundamental”.

Ms. Watson asked if approved, what opportunities does this shift create for the community? The Commissioners see opportunities to educate the public on all the ways water impacts our lives and the role Water Renewal Services plays.

Ms. Watson asked why proactively replacing assets before failure versus the alternative is important? The Commissioners believe protecting and replacing assets proactively is vital. Allowing a system to fail can increase the possibility of that failure causing another system failure resulting in more expense.

The Commissioners agreed Public Works policy has been to be proactive in maintaining and replacing its infrastructure so it was suggested the language in policy question two be changed from, “Should the city proactively invest in infrastructure to address capacity needs, system degradation and growing regulatory requirements to prevent system failures?” to “Should the city prudently invest...”. The Commissioners emphasized the importance of educating the public on the necessity of being proactive in maintaining and upgrading/replacing its infrastructure to overcome resistance to costs.

Mr. Burgos thanked the Commissioners for their suggestions and shared that given the magnitude of the investment the purpose was to get affirmation from the Commission and City Council that we should continue in this direction. In response to the question if he feels limited, Mr. Burgos responded only by financial constraints and concerns over affordability for citizens. Going forward our ability to pay cash for these projects will be limited, so we need to consider taking on debt to fund some projects and keeping affordability in mind.

Ms. Watson asked if the Commission is supportive of the city continuing to explore the City taking on debt as we look at these projects and look at fulfilling the water renewal utility plan? The Commissioners are supportive of the City exploring debt funding to mitigate some high upfront costs and promote generational equity.

Ms. Watson asked what the Commissioners feel the City should focus on and what is most resonant to them? The Commissioners agree that educating the public will be crucial to gain their support for any debt the City takes on to fund the projects. They feel it’s important to stress that debt funding wouldn’t become a business practice, but
rather is a response to a unique situation of needing to respond to the rate of growth at the same time our infrastructure is nearing the end of its useful life.

Ms. Watson asked how the Commissioners would like to engage the community as individuals and as a group? Commissioner Gravatt would like to see the City take a more interactive approach to educating the community on Water Renewal Services. He cited examples of pop-up exhibits in other cities and offering field trips and tours of our facilities. Commissioner Thorne added social media is a powerful tool and should be explored.

4. Next Steps

Mr. Burgos thanked the Commissioners for their time and sharing their perspective of the plan. He summarized the phases of the approval process and reminded the Commissioners they will be asked for a motion at the July 7th meeting to approve the Water Renewal Services Recommended Approach and recommend it to the City Council for consideration.

Mayor and Council – August and September
- Information on all portions of Water Renewal Utility Plan
- Seeking formal direction on Recommended Approach
- Public Hearing on Water Renewal Utility Plan adoption
- Funding:
  - Plan to present options to City Council in later 2020/early 2021
  - Decision needed on funding approach and potential affordability programs

Commissioner Thorne moved to adjourn. Commissioner Quick seconded, and the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.
TO: Public Works Commission
FROM: Peter McCullough, Materials Management Programs Manager
DATE: June 15, 2019
RE: Reduce and Reuse Program Introduction

ISSUE
The Materials Management Program will be expanding to include the new Reduce and Reuse Program.

BACKGROUND
Historically, the primary focus of our waste and recycling programs have been to manage the materials collected throughout the City of Boise with limited focus on the amount of waste generated. The trash program successfully collects and delivers the city’s refuse to the Ada County Landfill, while the recycling, Hefty EnergyBag, compost, and household hazardous waste programs have proven successful at diverting waste from the landfill. However, these programs are not without their shortcomings, primarily because the markets associated with them are continually changing, require the development and use of virgin resources, collection requires hauling the materials which uses fuel and other resources, and the complexity of participation for some residents can feel overwhelming.

Reducing the amount of waste we create, all of which needs to be initially manufactured and used, transported, sorted, recycled, processed, or landfilled, is one of the most impactful ways to conserve our finite resources. As a result, the Curb It team has identified an opportunity for developing the Reduce and Reuse Program which will help focus our community’s attention and efforts on limiting the consumption and discarding of materials, particularly those designed to be single use. The Reduce and Reuse Program will offer city facilities, our residents, and businesses education and support for limiting the amount of waste they generate. Additionally, Public Works will be developing internal and city-wide initiatives to address infrastructure such as installing drinking water stations at city parks for events and expanding reusable dishware to more city facilities. Incentives for waste reduction and elimination of single-use items in city facilities will be considered. The goal, ultimately, is to find the best methods to conserve resources for future generations, create a cleaner environment, and decrease landfill and recycling costs.
PROGRAM OUTLINE AND FEEDBACK

The Reduce and Reuse Program will focus on three main customer categories, residential households, businesses/schools, and city facilities. Each of these categories may have several different initiatives to help our citizens develop ways to prevent waste from being created. From small ideas like how to host a low waste meeting and event guides to larger ones like a grocery store conference designed to build real world waste prevention ideas for the stores we all shop in.

Staff will present the program concept, draft framework, and several ideas for potential outreach opportunities and initiatives/policies. We seek feedback from the commission on the program framework and ideas for engaging the public on this topic.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Information only
TO: Public Works Commission  
DATE: July 15, 2020  
RE: Used Water COVID-19 Testing Updates

ISSUE

In May 2020, the City of Boise began regularly testing its used water (wastewater) for SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. By testing wastewater, we get a broad view of the spread of the virus throughout our community. This is a new area of research; however, early studies suggest wastewater tests may provide an early warning for new COVID-19 cases.

BACKGROUND

Wastewater testing has been used internationally for decades to track the polio virus and test the efficacy of polio vaccination. When the COVID-19 pandemic began, cities across the country started testing wastewater for the COVID-19 virus. Individuals infected with COVID-19 “shed” the virus in their stool, even before they experience symptoms. Scientists can test wastewater for the presence of the genetic material specific to SARS-CoV-2. While testing cannot accurately tell us the exact number of individuals who are currently infected with COVID-19, it can establish the quantity of SARS-CoV-2 in our wastewater (virus copies per liter). An increasing trend in virus quantity over time indicates a growth in new COVID-19 cases. Therefore, wastewater testing data has the potential to fill some of the information gaps in our community and provide a leading indication of increase or decrease in COVID-19 cases. Some other potential advantages to the testing include:

• While this is a new area of research, early studies have shown that the virus can be detected in wastewater 5-7 days before we see an increase in confirmed cases.
• Few individuals get tested for COVID-19, but everybody uses the bathroom. By testing wastewater, we get a broad view of the spread of the virus throughout our community, including among asymptomatic individuals.
• Wastewater testing is inexpensive relative to testing individuals, and it is anonymous - no personal information can be collected.
• The wastewater data is shared with Central District Health to allow for a more comprehensive look at COVID-19 trends in our community.

By collecting this data, the City is trying to contribute another data set to aid in the fight against COVID-19. There are still significant information gaps about COVID-19 and how it moves through our community. Wastewater testing data could be a useful part of a
broader data strategy for containing COVID-19, and support and inform the difficult decisions to protect public health.

Staff will provide an overview of our wastewater testing for COVID-19 including more details on the what the data are suggesting to date.

**SUGGESTED MOTION**

Information only