

**Rivergrove Water District
Minutes-Regular Board Meeting
June 24th, 2017**

Chair DeVries called the Rivergrove Water District public hearing to discuss the Fiscal Budget 2017-201 adoption to order at 7:29 AM at 17661 Pilkington Rd, Lake Oswego. Commissioners DeVries, Roth, Johnson, McDowell and Patterson were present. District Manager DJ Ezell and Finance Manager Dan Zimmerman were also present. Prospective customer Tali Rubin was also present.

Public Hearing: No public present for budget adoption hearing

TAB 1: 2017-2018 RGW Budget to adopt

DJ noted that the numbers for the adopted column coincide with the Budget Committee approved figures as some were changed from the Budget officer recommended numbers. Chair noted that our revenue is up 2% and personal services went up 4.9%. We knew that was coming and approved it but we really can't have our personal services having that increase with resources not matching.

Public Comment: No Public comments on the adoption.

Commissioner Roth moved that we approved the RGW 2017-2018 fiscal year budget as presented. Commissioner Patterson seconded. Motion passed. Commissioners Patterson, Roth, Johnson, McDowell, and DeVries voted aye. Nays-None.

TAB 2: Resolution 2017-02: Budget Appropriations for fiscal year 2016-2017

Chair discussed the figures on the LB-1 & 2 form and the appropriations resolutions and he had matched all the numbers with the exception of the appropriations for the Capital Improvement Fund.

DJ explained that unappropriated ending fund balances are not included in the appropriations. If you subtract 567,792 the unappropriated ending fund balance out of the total requirements 1,767,729 it will match the number of 1,199,937. (And this correlates with line items 20 +21 on page 9 of LB-11 372,001+ 195791=\$567,792 or the unappropriated ending fund balance of Capital Improvement Fund page 9 LB11.)

Commissioner Patterson moved that we approve Resolution 2017-01. Commissioner Roth seconded. Motion passed. Commissioners Patterson, Roth, Johnson, McDowell, and DeVries voted aye. Nays-None.

Public hearing adjourned at 7:41 AM.

**Regular Board Meeting
June 26th, 2017**

Chair DeVries called the Rivergrove Water District regular board meeting to order at 7:42 AM at 17661 Pilkington Rd, Lake Oswego. Commissioners DeVries, Roth, Johnson and Patterson were present. District Manager DJ Ezell and Finance Manager Dan Zimmerman were also present. Prospective customer Tali Rubin was also present.

Public Comment:

TAB 3: Written appeal for variance of Water Service Ordinance 10-01 Section 11-04 by Property Owner Tali Rubin at 18225 SW 65th Avenue

Chair DeVries welcomed Tali and also expressed that the Board has read her letter dated June 2nd and DJ has provided input from our legal team.

Tali noted that they purchased the house in April, which was a total fixer upper. There was no plumbing and no electricity inside of the house. They purchased from the bank because it was something that they

could afford and they know how to fix up homes. They did use a real estate agent. They did go through escrow and title. When she heard about the water she was mad at herself for not checking what she needed to pay for water, but there was really no way of knowing. The title search did not pull it up. They did go to LO to confirm it and they learned they did not belong to LO but were in Washington County. In all of that there was no way of knowing that there was a problem. And there were definitely people living there until a year ago. They are going to live there. And they also learned that the people living there were related to the people across the street so maybe that is how they survived. And they were very liked in the community. They were 3 boys that went to school with others in the Community. So for them there was no way of knowing there was something so wrong about the situation with the water.

Chair DeVries asked how they got their water? They probably ran a hose across the street.

Commissioner Patterson asked if they hired a building inspector? Tali answered no because they did buy the house as-is. It was obvious to them it needed work and they do know construction as they have fixed many homes before. Not having a meter there they just assumed that they would have to pay for a new meter but not acquire an old debt that did not show up anywhere and there was no way to know about it.

Commissioner Patterson asked if they went to LO about options to get water. Tali stated yes it was weird they were actually trying to convince them to annex to the City. They showed her on a big screen computer the water lines that ran in the street and they were going to give her a discount. It was going to cost her less than Rivergrove wanted her to pay. But two or three hours later they called her back to let her know that the line that they showed her was not really LO's line and it wouldn't be feasible.

Commissioner Johnson stated that their actions also violates an urban service boundary agreement that they signed that says that residences annexed would remain in the Rivergrove Water District. Long term we really should talk to the City about that. They should not be going after cherry picking residences out of the Water District. That was a problem way back when he was on the planning commission.

Tali felt it was more politics than Engineering because she saw the water line on the computer. But when the planning person called her back the planner said the line she showed her was not really theirs and that they couldn't do it so she would have to go back and speak with Rivergrove.

Commissioner Patterson asked if the realtor was representing her or the bank. Tali stated she was representing her. The realtor didn't mention anything about it. She couldn't tell if they knew or not.

Commissioner Patterson asked how many times did they go into the house before they purchased it and was it during the day or night? Tali said a few times and it was during the day because they wanted to make plans for renovation and budget. They did see that there was no meter in the box and she thought someone spoke to someone here and was given the cost of the meter being around \$600. She thought she spoke with Dan about it.

Dan stated that he clarified at that time if he was to guess because he did not want to say for certain that if someone reinstates before a year that it would be \$600. But he added that he needed to do more research. When we looked at the Ordinance if it was more than a year we felt it would be a new service and he conveyed that to her in an email about all the fees needed to reinstate water.

Commissioner McDowell noted that it costs us \$600 to put a meter/backflow in. Tali said yes that is what Dan told her. But that she said at that time there was no discussion about a year it was brought up when he got back to her. He did say he would have to check and get back to her.

Dan stated that she had already bought the house at that time.

Commissioner Patterson asked if Tali had ever had any correspondence with the bank in terms of about any billing on the house?

Dan stated with that house in the last year there has been at least three calls from some kind of call center. They asked questions like whether we serve that house water and they had a very specific framework of questioning and if you tried to go outside of their framework they would just repeat their

question. It was like an India call center. So the answers would be yes we could serve the house water and no there is no water being served currently.

Tali said the call center is not the bank. The call center is from India and it is an escrow company that service banks in the US. It is cheaper and it is just like a call center for credit cards or anything else.

DJ stated that this was terminated when Mary Jo was here. She usually tried all avenues to keep getting the bills to owners or banks before terminating the accounts if we were aware of bankruptcy.

Commissioner Johnson said unfortunately this kind of stuff happens. When he bought his house he had to pay 5 months back service to clean water services because when the owner moved out he didn't continue to pay it. It doesn't show up on a title search or escrow or anything. It is kind of a buyer beware kind of thing.

Tali asked why a lien was not put on it? Because that's the only way that we can find out about it. Board and staff answered because we cannot legally do that. Cities and Counties can but not Special Districts.

Commissioner McDowell stated that he actually had the same thing happen. When he bought his house he found out that the surface water management bill had backed up for awhile.

Tali stated that the charges here are not really back payment. You are treating this like a new construction and it is not. It is a house that has been there forever. The pipes and everything are there all we need to do is to connect to them. It kind of seems you know...

Commissioner McDowell stated the reason the Ordinance reads as it does and we put the fees in place for Banks doing just this. They would not pay the back and current bill and in order to get service to the house they had to pay for the meter and be treated as a new connection.

Tali stated you know the banks are not bound by law to disclose this. There is no way for buyers to know these things. When you buy from a bank it is a completely different thing than buying from the owner.

Commissioner Patterson stated then sometime when you decided you wanted to purchase this house you had an opportunity to come in to the office and find out any of the rules and regulations that might pertain to this property.

Tali stated she didn't have specific time to go to the water district or to PGE or NW Natural Gas because they felt it should come up as a lien. She couldn't go to each utility to ask is there a problem with serving this house.

Commissioner McDowell asked when were they planning on moving into the house?

Tali said they were planning on September but it isn't looking promising. For the kids starting school they wanted to be there before school started.

Commissioner McDowell asked excluding the water issue?

Tali said that it will probably be Christmas. For the permits and inspections say for plumbing they need water in order to have an inspection so other things are delayed.

Commissioner Patterson asked if the realtor was aware any of the conditions in the house?

Tali said that the broker is someone she knows was a part of their community they are Israelis and they are not in a good place right now because Tali went back to ask her about it. She swore she didn't know and she looked over the title search and said there was no way to know.

Commissioner McDowell stated that it is called a phone call.

Tali said that the realtor works for Keller/Williams.

Commissioner Johnson asked DJ when you look at our Ordinance where is it listed for us to possibly vary from the requirements. These things are pretty clear is there a place in the Ordinance that gives us the ability to do a variance to that? He continued we just can't grant a variance because we want to. We need to be enabled to do it by the law.

DJ stated the only area she knows would be listed in the appeals process. She printed out the appeals process for the Board to read.

Commissioner Patterson stated that her concern is that there are three parties that had the opportunity to find out what the status was. One was the bank.

Tali stated that the bank isn't bound to do that so they don't. And the Real Estate broker they did a title search but nothing showed up.

Commissioner Patterson stated but did they? She used to sell real estate. There are a lot of things that affect the property that are not recorded.

Commissioner Johnson stated that failing septic tanks are not going to be recorded. Just recently there was a house close to his that was for sale with a failing septic tank and that would not be recorded. The buyers started asking around about it and found that out and the seller pulled the house off the market and repaired the septic tank prior to putting it back on the market.

Commissioner McDowell noted that his realtor called all the utility companies to make sure that everything was good to go before he bought the house.

Commissioner Patterson stated that is part of due diligence. What you are asking is because of mistakes of three parties the rest of our customers should subsidize these mistakes.

Tali stated it was the others not her and it was the District's responsibility to live up to paying their bills not her.

Commissioners in unison stated no it was not. Shutting off of the service for nonpayment was our responsibility and that was done.

Commissioner McDowell stated that what he would like to work towards is for DJ to research our appeals language through our legal team and see if that gives us flexibility.

Commissioner Johnson stated that while she is researching we have to be careful. There is a lot of investment going on. He was just up in the Seattle area last week. Properties are being bought and investors are just sitting on the property-not keeping up with internal maintenance just sitting as prices rise. That is going to start happening here. The market usually follows Seattle to the Portland area. This is Chinese investment that is where the money flows.

Tali asked and so how is this related?

Commissioner Johnson stated if you review our lawyer's message.

Tali interrupted that she is not Chinese and this is her family and going to be their residence.

Commissioner Johnson continued that wasn't his point.

Chair DeVries stated the point is that we can't set a precedence because of your situation. That is why we have rules. We have to live within our rules. If we go around our rules then the next person that has a similar problem will know that it was done for you so it can be done for them.

Commissioner Patterson stated that Tali has options to connect with her realtor about due diligence.

Tali said she did and she spoke with a lawyer about it and none of the parties can be held responsible for it.

Commissioner Patterson stated that one of the reasons that we have rules for everybody to follow is that there are opportunities for people to do their due diligence and find out what effect these things have. You had that opportunity. It is sad that this has put you in this dilemma that a number of issues have come up that we as a Board have no control over. Commissioner Patterson feels that our customers should not have to subsidize other people's mistakes.

Tali stated that she was hoping to solve this here but she feels that they are asking her to subsidize other people's mistakes. It is not here that didn't pay the bill.

Chair DeVries state that we are not asking you to subsidize anyone. Frankly what we are requiring that if you want us to supply water to your residence, you have to follow the Ordinances that every customer does to get that water.

Tali said it is a punishment though because it is not a new house and you are not going to run a new line there. All they are asking is to connect so she can understand a connection fee. She can understand a

new meter. But she cannot understand this fee of \$12,000 as if it was a new meter. She is sure that the appeal may have a second opportunity to look at it.

Chair DeVries stated that he thought at this stage we have to do more discussion as a Board, we have to look at our appeals process, and he empathizes with her position, but additional time is needed. Three of our Board members had similar problems and so we are aware of the problem and we are not trying to be punitive in any way. We are just trying to follow our rules. Our rules are there for a reason and we can't go around them in one case without the proper protocol. He asked for her to give them some time and a chance to go through those processes and then we will be able to respond to you.

Commissioner Johnson stated that in the District's appeals language the term variance is used so we can consider that.

Tali asked about a time frame.

DJ stated that the appeals language notes not longer than 60 days from the appeal date. The Board considered the meeting date June 26th the date of the appeal. Board consensus is that it gives them 2 months but they will set a goal of the next meeting to make a decision.

Tali asked if she should attend the next meeting or would she be notified by mail. Consensus was she shouldn't have to but all the meetings are public and she is welcome to attend. Commissioner Patterson noted that we do record all public meetings and that Tali does have public access to that.

Board discussion on appeals process:

Commissioner Johnson stated that the confusing part is it talks about an appeal and within that it talks about requesting a variance and exception. The appeal would be whether or not we don't grant a variance or exception within an appeal. Trying to say is we've made a decision they can appeal that decision or they can make a request for a variance or exception to that decision-two separate actions. The appeal would probably be based on we are interpreting the facts wrong or we are not interpreting the law correctly whereas the variance would be...we don't have any criteria for the variance. We need to have criteria for the variance otherwise you are making an arbitrary decision on a variance and that is just asking for a lawsuit. Criteria would be possibly a list of extraordinary circumstances but that's not going to help us now.

Commissioner Patterson noted that we haven't addressed the response from the Attorney about setting precedent. We have a responsibility to the rate payers not to set precedent.

Commissioner Johnson noted that he disagrees that they did the due diligence. When he bought his house he called the water district to make sure he would be able to have water. And he called the water and environmental services about the surface water management fee. He talked about a house sale done on Indian Springs that went up for sale with a failing septic system. The potential buyers talked to neighbors, etc., and found that out and it came off the market until the septic was repaired and then back on. There is some responsibility of someone buying property.

Chair DeVries stated that unfortunately it doesn't sound like there are specific rules for realtors.

Commissioner Johnson said that there kind of is they are not supposed to misrepresent to the buyer. He said as a land use planner people would call him up and say yes I want to buy this property. The first thing he tells them is that they need to check about their water, you need to check about the access, down the list. It is something he couldn't do but it should be done by prospective buyer. That to him anyone that has been in the business for any time at all should know about this.

Chair DeVries stated that the thing of it is he wasn't sure if they were a first time home buyer or not. Board consensus was that she mentioned they had experience fixing up a lot of houses so it didn't seem like that.

Chair DeVries stated yes that might be true but he can see the difficulty for a true first time home buyer that gets a bad realtor not knowing what the realtor is supposed to be telling them.

Board consensus was the fact that the realtor or homeowner or seller did not do due diligence that is not our problem. Want to be real careful that we don't get pulled into the triangular fight. Property owner did contact Attorney and said there is no recourse. Board consensus was that she should have recourse with realtor and there is also a Board that oversees them.

Board discussed issues that the seller should have done when buying it.

Commissioner McDowell stated that the way he is looking at it according to our Ordinance we have \$600 to install a new meter. A new connection SDC is \$10,956 dollars. The question is do we require the \$10,956 up front or do we set up payments. Board consensus was no for payments as we couldn't put a lien on the property according to State Law.

Chair DeVries stated he sympathizes with them but what are our costs here. We locked it off and pulled the meter due to unpaid bill. To put a new meter in there is a hard cost to put it in. While the Ordinance says it is a new connection it isn't really.

Dan interjected when the rate study was done this service was terminated. When the rate study was done we developed our rate structure based on the current number of meters not including this one and built in a certain number of SDC's to go with our formula of what is needed for Capital Improvements for the District. So if you waive this SDC you're basically cutting out these funds and it would have to be made up elsewhere in the rates.

Chair DeVries noted that is a good point. We can waive an SDC charge he thinks in terms of an appeal. Commissioner Johnson stated but if you do that you have to be very specific as to why. If someone else comes in with the same issues you have to grant it again. That is why he feels it comes back to the criteria for granting a variance or exception in terms of how you do it. And as of now we have none and he thinks you could still do it in terms of the Ordinance but he would say we just don't grant it we better have A, B, C, D, listing why.

Board discussion went on to water usage and would they be using more water than previously used due to new plumbing, etc. More discussion on bigger meter and bringing up to what the District wants as standards.

Chair DeVries asked if there was a difference between new construction and renovated construction and should we have a different class of SDC requirements? He feels it is a different situation than someone doing new construction on a brand new lot.

Board discussion on renovation and leaving one wall up to call it renovation to not come up against more code changes or expenses.

Chair DeVries noted his point is that building permits for renovation have different requirement than new construction building permits. So should we for water service? Should there be a distinction in requirements where a residence is renovated versus one that is new construction? More discussion.

DJ asked if she could comment. This is not the only issue that has been brought to her attention.

Developer of Timberland asked about an irrigation meter for his development. Would it have to be a one inch service when it wouldn't be necessary? DJ concurred it might not be necessary for the intended use. Several other developers asked about the ability to have a temporary water service for irrigation just to get plants a good start (maybe a year?) Then it could be terminated. And she reminded the Board about the water service granted to the City of Rivergrove for the park. This ended up being a 3/4" service as really that was adequate for the use there.

Chair DeVries asked if we have an SDC for a 3/4" meter? DJ stated yes in Jim's calculations he has a number that would represent a 3/4" SDC. We use that for giving a credit when a 3/4" meter is replaced with a 1 inch and only charge the difference between the two. We don't put it on our fee schedule because according to the Ordinance we require all new meters to be one inch. She continued that the reasoning behind how we came to the one inch requirement is that usually all new construction is McMansion size with who knows how many plumbing fixtures. We could never get cooperation with the City of LO plumbing inspector or the County plumbing inspector to recommend a size of meter for

the residence being built. It all depends on the number of fixtures and say if they have fire sprinkling systems, or pools, or hot tubs. That determines how big of meter. But because the Inspectors don't inform us, will not give a recommendation, we went conservative requiring a one inch meter on all new connections.

Commissioner McDowell asked if the service we are discussing is a ¾". DJ concurred yes the service line from the main to the meter is ¾". This will not change and not give them more water.

Chair DeVries asked if they would need more water. DJ stated that it would depend on how many water fixtures there are and if Tali could get written confirmation say from the Plumbing inspector to say this is the size of the meter I would recommend for this residence. And DJ felt that it would probably be a ¾" and not a 1 inch. The thing is normally if there is an existing meter and a house is being renovated we can't even put a 1 inch meter in there. We have to put our install in the current lay length for a ¾" meter and our installation for a one inch is too big. But Tali had an entire new service line installed and it is not hooked up so we can install a 1 inch if that is the decision.

Chair DeVries asked can we put a ¾" in there? DJ stated yes we can. DJ noted when it was discussed how much our 1 inch SDC is and Tali went to LO and wanted to annex and get their water she was willing to annex and pay \$7,700 because it was less than our \$11,000.

Commissioner McDowell mentioned that there were additional costs to annex: \$500 to Metro, etc.

Chair DeVries asked if we could find out what our SDC fee is for a ¾" meter? DJ said it is \$6,573.

Chair DeVries asked if she only needs a ¾" meter then that may be what we should be charging her.

Commissioner Patterson asked what happens to the rule that if the water is turned off for a year then it triggers a 1 inch. Why are we ignoring that?

Commissioner Johnson stated that unless we can list some reasons why we think we should vary that's fine but he wants to see those reasons.

Chair DeVries stated we consider a variance. Commissioner Johnson stated based on what? We just don't give a variance based on these poor people.

Commissioner McDowell stated that in the Ordinance it does not say a termination requires an upgrade to one inch. DJ stated that is in another section. In the termination section it just says that if terminated over a year it will be considered a new service. And in the other section we specify that all new meters will be one inch in size.

Commissioner McDowell stated feels that we would not be doing a variance on the SDC we are doing a variance based on the size of the meter we are installing. That's how we want to approach it. We are going to grant you a variance on the meter because your house does not need a one inch meter and there is an existing ¾" service line there. We are going to allow a ¾" meter installation.

Chair DeVries stated that may be from a policy perspective we need to decide what circumstances we will allow a ¾" meter to be installed instead of a 1 inch meter such as same footprint house, existing ¾" service line there, irrigation only meter, etc.

Commissioner Johnson added that maybe we ought to look at long term can we when someone adds on to their residence how much percentage expansion would trigger a required upgrade to a one inch meter whether it is an existing house or not.

Discussion continued on what type of triggers it would take for the District to require an upgrade.

Commissioner McDowell stated that what we need is a policy discussion about meter size and variant uses, existing house sizes vs. expansions, not getting that information from the County, having to make meter requirements related to water using fixtures. DJ to do research on fixture requirements.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he is not adverse to exception on this appeal because that tends to just apply to one case whereas variances can be pretty broad. We also need to commit to upgrading our Ordinance and fine tuning our policy. Suggestions to be proactive-watch properties for real estate signs as to who to call about a terminated property, or a door hanger, or a notice put in the meter box about the termination of a service.

DJ to check on the requirement differences of a ¾" meter to a one inch meter. If she thinks there are valid reasons that this could be an exception or other cases such as the irrigation make a list of those reasons. Give recommendations to the Board with backing to help the decision.

CONSENT AGENDA

TAB 4: Minutes-May 17th, 2017 Regular Board Mtg.

Commissioner Roth moved that we approve the May 17th, 2017 minutes as presented. Commissioner Patterson seconded. Motion passed. Commissioners Patterson, Roth, Johnson, McDowell, and DeVries voted aye. Nays-None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

TAB 5: Board Meeting Calendar 2017-2018 Resolution 2017-02

Commissioner Johnson moved that we approved Resolution 2017-02. Commissioner Roth seconded. Motion passed. Commissioners Patterson, Roth, Johnson, McDowell, and DeVries voted aye. Nays-None.

TAB 6: Leak Adjustment Policy and Form Discussion-Tabled to next meeting.

FINANCIAL REPORT

TAB 7: Financial Report-Deposit Reconciliations and Board Report Checklist

Dan stated bank reconciliations and CUSI reconciling at this time.

TAB 8: May 2017 Bank Statements and Reconciliations

Dan stated that we are moving money around.

Chair DeVries pointed out that the parentheses around the \$21,252 transaction. Dan will correct.

Dan stated that we moved some money over to non-restricted but we are already bringing some back because of low funds at end of year here. Big payments are going out with projects such as hydrant installations, pump #1 repair, and parts for backflow, etc.

Dan felt that we are pretty close to hitting the numbers for water sales and should make our budgeting figures.

Chair DeVries stated that we are over some line items for what was budgeted.

Dan noted yes, automobile expenses he noted and that is why we bolstered the truck fund transfer because the Chevy seems to be nickel and diming us.

Commissioner Patterson asked about the new truck having a backup camera. Board consensus is that it should be required standard equipment. Staff to ensure when purchased.

Chair DeVries talked about line item continuing education which we are aware and approved. DJ noted that some expenses such as those for attending AWWA Section and Subsection there were monies given to the district by AWWA and that went in to Miscellaneous Income rather than against the expenses.

Commissioner McDowell noted that we should look a year ahead and budget for those items that staff will be attending.

Dan stated on the ones that were over he will do kind of a review of where/why we went over.

Chair DeVries stated that would be good because even though they are not highly individually over together those are around \$5,000 over budgeting. He stated that he keeps bringing up PPE and where we should budget more.

Commissioner McDowell moved that we approve the financial report. Commissioner Johnson seconded. Motion passed. Commissioner Patterson, Roth, DeVries, and Johnson voted aye. Nays-none

TAB 9: Financial Report-Fiscal year 2016-2017-Pay Bills

Commissioner McDowell moved that we pay the bills and approve the bank statements. Commissioner Patterson seconded. Motion passed. Commissioner Roth, DeVries, Patterson, and Johnson voted aye. Nays-none

All Board members present reviewed and signed the “Approval of Payment Form and Approval of reconciliations between CUSI and QuickBooks for Water Sales, Penalties and Water Deposits (including attached supporting documents)” And all Board members present reviewed and signed the form entitled Rivergrove Water District-Bank & LGIP Statements.” Commissioner Roth completed the “Financial report check list” for this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

TAB 10-District Report/Pump Reads May 2017: DJ reported pump repair discussed, electrical contractor still not done, sub monitor shutting down due to hot weather, staff ready to change lock on gate so that we know when they are working, electrical engineer said that any of the punch list items any electrician should understand, trench asphaltting not approved more like a speed bump, liquidated damages are adding up. DJ will discuss liquidated damages with Attorney and Engineer.

Board consensus was that they like having staff overlook the Contractors on a job.

SDAO membership database-DJ confirmed with Board the email addresses they wish to have as their contact information.

DJ discussed the AWWA Professional Operator Certification. Brian has become a PO Operator 1. DJ took test for PO Water Distribution 2. She has not heard outcome to it as it was a beta testing program. All costs for these certifications were paid by staff.

Commissioner McDowell asked if this isn't accepted by the Health Division for what we need for the District why do it?

DJ noted that this was discussed with Chair DeVries during wage recommendations.

Chair DeVries at that time suggested that maybe for additional certifications that staff do and pay for on their own that a dollar amount be given by the District to staff as an incentive.

He felt that any type of education that is done helps with the employee's position.

Chair DeVries stated that he thinks it is great personally for the additional education. Some certifications are required by the State and some are like icing on the cake. Most companies that he has been with give an award for additional professional development awards. He is not sure how it would be funded through which line item. But say employees get a Certification they get a \$100 Gift card. It gives recognition for extra work being done. Staff getting better is better for everyone in our District. Board seemed to be in agreement and opened to suggestions.

Salary recommendations that were included in the budget personal discussions were approved with the adoption of the budget. Board consensus was that it is budgeted it is approved.

DJ noted that she sent our current job descriptions over to the company HR Answers, Inc, to be reviewed by their office. This part is free as we are members of SDAO. After that review she is going to ask them what it would take for a salary review of the positions and getting a comparable salary range for each job description. Staff thanked the Commissioners.

Commissioner Patterson asked if in the next meeting we could discuss about an RFP for engineering and evaluate the current engineering services. She would like to base the discussion on whether or not we are going to adopt the Oregon Resilience plan and base our Capital Improvement Program for our future. It is currently not our standard. Board discussed issues such as was our seismic study based on a five minute duration 9.5 Cascadia Subduction zone earthquake. We need to research that information and maybe revise the District Capital Improvements. Commissioner Patterson will email the Resiliency plan to those interested. Board consensus was to get it on the agenda within the next two meetings.

Dan noted that the new rates are in effect.

Commissioner/Staff Comments:

Chair DeVries asked if Board members want a notebook delivered or sent in an email. Commissioner McDowell stated that he didn't want his notebook delivered he wanted it sent in an email. The rest of the Board seemed to want to keep as is.

Commissioner Roth stated that she would sign checks this month.

Commissioner Patterson stated that the PSU report on the Rosewood area should be done.

Non-agenda items-None

Agenda Consensus for July 2017 Meeting

Appeal decision

Leak adjustment policy

Engineering "RFP" and evaluation

Chair DeVries adjourned the meeting at 8:59 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

DJ Ezell,
Water District Manager
Rivergrove Water District

These minutes are not verbatim and the meeting was tape recorded.
ORS 192.650 Recording or written minutes required; content; fees. (1) The governing body of a public body shall provide for the sound, video or digital recording or the taking of written minutes of all its meetings. Neither a full transcript nor a full recording of the meeting is required, except as otherwise provided by law, but the written minutes or recording must give a true reflection of the matters discussed at the meeting and the views of the participants. All minutes or recordings shall be available to the public within a reasonable time after the meeting, and shall include at least the following information:
(a) All members of the governing body present;
(b) All motions, proposals, resolutions, orders, ordinances and measures proposed and their disposition;
(c) The results of all votes and, except for public bodies consisting of more than 25 members unless requested by a member of that body, the vote of each member by name;
(d) The substance of any discussion on any matter; and
(e) Subject to ORS 192.410 to 192.505 relating to public records, a reference to any document discussed at the meeting.