RECEIVED

2014 NOV 5 RM 10 27

Agenda Item: ID#14-543 (11:00 A.M.)

Date: 11/6/14

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CFRESNO CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Items – ID#14-543 (11:00 A.M.) Supplemental Packet Date: November 5, 2014

Item(s)

Appearance by Tim Barker to discuss the Community Water Forum

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

RECEIVED

Re: Recharge Fresno Water Forums From: Tim Barker, Resident & Attendee

2014 NOV 5 8M 10 27

Hello,

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CA

I will be speaking at the 11:00 A.M. time slot at the City Council on Nov. 6. Three minutes of public speaking will not adequately cover the subject material so allow me this brief opportunity to present background material.

My name is Tim Barker, a resident of the City of Fresno. I have attended the previous three water forums. I attended because the opportunity was presented for the community to participate in the decision process. I did not have an opinion regarding the proposed Water Plan and looked forward to this opportunity to be informed and considered in this process. What was readily apparent from the first "forum" onward, was that this was a glossy presentation to promote and consider only the Water Department position, \$410,000,000, largely supported by a bond and the accompanying rate hikes.

There have been many comments from the attendees that merit consideration, however, those comments have not been revisited, only dismissed in rebuttal by the panel of "experts" who represent special interests and have not disclosed their conflict of interest while imposing their water plan for Fresno.

Some of the comments worthy of consideration:

- The developer fees have not been consistent with the real cost of infrastructure impact. From a retired city planning department employee.
- The water project is not designed to sustain Fresno, we may not even need new or extra water sources, but the water project is designed to support population growth without that segment paying for the new, extra sources. Voiced by many audience participants.
- Established landscaping is dying due to the watering restrictions. From a lady who watched her shrubs and plants die to be in compliance with the watering schedule. Yet the city permits an artificial lake development and green landscaped residential developments.
- There is no long term comprehensive water conservation program. To allow for proper landscaping and maintenance we need more than an short term inconsistent water conservation program.
- There has been nothing presented to itemize the requested expenses in this \$410,000,000 plan and there has been no mention of the \$1 billion Master Plan to follow. We are presented with rate hike demands without an itemization of what is being requested which makes it difficult to agree without the specifics of a final master water plan.
- Regarding the financing, a large portion of whatever the plan is, is a bond. The state

Water Resources Board has tried to get Fresno to participate in a state loan program at 1% interest (vs. approx. 5% for a bond.) The loan of approx. \$110 million dollars would provide for recycled water improvements and pipe system and new water plant construction at the present NE facility. The state has tried to get Fresno to participate but, in their words "with little response" from Fresno. The nature of a bond is that there is little restriction on how it is spent, the bond holder only wants their money back with interest. The state, however, has guidelines how the money would be spent. Using a bond to finance this project also may encumber any near future bond proposals as well as affect the bond rating (which is presently a fragile Baa-1.)

• Additionally, with the advent of Prop. 1, many of the features of that measure duplicate what the city is requesting, making that a less costly means to achieve the same results as the city proposal (whatever that is.)

Rate increases should not be casually addressed. They are an inheritance to your children and grandchildren. Rates go up, but not down.

These forums have been formatted from the beginning, before the public participated. The agenda has not changed due to public response but has stayed on program to promote the city and special interests. According to Columbia University study of U.S. Water Infrastructure: "Achieving sustainability in our water systems requires a transparent understanding of the factors that influence rates. We need to rethink what the water utility of the future should look like and how we will pay for water services and sustainable use."

Thankyou for your time and consideration. Tim Barker

Two Buch 907-2449