

**MINUTES**

DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY  
COUNTY OF HAWAI‘I  
WATER BOARD MEETING

April 25, 2017

Hilo Operations Conference Room, 889 Leilani Street, Hilo, HI

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Craig Takamine, Chairperson  
Mr. Russell Arikawa, Vice-Chairperson  
Mr. Leningrad Elarionoff  
Ms. Kanoë Wilson  
Mr. William Boswell, Jr.  
Mr. Nestorio Domingo  
Mr. Keith K. Okamoto, Manager-Chief Engineer, Department of Water Supply (ex-officio member)

ABSENT: Mr. Bryant Balog, Water Board Member  
Ms. Brenda Iokepa-Moses, Water Board Member  
Director, Planning Department (ex-officio member)  
Director, Department of Public Works (ex-officio member)

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Jessica Yeh, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Ms. Amy Self, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Mr. Ronald Kim, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Mr. Edward Frazer  
Mr. Lance Fukumoto, Fukunaga & Associates  
Ms. Nancy Cook-Lauer, Hawai‘i Tribune-Herald

Department of Water Supply Staff

Mr. Kawika Uyehara, Deputy  
Ms. Kaiulani Matsumoto, Information and Education Specialist  
Mr. Kurt Inaba, Engineering Division Head  
Mr. Richard Sumada, Waterworks Controller  
Mr. Daryl Ikeda, Operations Division Head  
Mr. Calvin Uemura, Customer Service Section  
Mr. Lawrence Beck, Engineering Division  
Ms. Ilene Wood  
Ms. Renee Kusano  
Ms. Marianne Panoff  
Mr. Lindo Matsu

- 1) CALL TO ORDER – Chairperson Takamine called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed the two new Board Members, Messrs. Boswell and Domingo.

MOVE AGENDA ITEM UP:

5) CONTESTED CASE HEARING:

**Water Service Account No. 7000944-10**

The Contested Case Hearing took place in accordance with Chapter 91 of the Hawai'i Revised Statutes and Rule 2-5 of the Rules and Regulations of the Department of Water Supply.

The issues involved in the above-referenced hearing were Edward Frazer's appeal of the proposed shut-off notice and the balance of \$300 remaining on account number 7000944-10. Hearing was held pursuant to Mr. Frazer's request on March 7, 2017.

(The following transcript is verbatim.)

A. SELF: Would you like us to introduce ourselves?

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes please.

A. SELF: Deputy Corporation Counsel, Amy Self, and to my right is Mr. Calvin Uemura, from the Water Department.

E. FRAZER: Hello, I'm Edward Fraser, the person contesting this, or appealing this case for a small amount of money compared to the fiscal budget of the Water Department...it seems pretty manini, but to me, it's a significant amount. So I figured I would come and appeal.

RONALD KIM: Normally the party appealing would have a right to begin, but also, you can ask the party, if you'd like, to make opening statements.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay. Do you guys have any opening statements?

E. FRAZER: Yeah, I was...I had a leak in my system and I was less than two weeks out of the timeframe for the right to appeal for what do you call it, when you can appeal for a leak adjustment. I was just two weeks out of that three-year period, and I had a seven hundred something dollar bill which I paid most of; and the reason I'm appealing is because I feel that they should have notified me either with a notice on my gate or a call right away when they noticed that significant leak. And I did not get any call from the Department but I got a letter some days later and I immediately fixed the leak as soon as I received that letter. And so my appeal is for the time that the leak occurred to the time that I received the letter and was able to fix the leak. I lost another fifty-seven-some (sic) gallons of water costing me an additional \$315.00 so I'm asking the Board to consider that timeframe that I was not notified of the leak. I feel that I should have been notified either with a phone call directly from the meter reader or at least a notice on the gate or something that I could have fixed that leak right away. That's about it.

R. KIM: Actually, that's his opening statement, so you let him put out his opening statement and then the Department will have a chance to put in their opening statement and then the appellant can present their case.

E. FRAZER: Oh, I see.

R. KIM: Oh, no, no, it's a good opening statement.

E. FRAZER: Okay.

A. SELF: Good morning. The evidence will show that the Department followed the Department of Water Supply Rules and while they obviously feel for Mr. Frazer's bill and the high leakage, or the high bill, there is nothing more that they could have done per the Rules, so we'll get into that later. But you'll hear from the evidence that they followed procedure and did really good to help Mr. Frazer with his bill. That's the end of my opening statement.

R. KIM: Mr. Frazer is free to present his case in chief with testimony or any documents or any other witnesses he might have; but if he is going to testify, then we're gonna have to swear him in first, actually. It's up to you, sir, how you want to proceed.

E. FRAZER: Well I pretty much said all the points that were important. I think everybody probably has a copy of the notes from our meeting at the Water Department. That's pretty much it. I just, you know, I hope I win this appeal and I don't have to pay the additional three hundred some-odd dollars.

A. SELF: Excuse me, I would request that he be sworn in and even though he's made those statements, if he could...it sounds like it's testimony, so I would ask that he be sworn in so that it could be part of the record.

R. KIM: So this swearing in will apply to your opening statement, too, actually, because it sounds like most of the evidence was presented with your first statement, actually.

SECRETARY: Mr. Frazer, could you stand and raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth on this matter now before the Hawai'i County Water Board?

E. FRAZER: I do.

SECRETARY: Thank you very much. Please be seated.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Mr. Frazer, is there anything else you want to add?

E. FRAZER: Uh, well I don't know if this is of any significance, but the waterline goes across my property and back when we purchased the property, we made an agreement with the Water Department that they would have access to the line which actually is the feeder line that goes down to Ahalanui warm pond and then onto Pohoiki and all the meters in between. And we made an agreement and we have kept up to that agreement and they do have access as per my addendum to the Deed so I have, you know, offered that, I think, significant point to my argument that I feel like I should have been notified about this leakage sooner.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Is there anything else?

R. KIM: Is there any more testimony or evidence you'd like to present in support of your appeal?

E. FRAZER: I don't think so. I think it's all been on the notes from the meeting at the Water Department and everybody probably has a copy of that and has read it. So I just hope I can win the appeal.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Thank you.

R. KIM: So you can ask the Department to present their case.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay.

A. SELF: Do you want to cross-examine him?

R. KIM: It would be probably cleaner if you actually call him as a witness and examine him then because I don't think he really presented much testimony. It was more argument.

A. SELF: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Do you want to call the next party?

E. FRAZER: One more thing I just want to add. I've kept up with my bills and never had the water shut off. Even though I've had leakages in the past, I've always kept up with paying my bill and been a pretty good customer.

A. SELF: Okay. I'd like to call Mr. Frazer as a witness before I call Mr. Uemura. Mr. Fraser, you received a notice of high reading prior to receiving your bill, isn't that correct?

E. FRAZER: Yeah, I did.

A. SELF: Okay. And, also, you had a leak adjustment...you received, you were granted a leak adjustment during the period from, I believe it was in December of 2016, isn't that correct?

E. FRAZER: That, I'm not sure. All I know is that I was less than two weeks out of the three-year period that the leak adjustment is granted when this leak occurred.

A. SELF: Oh. I'm sorry, actually, December 2013, isn't that correct, you did receive the leak adjustment before?

E. FRAZER: Yes, that seems to be correct. I don't have a record of that, but I can see it's there.

A. SELF: Okay. When you received your bill, there was also a notice on the bill stating that you had a leak or a high reading, right?

E. FRAZER: I assume there was, yeah. I don't have a copy of that; but, um, if you say so, I'm sure it's true.

A. SELF: Okay. So really, as you stated before, the reason that you appealed to the Board was to just see if the Board would forgive you...forgive the \$315.00, isn't that correct? That's what you are asking for, is that correct?

E. FRAZER: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. And you attended an administrative hearing with the Department, is that true?

E. FRAZER: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. And during that meeting, it was mentioned that you had had a prior leak adjustment, isn't that correct?

E. FRAZER: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. Thank you, that's all. Okay, I would like to call Calvin Uemura, please.

SECRETARY: Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth on this matter now before the Hawai'i County Water Board?

C. UEMURA: Yes.

A. SELF: Good morning Mr. Uemura. Could you please state your name for the record?

C. UEMURA: Calvin Uemura.

A. SELF: And what is your position or title with the Department?

C. UEMURA: I am the Water Programs Supervisor.

A. SELF: Okay, now, just briefly, could you describe the procedures that your Department goes through to determine a high reading on a meter?

C. UEMURA: The determination of a high reading is basically based on a filter that our billing program has. So in order to be able to determine that the readings need to be inputted into our billing system, the reading devices we use in the field have limited storage capacity, so it really only captures the bare minimum for our meter readers to be able to find the meter and record a reading. It does have the capacity to trigger an alarm if a reading does not fall within given parameters. In this particular case, it did not ring out in the field so our meter readers have no knowledge of...in the field, no knowledge of the customer's previous usage, average usage. All they know is where the meter is, what their last reading was, and, of course, we punch in the current reading. Once that route is done, in this particular case, it's Kapoho, Kalapana, Pohoiki area, the meter reader will come back to the office, unload it into our billing system, at which point a reading verification is generated. And that uses filters to, again, be able to show what the last reading was, what the current reading, and it was at that point that we can detect abnormalities in the customer's usage. And then we do additional research.

A. SELF: Isn't there also another step where you have to manually print it out and read the list?

C. UEMURA: Yes. So that report, actually, once it's loaded and printed out, we have to manually go through all the accounts on there to verify, and this report is not just simply accounts that have high readings. It also will flag accounts that have no usage. So we're looking at multiple items, and it's done by...well actually, it's done two times...once by our meter readers and then our data processing people.

A. SELF: And that's a really large area that they...the meter readers read so it takes how long for...on the average?

C. UEMURA: This particular cycle, it took about a day and a half to read that. So until that complete cycle is read, the data is not loaded into our billing system. And in some cycles, it could be as much as...the bigger the area, like within Hilo as an example, it will take...there's a couple of routes that may be two or three days.

A. SELF: Okay. And are you familiar with Mr. Frazer's water service account?

C. UEMURA: Yes I am.

A. SELF: Okay. I want to show you Exhibit 3. Okay, I've just handed you a copy of the Department's Exhibit 3. Could you please describe the significance of this particular document?

C. UEMURA: This is our water usage history from our billing system. It records on the extreme left, the date that the meter was read, the number of days between each reading date, billing type, if it notes as regular, which means we actually read the meter. Usage is in thousands so on the top line, seventeen refers to seventeen thousand gallons. That is simply the average daily use, the seventeen thousand divided by the sixty-day within the cycle and, of course, the last row is the amount billed.

A. SELF: Okay. In particular, which entry is showing the high reading for Mr. Frazer's account?

C. UEMURA: So the high reading is, or what we're referring to, is the reading date October 19 for 150,000 gallons of usage.

A. SELF: Okay. And is this a true and correct copy of this printout?

C. UEMURA: Yes it is.

A. SELF: Okay. I would ask that Exhibit 3 be moved into evidence?

R. KIM: That's at your discretion.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes.

A. SELF: Thank you. Okay, so, was there a notice of high reading mailed to Mr. Frazer?

C. UEMURA: Yes there was.

A. SELF: And when would that have been?

C. UEMURA: That would have been mailed October 21<sup>st</sup>.

A. SELF: Okay. And was that Exhibit 3 you were looking at?

C. UEMURA: Uh, no, it's not stated in that.

AMY SELF: Okay. Okay, so it was mailed out, you said October 21<sup>st</sup>?

UEMURA: Yes, our records indicate October 21<sup>st</sup>

A. SELF: Okay. Um, okay now, in addition to the notice that's mailed out, is there a notice indicating a high reading on the bill that goes out? Let me refer you to Exhibit 4, Department's Exhibit 4.

C. UEMURA: Yes, Exhibit 4, date October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016, under the column "user," the notation "PUBS" that's our notation coming from our billing system. If you look at the rest of the users, their names there, those are individual reps (sic) who entered data into the account comment

section. But the PUBS notation indicates that our billing system generated a high-reading notice on the bill the date it was printed.

A. SELF: Okay, and is this a true and correct copy of that printout from that system?

C. UEMURA: Yes it is.

A. SELF: Okay. I would ask that Exhibit 4 be moved into evidence as well.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay.

A. SELF: Okay, at the point after the notice went out to Mr. Frazer, was there any time when you called the Department to ask about his bill?

C. UEMURA: Not until November 1<sup>st</sup> Oh I'm sorry, 10/31.

A. SELF: And that's indicated on what, Exhibit 4?

C. UEMURA: Exhibit 4.

A. SELF: Okay. So he called on...the bill went out with the notice printed on it on October 24<sup>th</sup> and then he called the Department on October 31<sup>st</sup> correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: Okay. And then what happened after that?

C. UEMURA: On the 31<sup>st</sup>, we did notify Mr. Frazer that he did not qualify for a...well, he asked for a leak adjustment. And then on November 1<sup>st</sup>, we completed a recheck reading, meaning we went to recheck to verify that the reading on the meter was correct and at that point we found the reading of 2133. NDM noted on the November 1<sup>st</sup> entry stands for no dial movement.

A. SELF: And you are looking at what, Exhibit 4?

C. UEMURA: Exhibit 4, date October 21<sup>st</sup>. I'm sorry, November 1<sup>st</sup>.

A. SELF: Okay. And then after that point, there was...was the meter read again?

C. UEMURA: Next reading after the November 1<sup>st</sup> recheck would be the regular reading on February 17<sup>th</sup>.

A. SELF: Okay. So there hasn't been any other high readings?

C. UEMURA: No.

A. SELF: So that was an indication that he had fixed the leak, correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: Okay. Then if you could take a look at Exhibit 5. Could you describe what Exhibit 5 signifies?

C. UEMURA: This is a shut-off notice mailed to Mr. Frazer in regards to non-payment, or an outstanding balance of \$612.00.

A. SELF: Okay, and this is a true and correct copy of that letter?

C. UEMURA: Yes it is.

A. SELF: Okay. I ask that Exhibit 5 be moved into evidence. So to reiterate, the process the Department normally follows...

R. KIM: I'm sorry, for the sake of the record, could we indicate a yes or a no verbally?

A. SELF: Oh, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes.

R. KIM: Thank you.

A. SELF: Okay. So in other words, the process the Department normally follows regarding a high meter reading was the same process followed for Mr. Frazer's high meter reading, is that correct?

UEMURA: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. And also, if you could take a look at Exhibit 2 which I'll hand you. Could you describe what this document represents?

C. UEMURA: This is a...I'm not quite sure what the right word is, but a copy of the notice to Mr. Frazer of the final decision on the administrative hearing held at our Waiakea Office Plaza on April (sic) 25.

A. SELF: And attached is a copy of the findings of facts and conclusions of law, is that correct?

C. UEMURA: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. And this is a true and correct copy of that letter and findings?

C. UEMURA: Yes.

A. SELF: I'd ask that Exhibit 2 be moved into evidence.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay, and I'll refer you to Page 2 of the findings of facts. During the administrative hearing, it was mentioned that he...that Mr. Frazer had already received a leak adjustment and that he didn't...within the previous three years, so he didn't qualify for a leak adjustment, correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: Okay. Finally, I'll ask you to take a look at Exhibit 6. And could you describe this document please?

C. UEMURA: This is, again, part of our billing system. This is our call history log. We use this as our primary vehicle to track closings that you can see on this example, meter removals for delinquency. We also use the same call log to record people who move into an account, move out of an account. For this specific case, though, it's used for tracking leak adjustments. Because of the three-year limitation, we have it logged in other areas; however, it is simpler and quicker for our Customer Service Reps., on this screen, that it indicates what period the customer was granted his last adjustment. So if you look at Line 1, this account was granted an adjustment for usage from June 2013 to December 2013; and prior to that, also granted a leak adjustment from February 2008 to August 2008.

A. SELF: With regards to the most recent leak adjustment, so the leak this time fell within that three-year timeframe, is that correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: Okay. So the leak occurred was October, isn't that correct...?

C. UEMURA: Uh, yes.

A. SELF: sometime in October of 20...?

C. UEMURA: The current leak...October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013, uh, 2016 reading cycle. So this account wouldn't be eligible for an adjustment until after the December 2016 reading cycle.

A. SELF: Okay. And then, last, I'm gonna ask you to look at Exhibit 1. Okay, you're familiar with Section 3-10 of the Department's Rules and Regulations, right?

C. UEMURA: Yes I am.

A. SELF: Okay. And could you tell me is that a true and correct copy of that Rule?

C. UEMURA: Yes it is.

A. SELF: Okay. I'd ask that Exhibit 1 be moved into evidence.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes.

A. SELF: Okay. Could you please describe your understanding of Section 3-10, the portion that I have highlighted, Section 3?

C. UEMURA: Um, consumer has sole control of water delivered beyond the Department's meter, and the Department is not responsible for maintenance and repairs to pipes and fixtures beyond the meter. It goes on, consumers shall be limited to one leak adjustment per 36-month, that's three-year period, per service connection.

A. SELF: Okay, so, why could you not just waive the \$315.00 that Mr. Frazer is requesting?

C. UEMURA: The amount that Mr. Frazer...well, the period that Mr. Frazer is requesting is still within the three-year limitation for granting an adjustment.

A. SELF: And there are no other Department rules that allow the Department to grant any kind of or waive any amount of a bill, isn't that correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: Okay, thank you. I rest my case.

R. KIM: Okay, Mr. Frazer, you actually have right or opportunity to also cross-examine Mr. Uemura to ask him any follow-up questions you might have from his testimony.

E. FRAZER: Okay. Um, can't think of anything. It seems to be all pretty well, you know, cut and dry here as far as my leak adjustment times and my history. You got it down here pretty well. Only thing I wanted to add is I had noticed leaks on the road there a couple of times, and I called the Water Department as soon as I saw those, you know, the water gushing out from the main connection service areas on the road there. So I called right away. One of them was at night, actually. It was later at night, and they were able to get out there and fix it because I called. I think I called at least twice, maybe three times and you may have a record of those breakages in the system down the road. But I was the one that called.

R. KIM: Thank you. So, actually, I was asking if you had any questions of Mr. Uemura; but it sounds like you wanted to kind of just put some more evidence in? So that's okay.

E. FRAZER: No, I don't have any more evidence.

R. KIM: Okay. Okay. So if both parties have concluded presenting their cases in chief, you can give the opportunity to present closing arguments too, if you would like. And then...

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Closing arguments first?

R. KIM: Well you can ask questions too, if you please.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Board have questions?

KANOE WILSON: Um, for Mr. Uemura, is this part of the Department's practice to actually call customers in regards to high water usage?

C. UEMURA: Yes.

K. WILSON: And in this case, did the Department make a call to Mr. Frazer regarding this matter?

C. UEMURA: No.

K. WILSON: Um, and then in regards to Exhibit 6, Mr. Uemura, I noticed here when you explained about the leak in granting the leak, there is a six-month window?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

K. WILSON: Between the leak adjustment. How do you determine that six-month window?

C. UEMURA: Um, well, a little bit...well, normally, and again, this is prior to the recent rule change where the two billing periods...um, that the customer would, normally based on the

customer's repair date and the periods of high usage. And more specifically, on the application for leak adjustment, the dates need to be specified by the customer. So it could be anywhere from one billing period, two months...in this timeframe, up to three billing periods, or six months.

LENINGRAD ELARIONOFF: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I have five questions. Question No. 1, Mr. Fraser, what type of waterline are we taking about between the meter and your house?

E. FRAZER: Uh, it's Drisco, I think 1-inch Drisco, the black line.

L. ELARIONOFF: All the way?

E. FRAZER: All the way.

L. ELARIONOFF: Okay. Question No. 2 is how far between the meter and the house was the leak?

E. FRAZER: It was, uh, probably uh 150 feet, 150 I would say.

L. ELARIONOFF: Okay. So, we say 150 feet within the meter and the house, is that one-fourth the way, quarter way, half way, three quarter way?

E. FRAZER: It's about, um, about half way.

L. ELARIONOFF: And is this close to your driveway or...?

E. FRAZER: It goes up the driveway and then it goes over to the shower house. So we have a separate shower building, and the leak was in that line that goes from the main line going up the driveway to the shower house, the leak was there.

L. ELARIONOFF: Okay, I have a hard time understanding...shower house 150 feet from the...

E. FRAZER: Okay, so we have separate buildings. We have a kitchen, a house, a shower over here, so the line comes up the driveway and then it tees off that line and goes over to the shower house. So the leak was in that line that goes to the shower house. So it was about 150 feet from the meter to the tee and then another half-way to the shower house, say about another 40 feet.

L. ELARIONOFF: So in essence, a little bit too far for the Water Department to notice?

E. FRAZER: Yeah, yeah.

L. ELARIONOFF: Question No. 3, you had how many former leak adjustments prior to that?

E. FRAZER: How many?

L. ELARIONOFF: Yeah.

E. FRAZER: Three, huh? No, I had...let me see the exhibit...

C. UEMURA: Yeah, three.

E. FRAZER: Three.

L. ELARIONOFF: Okay. And the fourth question is what caused the leak?

E. FRAZER: Uh, somebody may have hit it with a machete or one of the connections, you know, Drisco has these, uh, connectors, and sometimes they fail or the hose clamp may fail, just over wearing out. In this case, I think it was a failed repair that we had done and then the repair failed and it leaked out.

L. ELARIONOFF: So, I have property too, so you...Drisco type of pipe, do you consider that dependable, undependable, or...?

E. FRAZER: It's been in there and it's pretty dependable.

L. ELARIONOFF: With three leaks in the past few years?

E. FRAZER: You have to be careful you don't hit it with a machete or a lawnmower. It's plastic so it's, you know...It's the way to go if you have a farm and it's like 500 feet all the way to the back.

L. ELARIONOFF: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay, I have a question. Mr. Uemura, okay, you stated that the Department did not call when the leak was...it was determined there was a leak? But can you clarify the policy or procedure of the Department whereas it's, you either call or send a letter? Can you clarify that?

C. UEMURA: Generally, we try to make a call, and the paperwork that is done to initiate the call is done by our meter readers. And in most cases, we attempt the call and then if we cannot get in touch, for whatever reason, phone disconnected, no message machine, then we elect to go to a mailout. In this particular case, the high reading was detected by our data entry people. And data entry is a non...let's say, a Customer Service function in the sense that they don't make direct contact with the customer so our data entry specialist just noted it, discovered it, and elected to just mail it out.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay. thank you. Any other questions? If not...

NESTORIO DOMINGO: I have a question. So you said you call, the standard procedure, to call, notify the customer if there is an incident of leak and also you send a letter?

C. UEMURA: Oh, gen...I guess just to recap, um, normally, our system would take care of that, meaning that if the customer's normal use...their current usage is above their historic six months usage, the system will automatically generate a letter on their bill. When we review, if the customer's previous usage is higher than...and what I mean by higher, is normally the message on the bill is triggered by a current usage more than 2.5 times higher than their previous six months. If we see something higher, with, what we call dial movement. In other words, when we went out there, we recorded a reading, and our data entry equipment has the capability of putting notes. So if we see the meter spinning, we know the leak is still continuing. That's when we make an effort to call the customer, okay? Um, for whatever, when we researched our records, this particular account didn't ring out at the meter so we had no indication whether the meter was spinning, wasn't spinning; but because it was, again, more than three times higher than what would have generated...I mean not what would have generated...our data entry specialist elected to send that

note. For most cases, the bill is what we use as a main vehicle for communicating to the customer that they have a high reading. So, like I said, the call or the individual direct contact with the customer generally is for extreme cases. In other words, the billing...the reading is higher than normal, but it's still going on, the meter is spinning when we...because if it's not spinning, whether we do it immediately or two days later with the bill, it's not an ongoing process. So that's how we try to strike a balance between getting the bill out on time versus scrutinizing every single account to see if we should make a call or not.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Any other questions? I think we have enough information.

A. SELF: Could I have one rebuttal question? Because I want to clarify something based on Ms. Wilson's question. So then just to reiterate, the high reading occurred on October 19<sup>th</sup>. That's when the meter reader would have gotten...would have read the meter, right?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: But then, you have the added process of the meter...that's possibly at the end of the work day, correct?

C. UEMURA: Yes.

A. SELF: Because it's a big area that she's covering.

C. UEMURA: So this route was unloaded in the afternoon of the 19<sup>th</sup>.

A. SELF: Okay, and then the next day, you have to process...you have to download the information and then you have to actually print out a report and go through it physically, is that correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: And so then that would have been noticed on October 20<sup>th</sup> right? Or about? And so then the notice, the actual notice before the bill was sent out was sent out on October 21<sup>st</sup>, correct?

C. UEMURA: Correct.

A. SELF: So not that much time passed between the time that the meter reader read the meter and the time that the initial notice was mailed out.

C. UEMURA: Right. And the 21<sup>st</sup> was a Friday, I believe, and then the 24<sup>th</sup> was a Monday that the actual bill got mailed out.

A. SELF: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Do we move on to deliberations at this point? Or...

R. KIM: You can ask for closing statements if you'd like to offer them.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay. Closing statements?

A. SELF: Should we get this?

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yeah.

E. FRAZER: I'm sorry, what?

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Do you have any closing statements Mr. Frazer?

E. FRAZER: Uh, no, I think I just made my appeal and I made my case and I think, you know, you folks are all fair and judging my appeal and uh, I hope that you guys continue with your good service to our Hawai'i County. I know it's a big job and a very large responsibility to supply water to especially the new subdivisions. Um, everybody wants County water, now especially with the rat lung problem. And I really appreciate the County water. So I think I'll just throw it out there for you folks to make a vote in my favor, I'll be very happy. If I don't, oh well, I'll still appreciate having the water.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Thank you Mr. Frazer. Any closing statements?

A. SELF: Just quickly. Um, I just want to reiterate that there is no mechanism in the Department Rules and Regulations by which the Department or the Board can provide a leak adjustment. That's the only remedy you have to compensate someone or have someone pay less than what their water bill is; and in this case, he simply didn't...unfortunately did not qualify for a leak adjustment and there is nothing else in the Rules that allow you to discount or waive any amount of a water bill except for leak adjustment, and he's had leak adjustments in the past. Unfortunately, he was very close. He only lacked two months. Uh, if it had happened two months later, he would have qualified for leak adjustment.

E. FRAZER: Two weeks.

A. SELF: Two weeks?

E. FRAZER: Less than two weeks.

A. SELF: I think it was two months right? December...

E. FRAZER: No, it was two weeks.

A. SELF: Anyway, it was close but in this case, it was within the three-year period, which is what is stated in Section 3-10 of the Department Rules, and thank you.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Can we move on to deliberation at this point?

R. KIM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Okay. I'd like to call for a Motion. Russell?

RUSSELL ARIKAWA: I move that we deny the petitioner's appeal.

L. ELARIONOFF: Second.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Seconded by Leningrad. Discussion?

R. ARIKAWA: Um, one of the reasons that I made that motion was that I believe the Department followed procedures in a timely manner. Mr. Uemura and his staff followed through what they are supposed to do and in fact they went one step beyond and sent a letter instead of just relying on the notice on the bill saying about high water usage. That's number one, and number two is because of the time. He already had a grant on...his appeal was granted on other leakage so this falls outside of that range.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Leningrad?

L. ELARIONOFF: Yeah, the reason I seconded the Motion, yeah, as far as I'm concerned, there is a responsibility on both sides, that the Water Department will provide the water. Water is such a valuable resource, the Water Department provides the water, Mr. Frazer has the responsibility to make sure that his line is also dependable. In this situation here, he had other leaks prior. I would think that being responsible would have to check the system and say something is wrong with that many leaks and not depend or hope that oh well, I'll ask for another leak adjustment. I think that's a failure here, Mr. Frazer, on your system. The Water Department did provide the water but what you said if a machete hits it or other things that happen, then maybe the waterline should be looked into and brought up to par so it is dependable. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Anybody else? You know, I'm a little bit familiar with the Drisco line, and it is a plastic pipe. It is pretty rigid, you know, and it can be used above ground; but it does have a life, you know, a lifetime to it, and it is susceptible to abrasion, like rock, or like Mr. Frazer said, being hit by something sharp. So I want to reiterate, you know, maybe you gotta do a very thorough inspection of the line and you can replace certain sections of it, yeah? Yeah, I'm pretty familiar with that, so, um, but we really appreciate you coming and presenting your case; but I gotta agree with the rest of the Board on this one. Anybody else have anything to say?

K. WILSON: I just want to thank the Department. I know sometimes these are very trying to help a customer and at the same time, ensure the integrity of our system, and the Department as well, so thank you to Mr. Uemura and the rest of the Department. I know it's very difficult, Mr. Frazer, but at the same time, our Department does a wonderful thing on making sure that we do have water for our entire island and so I have to mahalo them for that and hope it works out for the best.

E. FRAZER: Okay, well.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Oh, wait, if there are no other comments, I would like to call for a vote. All in favor?

R. ARIKAWA: You want to take an individual vote? We're going to take an individual vote, no?

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Do we have to do a roll call?

R. KIM: You can. It would make the record nice and clear because I think Mr. Elarionoff came in after we started already.

R. ARIKAWA: So you first?

WILLIAM BOSWELL: So my question is we are agreeing with what...?

R. ARIKAWA: Yes or no.

W. BOSWELL: Yes.

R. ARIKAWA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Yes.

L. ELARIONOFF: Aye.

K. WILSON: Aye.

N. DOMINGO: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON TAKAMINE: Motion carried. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Frazer.

E. FRAZER: Thank you. I will go pay my bill.

(Mr. Frazer left at 10:52 a.m.)

RECESS:

Chairperson Takamine called for a short recess at 10:52 a.m. The Board reconvened at 11:00 a.m.

- 2) STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC - None
- 3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES –
  1. March 28, 2017, Public Hearing on the Proposed 2018 Operating Budget, and
  2. March 28, 2017, Regular Water Board Meeting

ACTION: Mr. Elarionoff moved for approval of the Minutes; seconded by Ms. Wilson and carried unanimously by voice vote.

- 4) APPROVAL OF ADDENDUM AND/OR SUPPLEMENTAL – None
- 5) CONTESTED CASE HEARING:

Taken up earlier.

- 6) MISCELLANEOUS:

**A. WATER USE AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE - KEAUHOU AQUIFER SYSTEM AREA:**

---

The Water Use and Development Plan Update for the Keauhou Aquifer System area has been granted authorization by the Commission on Water Resource Management to proceed with the Water Board approval and subsequently the County Council approval process. This is the first of two Water Board Meetings to receive further input regarding the plan update.

Mr. Lance Fukumoto from the consulting firm, Fukunaga & Associates, gave a presentation on the Update.

Mr. Elarionoff's questions were answered as follows:

**1. Page 2-19 talks about groundwater water use and population. As population increases, water usage increases pretty much equal. What happens when you go to places that have catchment and you bring water to the catchment area? Would that not throw the whole thing off?**

Yes it would, but this was meant to be a reality check for the Keauhou area. On Page 2-20, there is a graph of the historical pumpage from the Keauhou aquifer's system compared to the population growth and you can see that the slope of the line is roughly equal. What they are saying is that it makes sense to, in the 20-year water demand scenario, to mirror the increase in pumpage to the population growth. It may not work for all areas, but in this area, it would.

**2. Page 4-6 last paragraph, "groundwater system extended well below sea level could exist." What is that based on?**

It is hypothesized. There was discovery of a confined aquifer. Right now, it is not very well known. The State Water Commission actually has a project implemented to further explore that potential resource. Nobody knows what it is capable of doing yet. It has been identified as a resource that exists. There is some information from existing wells, but the extent of this resource and how much it could possibly produce is not quite known at this time.

**3. Page 6-1, third paragraph, "Watershed management strategies should focus on removing these threats." It talks about fire, fountain grass and ungulates. It seems impossible. Shouldn't it be based something that is reachable instead of this far out dream?**

The Manager-Chief Engineer stated that in general, when you talk to the people who oversee watersheds and reforestation or rehabilitation, in general, that is what they will say. Mr. Inaba added that it is intended for little chunks at a time where you can accomplish it in specific areas, such as fencing projects, and re-establishing a forest by taking care.

**4. Page 2-7, "Quantifying the amount of surface or groundwater necessary for these uses is expected to be difficult. The information gathered will be shared with the CWRM with the hope that sustainable yields for aquifers or minimum instream use values for surface waters can be adjusted to take into account these valuable needs." What does the last sentence mean?**

The Manager-Chief Engineer explained that in the initial go-around with the consultant, they tried to identify an inventory, actual traditional and customary uses in the area, and they were hoping they could possibly utilize GIS to document where they are. That task proved difficult. For one, people were reluctant to share information or there was not much available information out there that resources were available to research. The intent back then was if anything was found, it would be shared with the Commission on Water Resource Management with the hope that it would factor into some of their decision-making on sustainable yield numbers or for minimum instream use standards. Unfortunately that effort did not pan out. A different approach was taken which is reflected in the body of the work.

**5. Page 9, Number 4, "Traditional and Customary Hawaiian rights." In the second sentence, it states, "impact to traditional and customary Hawaiian rights are often times difficult to predict but strategies to mitigate impacts and alternative strategies will be identified." Explain that.**

Mr. Fukumoto replied that, along the lines of what the Manager-Chief Engineer said earlier, the hope was to identify a database of the Traditional and Customary practices that are going on and then come up with mitigative measures in the plan. However, it did not pan out so they moved on to making the process that CWRM would follow by incorporating the requirement to determine these impacts into their well construction permit application. It is not necessarily defined explicitly in the plan, but the process is laid out to do it at the time a source development project is initiated.

Ms. Wilson had some comments and questions as follows:

1. ***Keauhou is misspelled a few places in the document, such as “Keauahou.”***
2. ***For the maps, please turn them landscape and increase the font size. They are very difficult to read.*** It was noted that some of the printouts were on 8½ x 11 paper. That could be fixed by printing maps out on 11x17 paper.
3. ***Figure 3-9 on Page 3-22, the Kona CDP overlap - she did not know what that area is. There is nothing there to describe what that section is. There are dotted lines. A legend would help.***
4. ***Explain Tables 3-15 and 3-16, the anticipated water demands versus the Hawai‘i County zoning water demands. There is a little bit of difference there and she knew it was based on looking at the 90% threshold. Explain why those two were broken up because she is seeing two different figures. Why the difference?*** The Manager-Chief Engineer stated there were two different approaches to forecasting future water needs. One was based on entitlements and approvals known to the Department at the time, which is the Anticipated Water Demands table, Table 3-15. Water Development Agreements with developers were taken into account. Their allotted units, any outstanding water commitments, service laterals that did not have a meter in them, open building permits, were all projected in. These are things that can happen five years from now, but more likely, thirty years from now with a full buildout of whatever has access to the water. For comparative purposes, Fukunaga & Associates also looked at the zoning and what would be capable of buildout by just looking at zoning and assessed future allocation of water needs based on zoning. They came out pretty close. The third thing was based on population projections, which is the more realistic approach. This is based on however many past years’ of population and pumpage history. They forecast future water needs, looking at it from different perspectives.
5. ***Chapter 5 – For the Cultural Issues and Public Consultation, am I to understand you only did assessments on two basic documents...EA’s and EIS’s?*** Mr. Fukumoto replied that was the preliminary resource, correct.
6. ***What is your research going to continue looking at after today, or if you are going to do any more? We know for a fact, we cannot only look at EA’s and EIS’s to determine traditional and customary practices.*** The Manager-Chief Engineer replied that it was the first finding of this effort. Overall, they went through close to 200 EA’s and only found one or two that had any mention of traditional and customary concerns. Obviously, that is not a fruitful way to evaluate those concerns. That is when it evolved into the actual proposed processes, what Mr. Fukumoto described, to include it in the well construction permitting process as part of CWRM’s permitting process whereby if you want to drill a well, you are going to have to reach out to that Aha Moku organization at the minimum. The hope is that supposedly, the Aha Moku was set up to get the people who actually are from that particular area to provide their input on the particular project. Both this Department and CWRM are hopeful that this will be the most productive way to actually get some information on traditional and customary related concerns for a particular project in a particular area, versus opening it up and having comments come from other parts of the island. Again, this is what is proposed and is planned to be implemented for the Department’s future wells. The process has yet to be gone through to see what the results or comments might be. As far as further research into documents, he did not think we are planning to do that.
7. ***I would like to encourage that in future development plans because I think we can go beyond just using EIS’s and EA’s. We have enough firms out there that have the ability and the capacity to also be doing research with archaeology, inventory studies, ethnographic studies, Hawaiian language newspapers, and things that would talk about the traditional and customary practices of those areas. And being that this report, that***

*was the second bullet in the report to really address, I would like to see more of that here. There is a website, "nakiloaina.com" that was developed by Ka'ūpūlehu which falls within this area here that talks about water and it also talks about the cycles in that area. So I would encourage the group to do that. As far as Aha Moku, I get it. I see what the ideal is for the use of the Aha Moku, but I would like the Department to think about developing its own advisory group on island to think about going right to and developing relationships with those kama'aina in the area and be able to then assist with future vetting of these types of processes because, again, we are getting back to Aha Moku is on that State level. But if we want to get back to looking at taking care of our own resources on our island, we have enough of the people on island to be able to do that as well. And so I would like the Department to take that under consideration as well.*

The Manager-Chief Engineer stated that the difficulty at this point in time with this framework is that it was already approved by the State Water Commission. If we start modifying this to such an extent, it may need to go back to them for re-approval. He proposed that we take what Ms. Wilson said and implement that on an internal protocol basis and guideline, internally. We can go over and beyond what this water use and development plan states. If the Board is okay with that approach, we can proceed and get this approved and commit to you that we will incorporate that for our work. The difficulty now will be if there are private well drillers that may not be subject to that same type of research. But definitely for our projects, C.I.P. well development projects, we can do what you propose. He asked if that sounded okay.

Ms. Wilson stated that sounded good. The other thing is there was a mention about developers adding that part of a vetting process with DWS, and asked if that was correct.

The Manager-Chief Engineer replied that what we can do is with each well development agreement, if the development is sizable enough where they need to construct a new well, typically the Department negotiates with a developer and comes up with a scope, not only for the actual physical requirements of the capital improvements required to do their project, but we can also negotiate terms of that agreement to include vetting to occur before taking over the well. We want to make sure that the Department and the Board is not in a position where we made this agreement and somebody comes out of the woodwork later on and say you did not factor this in. If we incorporate some of your recommendations into our internal guidelines and protocols, we can then expand that to part of our negotiations with private well development and ultimately those agreements come before the Board for review and approval also.

Mr. Elarionoff stated that the thing about Aha Moku, he did not necessarily agree. It makes him nervous because he is from Ka'ū and he knows more things about Ka'ū than 7/8's of the people that live in Ka'ū today. If you confine it to that group, what about the other outside information you miss?

Ms. Wilson stated that was why she was suggesting we make our own and not have to go to Aha Moku.

The Manager-Chief Engineer stated at this point, we have to at least go to Aha Moku because that was what was accepted by the Commission. However, it does not say we have to stop there. Hopefully we can have the discretion to go over and beyond that basic requirement.

Mr. Elarionoff asked the Manager-Chief Engineer if the Board can assume he is going to keep his word.

The Manager-Chief Engineer replied yes and there are minutes to prove that. That was part of our concern, too, was what we did not want to also get faced with is getting into conflicts where our projects would not proceed. That is the balance that we need to strike...getting valid information, but at the same time, moving forward with worthwhile projects. Time will tell.

Chairperson Takamine asked the Manager-Chief Engineer to update the new Board members on the importance of this Water Use and Development Plan and some of the goals the Department had to meet over the past year.

The Manager-Chief Engineer reviewed that this Water Use and Development Plan is part of an overall State Water Plan. It is mandated by Hawai'i Revised Statutes, and in the State Water Plan, there are five components. As part of that framework, the State of Hawai'i, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Commission on Water Resource Management (CWRM) oversees the waters of the State. In 2013, the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Park filed a petition to designate this Keauhou Aquifer System as a groundwater management area. What that means is if it gets designated, there is a higher level of scrutiny by the State on each well, even existing wells. This Department or any private entity who owned a well would need to reapply for a water use permit with the State. Every water use permit would then be subject to contested case hearings. Example, if someone were not in agreement that one of the Department's wells was being utilized properly, they could possibly have standing to file a contested case. The main concern was that in that Keauhou area, that petition to designate was premature. In other words, the aquifer was not in harm's way. That mechanism was put in place, if all the County/State protective processes still were not enough to protect the aquifer, somebody could petition to have it further managed. Over the past three and a half years, this Department's position was that the petition was premature. The potential for adverse impacts to our community outweighed the concerns of the petitioner. It appeared that the petitioner filed that to protect their interests rather than to protect the aquifer. What that caused this Department to do was in the 2010 Water Use and Development Plan, two areas were identified that warranted further consideration. One was Keauhou and the other was Waimea. Because of this petition, the Department decided to focus on Keauhou, which is the reason for this Water Use and Development Plan Update. Because Fukunaga & Associates did such a terrific job addressing the CWRM's concerns and questions as they related to the petition to designate, to him, and some of the Commissioners put it on record and said that because this was a good enough document, they felt comfortable that the County did have its hands on the situation and felt comfortable with denying that petition to designate the aquifer. That was another reason he did not want to touch the content of this document too much, because it is a document that this Department is committed to follow and has been accepted by the State Water Commission and is part of the reason why they decided not to designate the Keauhou Aquifer. Today's presentation may have only been fifteen minutes, but this document has been two and a half years worth of effort.

Mr. Domingo asked if you put the Keauhou Aquifer into a water resource management, does that limit the County as far as drawing the water out of that aquifer?

The Manager-Chief Engineer replied that was correct. Currently, the Department has thirteen wells in that Keauhou Aquifer System and is pumping roughly eleven to twelve

million gallons a day. The Department would have to go to the State and ask their permission to continue to pump that water. Somebody could come in and say the County has people out there wasting water and suggest a more appropriate number of, say, ten that it should be allocated. The Department would have to apply for an allocation and the State Water Commission would grant an allocation, but it is dependent upon clearing that process, which could include a contested case hearing. The Department could lose two million gallons in that example. That was one of our big concerns.

Mr. Domingo asked a general interest question about the Kona area, whereby he noticed that overlay on the groundwater and this aquifer. He asked if the Manager-Chief Engineer thinks, with the projected growth on that side of the island relying mostly on groundwater, whether there would be sufficient water to sustain that population's growth and demand.

The Manager-Chief Engineer replied yes. That is what this whole document is about is to try and anticipate what the future water needs are and to ensure there is enough water in the aquifer to sustain that growth. This document will be kept a live, active document, because plans change over time. Currently, the County is undergoing their update of the General Plan so if that changes, this Department would revisit the Water Use and Development Plan. Things like the Kealakehe Treatment Plant where the County has a project to upgrade the plant to provide R1 water--if that becomes more of a reality, hopefully, that will free up what people are using this Department's water for now to irrigate, and use the R1 water instead. That would lead to more of a cushion on the potable water.

Mr. Domingo stated that his concern had to do with coming from California were water is a big issue. On the west side of this island, the Kona side, it does not get a lot of rain to supply the groundwater, and sustaining this supply of water is a big issue.

The Manager-Chief Engineer noted that the Department is constantly keeping an eye on it to ensure the resource is not put in harm's way.

Mr. Elarionoff asked for clarification that the R1 water would need another delivery system.

The Manager-Chief Engineer replied that was correct, but it would not be this Department's delivery system. Part of it is being constructed with the Queen Ka'ahumanu Highway Widening project. There are also plans to utilize it at the old airport and even a commitment, he believed, from Planning and Parks for the future Kealakehe Regional Park to utilize it for the bulk of irrigation needs there. Again, this Department is hopeful that project comes to fruition whereby that type of water may be used for irrigation needs.

Chairperson Takamine thanked the Manager-Chief Engineer for his update and noted that Mr. Fukumoto would be back at next month's meeting in Kona if any Board members had further questions.

(Ms. Nancy Cook-Lauer left the meeting at 11:51 a.m.)

**B. MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT:**

Mr. Arikawa asked if the Laupahoehoe (Manowaiopae) 0.5 MG Reservoir is still ongoing.

Mr. Inaba replied that there are some punch list items to be taken care of, but the system is operating.

Ms. Wilson asked about the Āhualoa-Honoka‘a Transmission Waterline Phase 2 project, which shows a similar status.

Mr. Inaba replied the status would be the same as the Laupāhoehoe project.

The Manager-Chief Engineer stated that the spreadsheet shows the percentages of what the Department has paid out versus the full contract amount. When it gets into the 90 percent range, typically, the Department is using the project but is waiting for closing documents such as warranties.

Mr. Arikawa asked about the Paukaa Waterline Relocation. The report indicates a community meeting was held. He asked if delays along the highway can be expected.

Mr. Inaba replied it will be a short crossing of the highway. A traffic control plan was worked out with the State Department of Transportation.

**C. REVIEW OF MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:**

No questions.

**D. DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY PROPOSED OPERATING AND 5-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (C.I.P.) BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018:**

The Department’s Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Budget, totaling \$54,178,000 and 5-Year C.I.P. Budget for Fiscal Year 2018-2022, totaling \$72,200,000, have been distributed for the Board’s review. The Board may change either Budget, or adopt them as presented over two readings.

The Manager-Chief Engineer recommended that the Water Board approve the Department’s Fiscal Year 2018 Operating and 5-year C.I.P. budgets for Fiscal Years 2018-2022 on this second of two readings.

ACTION: Mr. Arikawa moved for approval of the recommendation; seconded by Ms. Wilson and carried unanimously by voice vote.

**E. MANAGER-CHIEF ENGINEER’S REPORT:**

The Manager-Chief Engineer provided updates on the following:

- 1) North Kona Water Restriction Update – Mr. Uyehara reported on the existing water restriction. He explained that the North Kona water system is from Makalei on the north side to the Teshima’s area in the south and everything makai to mauka. It generally covers the Keauhou aquifer area so some of those maps are relevant. There are thirteen existing sources there. Seven are high level, which is mauka side of Māmalahoa Highway, and six are in the basal source area. Currently, four of the mauka high-level wells are inoperable and under repair by contract. During the repair period, the Department had asked the public and community for their cooperation in order for the Department to meet everyone’s daily potable needs. There have been roadside signs

used, and the Department has coordinated with Civil Defense to get out text messages and emails about the situation. Radio ads and email through the WaterSmart program have also been used. The Department is trying to keep the word out there. Wai'aha Well will hopefully be the first well to get back online in July. The Department will continue to coordinate enhanced public outreach. Ms. Matsumoto will be visiting non-residential and commercial customers to reinforce the message of the need for water reduction. Ms. Matsumoto added that the Department is working with Civil Defense to provide them with weekly updates on the repairs and continuing to make sure that the public is aware of the situation. The Manager-Chief Engineer added that every day, we are getting reports from the district supervisor in Kona on the tank levels. It is really believed to be non-consumptive uses because the tank levels recover immediately whenever it rains. That is why we are trying to figure out the best way to get the word out in an appropriate way to the appropriate people.

2) Employee of the Quarter presentations for 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2017

The Manager-Chief Engineer noted there was a tie for this first quarter of 2017. Mr. Uyehara introduced Mr. Lindo Matsu from our Operations Division. Lindo is a Water Plant Operator from our Waimea baseyard. He started with the Department in 2000 as a Clerk-Meter Reader, in 2003 he moved to Waterworks Helper in the Field Section, and in 2011, he became a Water Plant Operator. The district he has to cover is from Laupāhoehoe up the Hāmākua Coast, Waimea Town, Kawaihae, and North Hawai'i. On a daily basis, he is responsible for checking all of the stations, which is our tanks our wells and chlorinators to make sure they are functioning properly and to make sure that in our finished water reservoirs, there is an adequate level of residual chlorine. If there are any issues, he either is responding to correct it on the spot or may be out coordinating with the electricians in the district if a booster is not pumping properly. He has an expansive area to cover on a daily basis and is a one-man shop who gets it done every day. As noted from his supervisors, he takes initiative to learn new things and is not afraid of challenges. He actively takes part in planning solutions, is a team player, and collaboratively tries to help fix the problems and make this a better department for everybody involved. Chairperson Takamine added that he read the recommendation and was very impressed and thanked Mr. Matsu for the good work.

Mr. Sumada presented Ms. Renee Kusano who has just been promoted to Senior Account Clerk in the Finance Division and works exclusively on payroll. This past December, the Department's payroll person of 25 years retired and was a person who never missed a payroll and her accuracy was consistent, so hers were big shoes to fill. Ms. Kusano is turning out to be the person who is going to fill those shoes. She has been with the Department only a couple of years but has been taking care of the payrolls these last three months, down a position, and doing very well. She is being recognized today for that effort. The Manager-Chief Engineer added that it is not easy doing payroll; you have to factor in all of the contract requirements, if there is overtime, if an employee worked nighttime, if they have a differential, if they get meal allowance, etc.

3) Retiree of the Department of Water Supply – Mr. Uemura introduced Ms. Ilene Wood. She is just shy of 11½ years with the Department. She works in the Customer Service Section in Hilo. He noted that it takes a special personality to work in Customer Service. She has also been instrumental for the Department when the old billing system changed over to the new one and helped identify services that are not within the Department's service limits, or out-of-bounds accounts. They have been flagged in the system so staff may follow up with the customer more closely. She is a very

conscientious person who always checks before taking vacation so that her Section is not short-handed. She has been instrumental in a lot of the Department's pot lucks and adds small details to make them special. She is headed off to retire in Oregon. The Manager-Chief Engineer added that Ms. Wood has had letters of commendation from customers during her time with the Department.

F. **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT:**

Chairperson Takamine reported that he had the opportunity to travel to Oahu recently and was invited on a tour to of the Waihe Tunnel. It is an amazing opportunity. Taking that one-hour tour gave him insight as to where the water source was in that area and how it is distributed. He talked to Mr. Ikeda today before the meeting and asked him if the new Water Board members, or even current members, could take site visits, whether it be in Waimea, the wind farm, or the Kahalu'u Shaft. He would like them to have that opportunity. Mr. Ikeda noted that he could be contacted directly, or through the Secretary, to arrange site visits.

7) **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

1. **Next Meeting:**

The next meeting of the Water Board is scheduled for May 23, 2017, at the West Hawai'i Civic Center, Community Center (Building G); 74-5044 Ane Keohokalole Highway, Kailua-Kona, Hawai'i

2. **Following Meeting:**

The following meeting of the Water Board is scheduled for June 27, 2017, at the Department of Water Supply, Operations Center Conference Room; 889 Leilani Street, Hilo, Hawai'i

8) **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** Mr. Arikawa moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ms. Wilson and carried unanimously by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary