

WAMC Survey and KPI Committee
March 2, 2023

Attendees:

Evan Pratt, Brian Vilmont, Olivia Olsztyn-Budry, Randall Roost, Carrie Ricker Cox

- Approved Meeting minutes from March 2nd
- Review Water Survey Results
 - Breaks up significantly from previous years survey
 - Appears to be a few utilities with majority of the breaks
 - Group also feels that systems are doing a better job of recording / tracking
 - Also feel that lead service line replacement is using both money and staffing causing many communities to reduce their watermain replacement program
 - 1% replacement value only applicable when starting from scratch. Since most systems are 50+ years old and they have not been collecting 1% concern that this is too low and not reflective of need
 - Prefer replace poor and very poor in 5 years is better (note not all systems provided condition so this may under represent)
 - Could floor be 1% as an absolute minimum? Concern once you allow a floor to exist utilities may not shoot for more, which they may need.
 - However, many systems are not doing 1% and need to gear up over time to minimize impact on rates
 - Concern labor and materials not available and this may not be reflected in 5 year CIP
- Labor Force
 - Concern with ability to complete CIP in industry as fewer people to do same amount of work AND
 - New generation with more work life balance working fewer hours
 - Cannot resolve but can identify in the story = There needs to be more investment
- Stormwater
 - Looks much different than last year, mostly due to one applicant
 - Those that knew length, knew condition this year
 - Should we bring last year's data into this year for cumulative?
 - Yes, feel like this would give a better picture
- Overall idea of feet of pipe in the state
 - Storm easier to guess with count of roads...
 - 41,000 county drain miles, 122,000 miles of roads = total 120-160k
 - Water main more in a vacuum
 - Conclusion? Tracking at <10% of what is out there
- Sanitary
 - Thought the percent of unknown was higher than expected, especially with SAW grant
 - SAW grants still have more (and better?) data than we are receiving but this data is getting stale
 - <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/80bdb83ff64e4913bf436046bcae3397>
 -

- EGLE working with WAMC to help mine existing submissions
 - Forming group to review new forms to help process
- Mandate that we review survey for completeness.
 - Approved but would like to change from complete to “current” as some are not complete but they provided the best data available.
 - What happens to those that do not submit?
 - Round 1 – decided to ask again in 3 years
 - Recommendation to contact and ask to submit round 3
- Data Collecting
 - What is bare minimum important information
 - Do you know LOS?
 - Do you have criticality goal?
 - Don’t want to loose these pieces of AM is go to existing submissions only to bring in data
- Annual Report
 - Note cannot compare year 1 and year 2 data collection (alphabetical so cannot draw conclusions)
 - Really would like each year on its own and a combination
 - Should we recommend training programs?
 - What we have is addressing condition of system
 - Concern that we need to address licensed operators
 - In statute MIC in charge of training but WAMC should have a say in the plan
 - Evan to bring up in WAMC council...
 - Pressure pipe
 - Vertical assets
 - inspections
 - Other topics may be helpful for training...
 - REMEMBER – operators are a critical asset to the system
 - Plan to present completeness and draft reports at the may WAMC meeting

ACTION ITEMS

1. Carrie to combine year 1 and year 2 data
2. Carrie and Evan to make recommendation to WAMC to contact those who have not submitted
3. Carrie to recreate new reports mimicking last year for Round 2 and a combined Year 1 and 2
4. Carrie to Reschedule April 27th meeting as overlaps WAMC council
5. Evan to bring up at WAMC council meeting discussion relating to training