



# Public Utility District No. 1 of Klickitat County

80 Years of Service \* 1938-2018

## GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

For the August 14, 2018 Meeting

### AGENDA ITEMS:

- A. RESOLUTION NO. 1765- PURMS 2018 ILA- At the PURMS meeting in June the members agreed to approve the Public Risk Management services and Approval of the PURMS 2018 Amended and Restated Inter-local Agreement. This resolution finalizes the approval step.
- B. VEHICLE DISCUSSION- Jeff Thayer will provide information regarding the vehicles that he would like to purchase from the 2019 budget year. He will be requesting permission to place the orders now, so we will receive and pay for the vehicles in 2019 as budgeted. We have found in the past that a delay in ordering causes a delay in receiving the vehicles. There will be no additional expense out of the 2018 budget due to this request.
- C. POLICY 7 DISCUSSION- Brandy Myers will bring back the recommendation of staff regarding limitations of the reimbursement parameters for discovered errors. The recommendation is to make the reimbursement practices the same period of time for recoverable costs, whether the finding benefits the customer or the KPUD. This recommendation would also limit reimbursements to existing customers.

### NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Meetings**- I attended the West Coast TEA Partners meeting Wednesday and Thursday last week. I had a chance to talk with PowerEx and TEA regarding markets and potential RNG opportunities. There was a block chain discussion, which I thought was very enlightening, that I will talk about at the meeting.

I am scheduled for personal leave three days this week, so my report is short for this meeting.

2. **Performance Reviews**- I completed performance reviews for my direct reports for the first half of 2018. All managers and supervisors are in the process of their reviews as well. I am very pleased on the focus managers are placing on their goals, and therefore on working towards strategic planning related initiatives. I think the stage will be well set for our next strategic session this November.
3. **NISC** – the accounting conversion team was on site three days this week to start the process. Employee participation has been excellent. I think that is due to great employees that care about what they do, but I also think it is reflection of how much they want improved system tools to work with. Thank you for your support in moving this project forward. Go live dates

are still holding at December for billing and January for accounting and related systems.

4. **Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) Follow-up**- This is a reprint of a WPUDA summary from the last monthly meeting:

During the WPUDA July Communications and Government Relations meeting, the PDC provided information regarding how PUDs may/may not engage when ballot measures come up that impact the utility. There were several questions posed to the PDC that required follow up. Below you will find the answers provided by the speaker, Jennifer Hansen (in red type). The answer to the second question is concerning as it restricts our ability to inform our communities when ballot measures are in the signature gathering stage. I am going to follow up on question 2. Further clarification is needed on providing information on ballot measure impacts to the media or public during signature gathering PRIOR to the PUD taking a formal position. I believe the restriction would have a chilling effect on transparency and silence local government during an important part of the initiative process, preventing citizens from receiving information critical to their decision making.

1. PUDs may provide factual information regarding the impact of legislation/ballot measures to their customers through their usual methods. For example, if the PUD usually communicates about issues through a newsletter, then that means of communications would be appropriate. The question is when a PUD employs a new method of communications to their customers, such as a new digital format or starting a newsletter. Because it is new and hasn't been previously used, can a PUD use that method of communication on legislation/ballot measures? One idea mentioned that you indicated would work was to have the elected board pass a policy to start new ways to communicate to customers. Please clarify if that would be effective for establishing a communication method as a usual method for sharing information on ballot measures/legislation. – **First, creating a general policy is not necessary but I do believe it will create consistency among your individual PUDs and provide information to your members who need it. Starting something new would not create an issue on its own. The PUD could not use public funds to support or oppose a ballot measure. However, as you have already described, the PUD is allowed to create a set of facts for the purpose of informing the general public (or in this case the customers of the PUD) about the operational and maintenance issues of the PUD. In addition, the PUD could distribute this factual information through its normal means of communicating such information. If the PUD decides to begin communicating about the topics above AND wants to use a new means of communication, they could do so by continuing to use the new method of communication for factual information and/or other topics. For example, a Twitter account is created to communicate about a current ballot measure's impact on the PUD. It could be problematic if this new Twitter account is only used when a PUD is affected by a ballot measure and the PUD does not use Twitter for other communications or topics.**
2. The other question was about providing information to customers and/or following the statutory specifications for a PUD to take a position on a ballot measure. Can this happen during signature gathering when PUD customer may be making a decision on whether or not to sign a petition or can it only happen after the initiative is certified and on the ballot? And, what about media inquiries? - **I brought this question up with the compliance division staff. The consensus was that the PUD should hold off on providing factual information regarding the fiscal or other impact until the measure is certified – not during the signature gathering process. There was a specific scenario brought up about inquiries from the media or the public who see the signature gathering process and want to know where the PUD stands.**

Staff believes that providing the PUD's position prior to the measure being certified could be seen as support or opposition and might be a use of facilities issue.

There was one more question that was asked at the event but not included here regarding the requirement to include political contributions on the L-5. RCW 42.17A.635 specifically prohibits public funds to be used for making campaign contributions. In addition, it requires that personal funds are reported in some instances. Please share with your members that they will not need to include personal contributions made to candidates on the L-5. PDC staff will be updating the L-5 form, the written instructions and the training materials so they align with the statute.