

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ANDY D. RUTLEDGE
Division 5
President

KEITH DYAS
Division 2
Vice President

CARL B. HUNTER, JR.
Division 1

FRANK S. DONATO
Division 3

GEORGE M. LANE
Division 4

NEAL A. WEISENBERGER
Division 6

DAVID RIZZO
Division 7



A PUBLIC AGENCY

OFFICERS

RUSSELL E. FULLER
General Manager

BEST, BEST and KRIEGER
Attorneys

MARILYN L. METTLER
Secretary-Treasurer

BOYLE ENGINEERING CORP.
Consulting Engineers

February 7, 2005

Dear Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Customer:

New water quality standards that will significantly impact AVEK's treatment process will become effective by 2006. AVEK has, over the past two years, conducted an extensive evaluation, including pilot testing, of known processes that could be incorporated to assure system compliance. The abbreviated summary of the findings is attached for your review.

The main objective of the process change is to lower trihalomethane (THM) levels to meet USEPA standards. The two processes that have been identified for meeting that goal are referred to as Ozone + Chloramines (Chloramine) and Adsorber GAC (GAC). The Chloramine option would add about \$47/AcFt to AVEK's cost and about \$17/AcFt to most purveyor's costs. The GAC alternative would add about \$180/AcFt to the price of AVEK water, but would not require changes to purveyors' systems.

The obvious advantage of the chloramine option is the lower cost. The main disadvantages are: 1) the GAC may be a longer term solution as eventually disinfection by products from chloramine use may be identified.; 2) A major consumer notification program is required if a system is converted from chlorine to chloramines; 3) Blending chloraminated water with chlorinated water in a distribution system can create water quality concerns and it is probable that most systems using chlorine will need to convert to chloramines. The estimated costs for other systems to convert is shown in the cost analysis as Purveyor Cost; and 4) system operators will need specific training on chloramine use and monitoring.

Meeting the new standards will require a very significant change in AVEK's operations. The Agency recognizes the need for a series of meetings with each retail purveyor to answer questions, explore unique circumstances that exist with each system, and, most importantly, to receive your input and recommendations on how to proceed.

Please provide the details on your system as indicated in the attached questionnaire. We recognize that the questionnaire will require some time to complete however, the information is vital to understanding the potential impact of AVEK treated water to your system.

Thank you for the your time and effort that will be necessary in this process. Please contact Mr. Michael Flood or me to initialize the process.

Thank you,

Russell E. Fuller

Russell E. Fuller
General Manager

Enclosure: Questionnaire

Treated Water Cost Analysis

Treatment Technology	Water Quality				Average Cost (\$/AF) for Blends of Imported/Local	
	Quartz Hill Capacity (mgd)	THMs	Taste & Odor Control	AVEK Cost Billed to Purveyors (\$/AF)		
Chloramines	65	Low	No	12	17	29
GAC	65	Low to Very Low	Yes	180	0	180
Ozone & Chloramines	65	Very Low	Yes	47	17	64

CHECKLIST OF ITEMS REQUESTED FROM EACH UTILITY

- Annual Water Quality Report (Title 22 Data) for each source water supply (except AVEK supply).
- Map of distribution system including existing and future supplies.
- Description of how and where AVEK water will be blended with existing supplies. Please include specific discussion on how chloraminated water from AVEK will be blended with any existing chlorinated supplies.
- Average monthly water demand during 2004 (See Attachment 1).
- Average monthly flow from each water source during 2004 (See Attachment 1).
- Please describe how the AVEK Entitlement will be used (peaking, base, etc.) and approximately what impact the AVEK supply will have on the monthly flows for each existing source (as listed in Attachment 1).
- Average chlorine residual entering distribution system from each source water supply during 2004 (See Attachment 1).
- Total Coliform Rule compliance data for 2004 (See Attachment 2).
- Lead and Copper Rule compliance data (See Attachment 3).
- Summary of customer complaint data (See Attachment 4).

ATTACHMENT 1

Water Demand Data From 2004

Month	Average Total Demand	Average Flow Source 1	Average Flow Source 2	Average Flow Source 3
January				
February				
March				
April				
May				
June				
July				
August				
September				
October				
November				
December				

Note: Please identify units used in table _____

Source Name/Location:

Source 1 _____

Source 2 _____

Source 3 _____

Chlorine Residual

Year Average:

_____ mg/L

_____ mg/L

_____ mg/L

(If there are more than three (3) sources of supply to the distribution system, please make additional copies of this sheet as needed.)

Is a positive chlorine residual consistently maintained throughout the distribution system? If no, please explain: _____

ATTACHMENT 2

Total Coliform Rule Compliance Data

Has the utility ever violated the Total Coliform Rule? Yes No

Of yes, please explain the circumstances: _____

Number of Samples Collected Each Month for TCR Compliance: _____

Percent of Total Samples Containing Coliform Bacteria During Each Month of 2004:

January:	_____	%
February:	_____	%
March:	_____	%
April:	_____	%
May:	_____	%
June:	_____	%
July:	_____	%
August:	_____	%
September:	_____	%
October:	_____	%
November:	_____	%
December:	_____	%

ATTACHMENT 4

Summary of Customer Complaint Data

Typical Number of Water quality-Related Customer Complaints per Month:

Is there any noticeable seasonal variation in the type or number of customer complaints? If yes, please describe below:

Proportion of Complaints Corresponding to Items Listed Below:

Color Complaints:

Red or Rusty: _____ %
Blue: _____ %
Yellow or Brown: _____ %
Other: _____ %

Odor Complaints:

Musky or Earthy: _____ %
"Rotten Egg": _____ %
Other: _____ %

Additional Comments Related to Customer Complaints:

