

This issue of "The Clarifier" is published by the Kansas Rural Water Association and is provided to water and wastewater utilities, associate members, agencies and other friends. Have a comment? Send it to KRWA at P.O. Box 226, Seneca, KS 66538; ph. 785/336-3760; e-mail: krwa@krwa.net. This newsletter is in addition to KRWA's regular news magazine, *The Kansas Lifeline*.



# CLARIFIER

August 2014

Vol. 4

## National Rural Water Association Advocates for Relief Under the Lead and Copper Rule

By Elmer Ronnebaum  
KRWA General Manager

***Public water systems in Kansas and across the nation could benefit greatly from updating of the Lead and Copper Rule. The National Rural Water Association is pressing for such relief from what has become unnecessary in the opinion of many water system professionals.***

**T**he "Lead and Copper Rule", or LCR, is one of the many regulations covered by the Safe Drinking Water Act. The LCR limits the concentration of lead and copper allowed in public drinking water at the consumer's tap. The Rule was first issued in 1991. The intent of the Rule is to limit levels of lead and copper in the drinking water. Most systems have shown consistent compliance over many years but some have to improved treatment and some have eliminated lead lines.

### IN THIS ISSUE...

- National Rural Water Association Advocates for Relief Under the Lead and Copper Rule
- Sustainable Management for Water and Wastewater Utilities Workshops
- Changing Rules for Professionals Who Assist Local Governments
- EPA Proposes Rule to Clarify Clean Water Act
- Training – KRWA's Number 1 Mission



The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency made minor revisions in the Rule in 1999; those were included in the Final Rule in 2000. One of the revisions was to allow states to grant monitoring waivers to small systems with plumbing that was free of lead and copper-containing materials. While nearly all systems have copper plumbing and documenting no lead would difficult, why not provide monitoring waivers to small systems if those systems show, eg., ten years of sampling with consistent compliance?

Recently, a water system in Idaho suggested that the National Rural Water Association support permanent waivers for certain systems. That water system commented as follows: "Although the LCR was productive to some extent, enough years of sampling have gone by to identify water systems that are merely wasting revenue by continued sampling (ours being one of them). Modern plumbing materials insure that future

sample results can only decrease. The 'one size fits all' regulatory mentality is ridiculous. We have no reason to conduct corrosion control treatment, no lead pipes, lead or copper levels of concern. We do not plan to develop a different water source. I would think a permanent waiver would be appropriate, with the condition that it could be withdrawn if a change warranted it."

John Sasur, the NRWA negotiator on the panel,

replied: "Agreed, as a small system operator and sitting on the committee, this is one of our primary goals. As it stands now, it seems only a system with plastic pipe, fittings and valves and homes with all the same non-metal plumbing would qualify for nine-year exemptions."<sup>1</sup>

In most systems in Kansas, the continued monitoring will show that water systems are in compliance and the water will be safe for the customers. Much money and time, and tracking by the regulators, could be saved if small systems were granted waivers for sampling and analyses. The time has come for a "re-think" and change in some of what is proving out to be unnecessary requirements associated with the Lead and Copper Rule.

<sup>1</sup> Keegan, Mike. "NRWA Advocates for Relief from the Lead and Copper Rule (LCR)." [www.ruralwater.org](http://www.ruralwater.org). Web. 21 July 2014.



# Sustainable Management for Water and Wastewater Utilities Workshops

If your water or wastewater system has an existing or are making application for a new loan or grant through USDA Rural Development, then you need to read this article.

In 2014, KRWA is currently scheduled to host three workshops titled, "Sustainable Management for Water and Wastewater Utilities." When you read this title, you might be wondering, what does sustainable management mean? This program was developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to help cities and rural water districts identify and address various utility management issues. These may include aging or inadequate infrastructure, difficulties recruiting or retaining qualified staff, growing or establishing financial reserves, and setting rates that are reflective of operational costs. KRWA has been tasked with presenting this program to systems in a workshop format which focuses on ten key management areas:

1. Water Resource Adequacy (Water Quantity)
2. Product Quality (Clean & Safe Water)
3. Customer Satisfaction
4. Community Sustainability & Economic Development
5. Employee Leadership & Development (Training, Career Enhancement)
6. Financial Viability (Rates)
7. Operational Optimization (Pressure, Flow, Quality, Energy Efficiency)

## Workshop Feedback

Here are several comments that registrants provided following the July 16th session at Iola:

*"This workshop gave us an opportunity to meet with other people and get ideas on how to improve our operations."*

*"Good to hear from other systems with similar problems and how they address them. Best part of the program!"*

*"The Self-Assessment is a good tool that I plan to take back to my board."*

8. Infrastructure Stability (Asset Management – Repair/Replacement of System Components)
9. Operation Resiliency (Vulnerability Assessments, Emergency Response Plans)
10. Stakeholder Understanding & Support (Outreach & Education)

The workshops include a guided self-assessment for each system to identify which of the ten key management areas need improvement and are critical to success at their utility. The self-assessment is designed to help prioritize actions when resources are limited. Those attending are able to learn from other utilities that have faced similar challenges. Workshop attendees are also introduced to the system management improvement plan, which is a useful resource for listing priority management areas, describing improvement activities, and establishing a timeline for each activity/objective.

The target audience for these workshops includes city councils and RWD board members, and utility staff members that have management responsibilities. A participating city or RWD may also send operators, clerks, and office staff. It is important to note that USDA Rural Development is working on making attendance at one of these workshops a condition for new and existing borrowers.

To register for a workshop, see the sessions listed on the KRWA Web site at [www.krwa.net/training/calendar.asp](http://www.krwa.net/training/calendar.asp) or call KRWA at 785-336-3760. Do you want KRWA to present a system-specific workshop for your staff, board/council, and local decision makers? KRWA will do that! Contact Monica Wurtz at [monica@krwa.net](mailto:monica@krwa.net) or 913-314-5835. For more information on the Sustainable Management for Water and Wastewater Utilities program, visit: <http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/UWP-WorkshopSupplementalMaterials.html>

## Upcoming Workshop Dates & Locations

- Mayetta, Prairie Band Conference Center – October 29, 2014
- Hays, Hadley Center – October 23, 2014

## The Municipal Advisor Rule: Changing Rules for Professionals Who Assist Local Governments (and some understanding for local units of government)

By Gary Hanson and Todd Luckman  
Stumbo Hanson LLP

One of the many products of the 2008 housing crash and resulting recession was the passage of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in 2010. While other provisions of the Act garnered headlines, a less well-known part contained a change to existing statutes and regulations to provide new duties for “municipal advisors”. The changed rule was proposed to prevent harm to investors due to the risky investment strategies pursued by some large municipalities. Sometimes, local governments may have invested the proceeds of bonds into lucrative and complex investments instead of using the funds to build infrastructure. This was aided by third party investment managers whose actions were fraught with conflict of interest issues and political patronage concerns. To address this, the Act added new legal duties for municipal advisors along with a registration requirement. After passage of the Act, municipal advisors would be fiduciaries of their client municipalities, would be subject to registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and would have to submit reports to the government. While regulation of small municipalities and government-sponsored lending were not considerations in the passage of the new law, these provisions will have an effect on how small communities, lawyers and engineers approach these transactions. Managers, officers, council members and board members should be aware of these rules, as the regulation will change what information can be provided to a municipality and the parties who will provide it.

Section 15B(a)(1) of the Act makes it unlawful for a municipal advisor to provide advice to, or on behalf of, a municipal entity with respect to municipal financial products or the issuance of municipal securities, or to

undertake a solicitation of a municipal entity, unless the municipal advisor is registered with the SEC. This is a broad and general rule that not only would control the actions of an investment advisor for a large city, but could also apply to anyone providing advice to a municipality about loans or bond issues for construction of improvements. It is certainly recognized by the SEC that this new law implicates independent accountants, lawyers and engineers consulting with municipalities. Instead of creating a narrow and strict rule for a few investment specialists, the focus of the regulations and comments has been to limit the reach of certain terms in the law to allow actions that do not undermine the purpose of regulating municipal securities in the current market. As a result, there are very few bright-line rules established by the regulations. So, those parties who assist municipalities in the planning and funding of infrastructure projects will need to understand the rules and how to apply them in each situation they encounter.

The first question is whether someone is providing “advice” to a municipality. The SEC has refused to state a clear rule, but instead has outlined some general standards to determine if advice has been given. First, a person can provide general information that does not involve a recommendation, more particularly:

- ◆ Information of a factual nature without subjective assumptions, opinions or views;
- ◆ Information that is not particularized to a specific municipal entity or type of municipal entity;

- ◆ Information that is widely disseminated for use by the public, clients, or market participants other than municipal entities or obligated persons; or General information in the nature of educational materials.

This gives several indications of what “advice” entails. General information, without opinions or direction on picking one option over another, would not be prohibited advice. But comparing funding options, giving opinions on those options, or applying the general information specifically to the

municipality being served is likely to be considered “advice” subject to regulation. The regulations and rules attempt to focus on providing opinions or recommendations regarding municipal funding options. The SEC believes that a recommendation is advice that is particularized to the specific needs, objectives, or

circumstances of a municipal entity, including with respect to the structure, timing and terms of the security, based upon all the facts and circumstances. This standard considers the specific facts on a case-by-case basis, but at the same time it is considered an objective inquiry. So, the intent of the person providing the information is irrelevant. Also note that it is irrelevant whether the advisor is paid for his or her services. The regulations will look to the facts in each case to see if, to the neutral observer, a recommendation has been given.

Apart from the repeated references to “recommendations” and “advice,” the SEC emphasizes that the advice must be about the structure, timing and terms of the municipal security. This would require there to be some specific details about the municipal security proposed – that the interest rates, length of the loan and procedures for the funding would have to be

**Essentially, a municipal advisor is a qualified financial professional (such as a banker or financial consultant) who counsels municipalities on financial deals like bond offerings.<sup>1</sup>**

## Day-To-Day Examples Concerning the SEC Municipal Advisor Rule

**B**ecause of the refusal by the regulatory authorities to establish any bright line rules, it is difficult to tell exactly what information would be considered to be “advice” in these circumstances. As a general matter, boards or municipal employees will not need to be concerned about compliance with the rule, but to understand that the information that they may be used to receiving from engineers and others may no longer be available, or may be in a different form. In order to understand these limitations, and due to the fact-based nature of the issues, the best way to discuss the rule is to deal with real-world examples:

**1. KRWA provides an educational program open to public water suppliers where staff explains funding options available to water suppliers through State of Kansas revolving water or wastewater fund loans, GDBG grants, USDA Rural Development loans, bonds or other financing options.**

*This would not be a violation of the Municipal Advisor Rule as KRWA is giving general advice to these suppliers that is neither specific to their individual needs, nor a subjective opinion on what option to choose based upon those needs.*

**2. A city obtains a USDA Rural Development loan to replace aging water lines, and obtains assistance from KRWA assist with the loan application.**

*This also would not be a violation as KRWA is providing clerical and technical assistance in regards to matters involving municipal debt, but is not providing advice or a recommendation between different types of debts.*

**3. At the invitation of a city in southwest Kansas, an engineering firm provides a preliminary report on a new well replacement project. In the preliminary report, the firm studies historical water use, the present water system and the ability of the new source to supply the necessary water. The engineering firm gives some general cost estimates of the well replacement project in the preliminary report. The city is interested in pursuing the project further, and asks for additional information on the financing of such a project. A subsequent report includes the same information as the preliminary report, but also includes a summary of the estimated debt service using a KDHE revolving fund loan compared to a Rural Development loan, and creates projections on likely water rate increases needed to service the debt under each option. The engineers present the supplemented report and stating that the choice is up to city on how they wish to proceed.**

*The preliminary report would be considered traditional engineering advice, and would not be a violation. However, the supplemented report contains advice regarding municipal securities (KDHE loans and USDA loans) that could be considered an opinion regarding the structure, timing and terms of the issuance of a municipal security. Since the report has financial details specific to the city, the engineers have met many of the factors that the SEC looks for in determining whether advice has been given. This leaves only one question, whether the information, under all the facts and*

*circumstances, makes a recommendation on which funding to use. Since no court has ruled on the issue, it may be to just present the alternatives to the city without endorsing a specific option does not violate the rule. However, it is possible that providing this information, even though not actually pushing one option, or by affirmatively stating that “no recommendation is being made,” may be determined to violate the rule.*

**4. Before construction of a new wastewater lagoon, KRWA performs a rate study for a city to determine how much rates would need to increase in order to have a surplus of at least \$22,000 per year that could be used to service debt.**

*This is not a violation. While the study is tailored to a specific municipality, it does not contain an opinion, recommendation or information on the issuance of a municipal security, as it merely determines an amount of surplus income for debt service.*

**5. A city attorney is asked to negotiate on behalf of a city for a lease-purchase agreement with a local bank for construction of a new water storage tank. The bank provides the documents for the attorney to review, but the city wishes the attorney to push the bank for better terms.**

*This is not a violation. Providing a review of a loan document is traditionally considered legal advice, and it is not prohibited for the attorney to attempt to obtain better terms for a client as this is within the attorney exception.*

**6. A city attorney helps with a new project to create a nitrate removal system. In the process the attorney looks over legal titles to properties and deals with the permits and requirements of the state to construct the new plant. At the same time, several funding options are presented to the city. The attorney discusses the funding options with the city council and pushes for a USDA loan over KDHE revolving fund loan; arguing that the interest rate and terms are better for the city.**

*This is a violation. It is acceptable for the attorney to help with the legal titles and permits, but the attorney cannot give an opinion or advice on which municipal security to choose based upon economic advantages for the client.*

**7. A certified public accountant is at a city council meeting presenting the annual audit to the city and explaining the results. The council begins discussing the need for capital improvements for the coming year, but remains concerned about existing debt. Knowing that current interest rates are much lower than the long term bonds being paid by the city, the accountant tells the city that they may be able to refinance their bonds and reduce their debt payments, opening up more funds for improvements.**

*Providing audit services does not make the accountant a municipal advisor. Just making general statements about refinancing would not be a violation of the rule. However, if the accountant also provides a spreadsheet showing savings that would result from refinancing at current rates, even without a specific recommendation it could be considered advice and a violation.*

outlined in some respect. Giving advice about matters beyond these terms would not be covered by the new rule. This leads to the question of what “municipal securities” are included within the rule. At present, this provision is also read broadly, and would not only include general obligation bonds and revenue bonds, but also revolving fund loans and Federal loans backed by municipal bonds. Thus, most funding methods for large projects would be considered to be within the Rule.

The Municipal Advisor Rule has certain exceptions for some professionals. Accountants, engineers and attorneys all are granted exceptions, but these are limited to providing advice that involves their specialty, and not advice on municipal securities. The engineering exception is one of the more significant exceptions due to the duties of the engineer. In the context of municipal borrowing for infrastructure, engineering has gone beyond the mere nuts and bolts planning of improvements, and may include assistance on funding options, including obtaining federal and state funding through loans or grants. These usually require not only up-front traditional engineering planning, but also details on financing terms, cost projections and proposed rate structures to show the ability to pay for the improvements proposed. In many ways, the engineer is in the best position of the group of professionals hired by a municipality to assist in determining a course of action based upon the costs of municipal funding options. At the same time, this kind of advice will often present options and make

recommendations that would require registration as a municipal advisor.

In general, the SEC states that activities within the scope of the exemption could include feasibility studies, cash flow analyses, and similar activities; provided that the exception would not cover these actions if they amount to “advice.” While this seems at first to give engineers a specific list of things they can do, they are still forbidden to give advice or to make recommendations regarding municipal securities. As such, a feasibility study that ended with recommendations for certain financing options would still be prohibited. Still, the SEC has attempted to give additional assistance in interpreting the regulations. Specifically, the SEC states that an engineer could provide a project schedule and anticipated funding requirements. In addition, engineering feasibility studies that include output capacity projections, potential utility rates, future market demand or projected revenues that are based upon consideration of engineering aspects of a project are within the scope of the exception. Since most Federal government financing options require feasibility studies to be submitted to the financing agency, it makes sense that reports regarding technical feasibility of a project, without reference to funding options, would be excluded from the rule. Also, the engineer can establish a proposed schedule for construction, noting the times when funding would need to be available to pursue the project, and when certain revenue would be available due to the ability to hook up customers to the

improved system. These kinds of activities are strongly based in engineering concepts, and are not directly related to determining the structure, timing and terms of a municipal security. If the municipality provides certain financial information, such as interest rates for existing debt or current utility rates, analysis of these in light of planned improvements would also be considered engineering advice, and outside of the rule. In regards to “cash flow analysis” the use of information on municipal cash flows and relating them to the project schedule and available funding sources would not be engaging in municipal advisory activity.

But quick reliance on buzzwords such as “cash flow analysis” and “feasibility studies” can be misleading, as the rule is clear that these activities can cross over into improper “advice”. While simply providing projected revenue or debt service information can be protected by the exception, if these are used in connection with a presentation on different funding options for a municipality, the rule has been violated. An engineer who does so is likely to be considered to be giving a recommendation on the issue of municipal bonds and would not be within the exception. Similarly, a feasibility study that contained the usual engineering information and proposed financing options would suggest municipal advisory activity.

The new rules regarding municipal advisors are untested and subject to interpretation. Since the questions involved are based upon each individual circumstance, it is impossible to list any clear rules that would guide municipalities and others. However, municipalities should know that these limitations exist, and should seek out a registered municipal advisor if it does need help with issues involving municipal securities. Since another exception to the municipal advisor rule exists for other professionals when the municipality is represented by a registered municipal advisor, be aware that this help may be requested in larger projects involving municipal securities.

<sup>1</sup> Farmer, Liz. “Why’s the SEC’s New Municipal Advisor Rule So Confusing?” *Governing*. Web. July 2014.

It's not too early to book your rooms!

**2015 KRWA Annual Conference & Exhibition**

**March 24 - 26, 2015**

**Century II Convention Center**

**Wichita, KS**

# EPA Proposes Rule to Clarify Clean Water Act Deadline to Submit Comments Extended to October 20, 2014

By Douglas Helmke, LG, KRWA Water Rights Tech

**K**ansas public water system professionals fully understand the impact the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has had, and continues to have, on the operation of their water systems. Regulations exist to protect customers from naturally occurring and human sources of contaminants in drinking water, from ineffective and faulty water treatment processes and from back-siphonage and cross-connections. Regulations exist for operator certification and continuing education, for reporting continued compliance with regulations and reporting of lapses in maintaining water pressure and disinfection. National and state water system associations work hard to keep a balance between these regulations and affordability, and are continuously in discussion with the EPA to keep safe water available and affordable to as many Americans as possible.

The latest "controversy" involving the EPA is not with drinking water regulations, but with a definition of the "Waters of the United States." The federal government website\* for proposed regulations has this summary, where CWA is an abbreviation for Clean Water Act and SWANCC is an abbreviation of Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County:

After U.S. Supreme Court decisions in SWANCC and Rapanos, the scope of "waters of the US" protected under all CWA programs has been an issue of considerable debate and uncertainty. The Act has a single definition for "waters of the United States." As a result, these decisions affect the geographic scope of all CWA programs. SWANCC and Rapanos did not invalidate the current regulatory definition of "waters of the United States." However, the decisions established important considerations for how those regulations should be interpreted, and experience implementing the regulations has identified several areas that could benefit from additional clarification through rulemaking. U.S. EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of

Engineers are developing a proposed rule for determining whether a water is protected by the Clean Water Act. This rule would make clear which waterbodies are protected under the Clean Water Act.

The EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) have extended the comment period for the proposed rule "Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act" published on April 21, 2014 (79 FR 22188), due to many requests for an extension. Now, comments must be received on or before October 20, 2014. The comment period was originally scheduled to end on July 21, 2014.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, now known as the Clean Water Act, were enacted 42 years ago in 1972. The objective of the CWA is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. The definition of the "waters of the United States" was not defined by Congress in the CWA, but in 1986, a regulation was adopted that defined "waters of the United States" as traditional navigable waters, interstate waters, all other waters that could affect interstate or foreign commerce, impoundments of waters of the United States, tributaries, the territorial seas, and adjacent wetlands.

Under the proposed first section of the regulation, section (a), the agencies propose to define the "waters of the United States" for all sections of the CWA to mean:

- All waters which are currently used, were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide;
- All interstate waters, including interstate wetlands;
- The territorial seas;
- All impoundments of a traditional navigable water, interstate water, the territorial seas or a tributary;
- All tributaries of a traditional navigable

water, interstate water, the territorial seas or impoundment;

- All waters, including wetlands, adjacent to a traditional navigable water, interstate water, the territorial seas, impoundment or tributary; and
- On a case-specific basis, other waters, including wetlands, provided that those waters alone, or in combination with other similarly situated waters, including wetlands, located in the same region, have a significant nexus to a traditional navigable water, interstate water or the territorial seas.

The agencies state, "Developing a final rule to provide the intended level of certainty and predictability, and minimizing the number of case-specific determinations, will require significant public involvement and engagement. Such involvement and engagement will allow the agencies to make categorical determinations of jurisdiction, in a manner that is consistent with the scientific body of information before the agencies, particularly on the category of waters known as "other waters." To do this, the proposed rule will retain the existing regulatory definitions for the terms "adjacent" and "wetlands" and the first time define the terms "neighboring," "riparian area," "floodplain," "tributary," and "significant nexus." The agencies propose no change to the exclusion for wastewater treatment systems designed consistent with the requirements of the CWA, no change to the exclusion for prior converted cropland, and no change to the regulatory status of water transfers. The proposed rule is reportedly consistent with science and the two Supreme Court opinions.

Comments should be consistent with the goal of clarity and consistent with the Clean Water Act. They are not requesting comments on whether the current ambiguity created by caselaw should continue to exist. The website states that the agencies pose the questions because of the strong intent to provide as much certainty to the regulated public and the regulators as to

which waters are, and are not, subject to CWA jurisdiction.

In summary, rivers, creeks and wetlands in Kansas, and the water quality in those waterbodies regulated under the 1972 Clean Water Act are, and will continue to be, regulated by the EPA and Corps. Other waters, including wetlands not adjacent to streams, will be regulated on a case by case basis if there is found to be a "significant nexus" to a traditional navigable or interstate stream.

**In summary, rivers, creeks and wetlands in Kansas, and the water quality in those waterbodies regulated under the 1972 Clean Water Act are, and will continue to be, regulated by the EPA and Corps.**

More in-depth explanations of the scientific evidence and caselaw related to the current situation and the goals of the new rule, visit the regulation website listed at the end of this article and click on the Primary Document (PR) with the title, "Clean Water Act; Definitions: Waters of the United States." You can also post your own comments to be considered by the EPA and Corps at this Web site <http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OW-2011-0880>

## Training – KRWA’s Number 1 Mission

By Greg Metz, KRWA Technical Assistant

**T**he mission of the Kansas Rural Water Association is *Provide education and leadership necessary to enhance the effectiveness of Kansas’ water and wastewater utilities. Training is KRWA’s number one mission.*

KRWA-sponsored training is provided across Kansas to help water and wastewater operators, administrative staff and board and council members learn about topics of all sorts. Whether it’s troubleshooting programmable logic controllers or how to format an Excel spreadsheet, KRWA’s goal is to try to meet the training needs as identified by cities, rural water districts and other utilities. Workplace safety, emergency response and backflow prevention and other topics have been attended by 787 people from January 1 through July 30, 2014. That attendance was comprised of the following: 618 Operators; 48 Administrative Staff; 9 Board/Council Members; 2 Regulatory; 110 Public.

From January 1 through July 30, 2014, KRWA has sponsored 38 training events, not including the conference which was attended by 2,237 from 320 cities and 192 RWDs or other systems.

Always, be sure to check the KRWA Web site at [www.krwa.net](http://www.krwa.net) for upcoming training. If it is not posted on KRWA’s Web site, then it’s not happening.

**K**RWA sponsors top-notch training – and generally, without cost to those attending. As an example, the July 16 and 17 training at Abilene entitled “Understanding and Troubleshooting Electrical Motors and Variable Speed Drives” was filled to capacity with 30 people attending each day. This training session provided hands-on instruction on the use of multi-meters, and how to test and troubleshoot electrical motors using a multi-meter. The training was augmented by several cutaways provided by Rena Kilgore of Baldor Great Plains from Lenexa, KS who was in attendance for the training. These cutaways showed design of types of motors and windings as well as insulating factors that help determine the longevity of motors in different applications. The training also included the programming, operation, function, benefits and troubleshooting of Variable Frequency Drives (VFD’s). The trainer, Robert Blume of IET Consulting, has been conducting electrical training for KRWA for 28 years. Bob set up a dozen VFDs on motors for training on programming and operations of the VFDs. Numerous other components also allowed those attending to gain valuable experience on testing motors, circuits and other devices associated with troubleshooting everyday problems in utility systems.

Systems attending the two-day training at Abilene included: City of Abilene, City of Manhattan, City of Plainville, City of Riley, City of Salina, City of Strong City, City of Sylvia, Fort Riley, KS Dept. Wildlife Parks & Tourism, Sundowner West and Veolia Water.



All chairs were filled for the recent KRWA-sponsored training session, “Understanding and Troubleshooting Electrical Motors and Variable Speed Drives”, held at Abilene.



PO Box 226  
Seneca, KS 66538

**Non Profit Organization**  
**U.S. Postage**  
**PAID**  
Permit No. 580  
Manhattan, KS 66502

© Kansas Rural Water Association

**KANSAS RURAL WATER association**

ABOUT ONLINE RESOURCES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TRAINING MEMBERSHIP

### Calendar & Registration

Take advantage of our expertise coming directly to your area! Please note that KDHE's training listing may include sessions that are not listed on this page. Only those sessions which are being sponsored by KRWA are listed below. If you have further questions, email them to us at [krwa@krwa.net](mailto:krwa@krwa.net).

"I took home a substantial amount of data."

**KRWA's Mission No. 1 is TRAINING**  
for water and wastewater systems! If you have an interest in a training topic, send an email to [krwa@krwa.net](mailto:krwa@krwa.net) or call KRWA at 785-336-3760. Don't be bashful in asking. Any request is held in confidence. KRWA will attempt to accommodate your request.

For a .pdf brochure containing further information about the session, click on "Details" next to the session. If you do not have Acrobat Reader, you can download it free from this link. To Register, select the "register" button. You may register for more than one session at a time. To complete all your registrations, select "checkout."

Use our Interactive Searchable Calendar.

Dates	Course	Location	View Brochure	Operator Credits	Cost
August 6, 2014	Programmable Logic Controllers: Application, Function & Repairs	Manhattan	Details	www	No Charge
August 7, 2014	Programmable Logic Controllers: Application Function & Repairs	Manhattan	Details	www	No Charge
August 12, 2014	Collection System and Lift Station Maintenance (Manhattan)	Manhattan (Riley County Public Works Office)	Details	www	No Charge
August 20, 2014	Emergency Response Planning - Tabletop Exercise (Tonganoxie)	Tonganoxie	Details	w/www	No Charge
August 21, 2014	Wastewater Stabilization Lagoon Operation and Maintenance (Effingham)	Effingham	Details	w/www	\$90.00
August 21, 2014	Emergency Response Planning - Tabletop Exercise (Great Bend)	Great Bend	Details	w/www	No Charge
August 26, 2014	Emergency Response Planning - Tabletop Exercise (Great Bend)	Great Bend	Details	w/www	No Charge
August 27, 2014	Competent Person for Trenching and Excavation (Abilene)	Abilene	Details	w/www	\$90.00
August 28, 2014	Confined Space Entry (Beloit)	Beloit	Details	w/www	\$90.00
September 4, 2014	Wastewater Stabilization Lagoon Operation and Maintenance - Effingham	Effingham (The Blue Building at 204 Main)	Details	ww	No Charge
September 18, 2014	Competent Person for Trenching and Excavation (Beloit)	Beloit	Details	w/www	\$90.00
September 23-24, 2014	Cross Connection Control - Backflow	Liberal (Girl Scout Building)	Details	w/www	No Charge

## PROVIDING TRAINING IS CENTRAL TO KRWA'S MISSION

*The mission of the Kansas Rural Water Association is: Provide education and leadership necessary to enhance the effectiveness of Kansas' water and wastewater utilities.*

KRWA is proud of its long history of providing training for both water and wastewater systems. Since 1976, KRWA has facilitated, sponsored or conducted more than 2,247 sessions. Since that first session on April 3, 1976 when 101 people from 48 systems attended a water system training seminar in Iola, KRWA's history of providing training remains unmatched in Kansas.

Always check KRWA's training calendar at [www.krwa.net](http://www.krwa.net) to learn what sessions are scheduled. Register online also. KRWA encourages operators, board/council members, agencies, engineering firms and others to forward any suggestions for future KRWA sessions. KRWA Training is a partnership with your Association staff, associate members and a host of other, experienced resources.