

BOLINAS COMMUNITY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT

BCPUD

BOX 390 270 ELM ROAD BOLINAS CALIFORNIA 94924

415 868 1224



MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Jennifer Blackman *JWB*

RE: Legislative History – BCPUD Resolution 471 (revising BCPUD Resolution 173, Section 7)

DATE: August 11, 2023

At the upcoming regular meeting of the Board next Wednesday, August 16, 2023, you will be presented with requests from two property owners, John Bryant and Pete Smith, to approve rights-of-way permits pursuant to Ordinance 30 for each of them to install water, wastewater and electrical lines in the public (non-County) rights of way on the Bolinas Mesa to serve their proposed ADU developments on the lots across the street from their primary residences. (*See items 5 and 6 on the August 16, 2023 meeting agenda.*) Both property owners represent that they have merged the lots across the street from their primary residence into the lots with their primary residence, thereby creating single assessor parcels, merged across the public right of way. The County of Marin’s Planning Department previously confirmed in writing to the BCPUD that property owners are permitted to merge commonly owned lots across public rights of way in Bolinas. The County further confirmed:

“if a single family residence is on one parcel of the now-merged property, then a detached accessory structure, such as an ADU, would be allowed to be built on the other, current vacant [or “undeveloped”] parcel of the now-merged property, which is across the street or right-of way from the parcel with the single family residence, given it complies with the County Development Code.”

As you no doubt will recall, strong public concern was expressed during previous Board meetings that if the Board were to allow a *water service line* to be installed across a public right of way (as opposed to a wastewater, fiber-optic or electrical line, which the Board already has approved) to serve an ADU (or for any other purpose), that action would be in violation of Resolution 173 (the “moratorium resolution”). Community members noted this resolution states, in pertinent part (§7): “In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter.”

In anticipation of the likely public interest in Items 5 and 6 on the August 16, 2023 meeting agenda, I have researched district records to ascertain the legislative history behind the above-underlined sentence of Resolution 173 §7. (This sentence was added to §7 by the Board on August 22, 2001 when it adopted Resolution 471; this sentence did not appear in the original moratorium resolution.) This memorandum presents a summary of my findings.

BCPUD Resolution 471 reads as follows, in its entirety:

Resolution 471

Revises Resolution 173, §7, to add language prohibiting water pipes crossing property lines

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Bolinas Community Public Utility District as follows:

Resolution 173, §7 is hereby amended to read:

7. The District may discontinue service to anyone willfully violating the regulations and restrictions set forth hereinabove, or to any meter through which water flows to an expanded or modified service for which no permit has been issued or for which the permit has been revoked. In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter.

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that this resolution was duly introduced and adopted by the Board of Directors of the Bolinas Community Public Utility District this 22nd day of August, 2001, by the following vote:

AYES: Amoroso, Bertsch, Kayfetz, McClellan, Siedman

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

###

My research confirms that Resolution 471 amended Resolution 173, §7 to add the second sentence: “In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter.” No changes were made to the preceding sentence, which was enacted as part of the original Resolution 173. Regrettably, the minutes of the August 22, 2001 Board meeting at which Resolution 471 was enacted are not very enlightening as to the Board’s intent in amending §7 to add this sentence; those minutes read as follows, in their entirety:

“13. Resolution 471, revising Resolution 173, §7, to add language prohibiting water pipes crossing property lines

Director McClellan raised the question of the language in the resolution prohibiting an owner of two adjacent parcels from legitimately watering a yard on the second parcel. After discussion the wording was amended to avoid specific reference to owners of adjacent parcels.

-- Kayfetz/Bertsch unanimous to approve Resolution 471, as amended”

Accordingly, to assist the Board in its interpretation/application of Resolution 471 (and therefore Resolution 173, §7), I did some further research. I discovered that the suggestion of enacting a resolution such as Resolution 471 was first made by then-General Manager Phil Buchanan during his Manager's Report at the July 18, 2001 regular Board meeting. The pertinent section of the minutes of this meeting read as follows, in their entirety:

“Staff will draft a resolution clearly stating District policy on water provision across property lines, to be presented at the August meeting.”

Since the minutes of the July 18, 2001 and August 22, 2001 on this topic are so succinct, I located and listened to the recordings of both meetings to determine whether the discussions that occurred during these meetings would shed light on the Board's purpose and intent in enacting Resolution 471 to add the second sentence to Resolution 173, §7. I believe that these discussions are exceedingly helpful so, with Belle's considerable assistance, I have transcribed them for your consideration and the transcripts are attached as Exhibits A and B to this memorandum.

The transcript of the July 18, 2001 meeting reveals that Phil Buchanan had reviewed all of the then-existing BCPUD rules and regulations and determined that the district did not have an express rule prohibiting customers from providing water across property lines. He conducted some quick research and found language enacted by the Seacoast Utility Authority which he quoted during his manager's report and suggested that the BCPUD could enact something similar. To the best of my knowledge, the language Phil located and read from is attached to this memo as Exhibit C (I found this document on the BCPUD's computer system in a file that was last updated on July 9, 2001), with the pertinent language highlighted in yellow. In response to questions from the Board at the July 18, 2001 meeting, Phil said that he was dealing with an apparent situation in the district that had triggered his request for this language. After a very brief discussion, Phil was asked to present specific recommended language for the Board to consider/enact to address his concern at the next regular Board meeting.

Unfortunately, I have been unable to find any documentation to show exactly what Phil presented to the Board at the next meeting (August 22, 2001) in the form of a draft of Resolution 471, but my best guess (based on the discussions at the July 18, 2001 and August 22, 2001 Board meetings; see the transcripts) is that Phil proposed to add the following sentence as a new, additional sentence to Section 7 of Resolution 173:

“In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter, even though such adjacent property is owned by that customer.”

At the August 22, 2001 Board meeting, the discussion started with director Jack McClellan stating that he did not want Resolution 471 to prohibit a customer who owned two or more adjacent lots that were effectively used as a single property to be forbidden from using water across his or her own property lines. Other Board members pointed out the properties could be easily merged in that instance, but discussion ensued and directors acknowledged that some parcels may not be able to be merged if title is held differently (or potentially for other reasons). All of the directors appeared to agree that they did not want to prohibit someone from watering grass that might be on a separate parcel as long as the parcel was owned by the same person and used as a single property. The directors did, on the other hand, want to address the situation

Memo to the Board
August 11, 2023
Page Four

where a customer provides water to someone who erects a “garden shed” on a separate parcel and then proceeds to live in it. Ultimately, Phil Buchanan said:

“Why don’t we just drop the after the comma and just have it be that ‘In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter’ Period.”

I believe the language Phil therefore recommended be dropped was “even though such adjacent property is owned by that customer” (see the Seacoast Utility Authority Exhibit C), and that this was to address the concern director Jack McClellan raised and the other directors agreed they were not seeking to prohibit. As director Jack Siedman said:

“... there is a real big difference between the person who buys a vacant lot and puts up a 10x10 and gets a neighbor to run the a hose, which would definitely be ... and somebody, which is happening more and more frequently, who buys the adjacent property but for some reason cannot combine them because they don’t hold title or something like that, and they should be allowed to ...”

Director Jack McClellan ultimately said later in the August 2001 meeting that he voted for the resolution with the understanding that the Board’s discussion is “part of the legislative history” and that Resolution 471 “does not apply where it’s one household that’s got two properties ... and there is no property line between the two.”

###

I hope this memorandum is helpful; please let me know if you have any questions or would like me to do any additional research.

EXHIBIT A

TRANSCRIPTION OF A PORTION OF THE JULY 18, 2001 BCPUD BOARD OF
DIRECTORS MEETING – MANAGER’S REPORT

Minutes of the July 18, 2001 BCPUD board meeting – Managers report

3. Manager's Report

Marin County Department of Public Works is preparing to repave Brighton and Terrace Avenues and some surfaces on the Mesa. Some distribution system valve risers have to be prepared in advance and those that need to be brought up to grade can be done immediately following the repaving, taking advantage of the DPW's traffic controls, especially on Terrace.

The barrier to the beach entrance on Wharf Road has been installed as illustrated by a drawing from the County of Marin Department of Public Works. Staff will contact the project coordinator, Bob Beaumont to discuss the possibility of adding a chain barrier to prevent motorcycle access to the beach as well.

Pond 1A at the wastewater treatment facility is drying out, revealing a high cone of sludge which Operator Kate Currey is recommending be removed with a small rented Bobcat and trucked to Redwood Landfill, pending compliance with Redwood's constituent testing requirements. Such immediate action to deal with the sludge buildup would still allow the possibility of composting or pursuing Bailey Green's digester pit proposal. Directors had no objections to Currey's proposal.

Staff will draft a resolution clearly stating District policy on water provision across property lines, to be presented at the August meeting.

Director Amoroso recommended that Rudy Ferris, Ann Young, Meg Simonds, Cabe Silverhame, Ilke Hartmann and either Dale Polissar or Judy Molyneux be appointed to the Eucalyptus Control Committee, at the August meeting.

Transcription of the July 18, 2001 BCPUD board meeting – portion of Manager's report on water provision across property lines¹.

Phil Buchanan: "And the only other thing I wanted to mention is whether you think it's worthwhile to put an item on a future agenda regarding establishment of an exclusive policy concerning provision of water across property lines? I could have sworn that we had a resolution that explicitly stated that you cannot let your water cross property lines, and I know this has come up a couple of other times and we have certainly acted on that assumption . . ."

Director Vic Amoroso: "We have . . ."

Phil Buchanan: "And what you have in your . . . I went through resolutions from 1 through 465 and what I found was 120, which to a certain extent has been supplanted by 173, but the third section there, "that water will be supplied through a district owned meter abutting the boundary line of the property to be served", which seemed to be pretty much to the point but it doesn't explicitly prohibit . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Yeah. . . look at the definition of a service -- that is where it's going to go."

¹ This transcription is of the portion of the Manager's Report relating to the language highlighted in yellow in the Minutes of this meeting

Phil Buchanan: "The service definition is right above that, in the second section, and, so I am not sure about that. But the other thing is, Resolution 173, section 7 says that "the district may discontinue service to any meter through which water flows to an expanded and modified service for which no permit has been issued", and it seems to me that if we would be requiring a permit for people to expand their service within the boundary of their own property, we'd certainly be requiring something to allow it to leave their property and go to some other property. And yet I couldn't find anything explicit and then, on the then back of that 173 -- I found this in about a minute and a half searching on the web -- which is Seacoast Utility Authority says, "in no case shall a customer, except with the written consent of the Authority, extend lines across the street, alley, lane, court, property line, avenue, or other way, in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter". And, I am just wondering if we should have a resolution that says something similar like that."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Is there a current situation which triggers this at this time?"

Phil Buchanan: "There is an apparent situation that triggers some concern on my part about this, and there is another situation of long standing which looks like it may get fixed, you'll be happy to know. But I'd rather not go into details of that at a meeting, I feel like I am treading close to confidentiality of customers."

[??? Not clear if this is director Paul Kayfetz or director Siedman]: "And this is one on the Little Mesa?"

Director Joan Bertsch: "Well, the way this is written, "except with the written consent of the Authority", that's all anybody would need, is the written consent, so it would be each case would be looked at and approval would be given, just like an expanded water use permit or anything else."

Phil Buchanan: "I assume that that's why they put that in there. Not to box themselves in, not that they would ever actually give their consent. So, anyway, just something to think about."

Director Jack Siedman: "Do you think we should make this ... put this in ... "

Director Vic Amoroso: "I think we definitely have to do that ... "

[directors talking over each other for a few seconds]

Director Joan Bertsch: "Would this be incorporated into an exist . . . a change of resolution or a new resolution, standing alone?"

Director Jack Siedman: "[*indistinguishable*] like 120."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Why don't you write up your recommendation and put it on the agenda for the next meeting?"

Phil Buchanan: "Alright. So, that's all I have."

EXHIBIT B

TRANSCRIPTION OF A PORTION OF THE AUGUST 22, 2001 BCPUD BOARD OF
DIRECTORS MEETING – ITEM 13: RESOLUTION 471 AND
SUBSEQUENT BRIEF DISCUSSION

Minutes of August 22, 2001 BCPUD Board Meeting – Item 13

13. Resolution 471, revising Resolution 173, §7, to add language prohibiting water pipes crossing property lines

Director McClellan raised the question of the language in the resolution prohibiting an owner of two adjacent parcels from legitimately watering a yard on the second parcel. After discussion the wording was amended to avoid specific reference to owners of adjacent parcels.

-- Kayfetz/Bertsch unanimous to approve Resolution 471, as amended

Transcription of August 22, 2001 BCPUD Board Meeting

Item 13: Resolution 471, revising Resolution 173, §7, to add language prohibiting water pipes crossing property lines¹

Director Jack McClellan: “Before we rush through 471, I have some concerns about it. I think it’s broader than we actually want to make it, for the reasons -- and I’ll use Bill Beckman’s golf course as the example -- in situations where, you say, “even though such adjacent property is owned by that customer.” I would like to see a proviso in there to the effect, that “provided however, that such adjacent property is actually used as part of the single family home then it’s exempt from this provision.” In other words . . . Beckman had a water pipe going across a property line. He owned both properties. He is using that whole end of that block as his residence. It’s not somebody else’s residence that he’s renting, you know, renting out . . . and so I’d like to see an exception to this where the adjacent property is actually joined to . . . in the same ownership and in the same use, it should be considered the same property.”

Director Jack Siedman: “That pretty much wipes out the second sentence then, right?”

Director Jack McClellan: [*talking over Phil Buchanan*] “Well no, because the second sentence would apply to a situation where I own the property next door, I have a house that I built there, I rent it out to John Doe and I send water through the hose under the fence to . . . “

Director Jack Siedman: “Ah, I got you.”

Director Jack McClellan: “Do you see what I mean?”

Director Jack Siedman: “Alright.”

Director Paul Kayfetz: “Phil just made a very good point and that is if somebody wants to have a golf course and water it, then simply for fifty bucks, which is what it costs for a property merger, or a parcel merger . . . “

Director Vic Amoroso: “And if later they wanted to subdivide it again, if it meets the requirements . . . “

¹ This transcription is of the discussion that occurred during Item 13 on the August 22, 2001 BCPUD Board meeting, followed by a transcription of a brief additional discussion that occurred after this agenda item.

[*briefly indistinguishable*]

Director Jack McClellan: "The . . . uh . . . provided you have the initiative [*indistinguishable for a few seconds*] where the property's actually used or property merger applied for [*briefly indistinguishable*] . . . There may be a situation where, suppose the golf course is not exactly in the same title. Suppose uh, suppose Bill and Debbie had joint tenancy on one property and Bill bought the other property and put it in Debbie's name. There is still a reason – do you see what mean? For some technical reason you can't merge them . . ."

Phil Buchanan: "What can we say then that would . . .?"

Director Jack Siedman: "What if we started that second one, because we say "in no case". What if we said "unless permitted by the BCPUD, a customer shall not" . . . and eliminate the words "in no case" and that way we would give ourselves the flexibility."

Director Jack McClellan: "I'd rather define the situation . . ."

Director Vic Amoroso: "I'd rather define. . . . yeah . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "rather than just . . . otherwise we are open to the criticism once again . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "But the definition that you offered is too broad. It will allow all sorts of abuses and evasion."

Director Jack McClellan: "Like what?"

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Like the garden shed that then gets rented and we end up having to be cops and to have deal with is somebody sleeping in it or not . . . you know, as soon as you get into that it's a slippery slope . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "As long as it's used as one residence. . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "You gonna go and do surveillance to enforce that? What's 'used as one residence'?"

Director Jack McClellan: "Whatever the property owner says it is unless we know something different."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "The property owner is always going to say it's used as one residence, even if he is renting it to somebody from Mill Valley who is coming out and using it as a weekend camp site, which is happening a lot."

Paul Buchanan: "Well, I didn't mean to open up a can of worms here with this, uh, it's just . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "I think we need to really . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "I think Jack Siedman's idea is a good one. I think that allows us to deal with reality . . . people out there . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "Well, we need some standard, we need a standard."

Director Vic Amoroso: "I think we need a standard, yeah."

Director Jack McClellan: "We can't just do it ad hoc, otherwise it won't stand up to judicial review."

Director Vic Amoroso: "What if we just do this: "In no case furnish water to an adjacent property through one meter", period. And just leave it there and uh . . . I don't know if that solves anything, but it doesn't give a specific interpretation."

Director Joan Bertsch: "What if you say an adjacent 'residence' instead of 'property'?"

Director Paul Kayfetz: ". . . no because . . ."

Director Vic Amoroso: "Well I think we do have to have . . . I mean . . ."

Director Jack Siedman: "Yeah, that's getting closer. I mean, he makes a good point. Let's say that you buy a parcel that's next to you but for whatever reason you don't consolidate them so it's an adjacent property and there is a property line. But it's yours and it's an extension of your back yard or something. You should be able to water that grass, and even run your hose bib over there. That's . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Agreed."

Director Jack Siedman: "That's how'd we do that."

Cela O'Connor: "We have a piece of property over in Tam Valley; it was two parcels and we just consolidated it."

Director Jack Siedman: "Yeah, but what if you don't?"

Cela O'Connor: "Well, why aren't you going to consolidate it?"

Director Jack McClellan: "Well, there may be some technical reason why you don't or why you can't."

Phil Buchanan: "Jack's example was that you might hold title differently on two parcels . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "How about if the adjacent . . . how about . . ."

Cela O'Connor: "But that still would not preclude combining them, people . . ."

Director Jack Siedman: "It does."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "How about if the adjacent parcel has no structure on it?"

Director Jack McClellan: "Why would you [*indistinguishable*] . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Because where this becomes a real world problem is when we get these quote 'garden sheds', uh, whatever they are, that end up being part time or full time residential. And that's what's going on all over the Mesa. I mean, uh, I know somebody in Mill Valley who just bought a lot in Bolinas and she's happily putting up her weekend cabin on it."

Director Vic Amoroso: "hmm hmm"

Director Paul Kayfetz: "And I'm sure there are, you know, 50 more of those."

Phil Buchanan: "Why don't we just . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "How does this reach that?"

[*indistinguishable, due to directors talking over each other for a few seconds*]

Director Vic Amoroso: "With respect to the last clause, it's just, uh . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "That's clearly not what we are talking about, Paul. We are talking about where the same person owns . . ."

Phil Buchanan: "Why don't we just drop the after the comma and just have it be that "In no case shall a customer extend water lines across a street or property line in order to furnish water service for an adjacent property through one meter." Period."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "That gets rid of Jack's problem."

Director Vic Amoroso: "I would try that, I mean, and then we can make our interpretations beyond that. I mean . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "Then if we have real world problems we can go back and do something else."

Phil Buchanan: "Because it's not . . ."

Director Vic Amoroso: "You can't meet all the permutations and combinations."

Phil Buchanan: "It's not really that situation that we're concerned about, it's . . ."

Director Jack McClellan: "I understand that, but you don't want to draft something that reaches that situation."

Director Paul Kayfetz: "What about if you put a period after [*indistinguishable*] . . .?"

Phil Buchanan: "I mean I have no personal problem with that, I just don't want it to be a . . . stopper. I mean, personally I don't see a problem with saying even if you own it, you can't do it; but, if that is a stumbling block then, you know, let's just get rid of it . . ."

Director Vic Amoroso: "Let's just go with it by putting the period there and that leaves it open a little bit. I mean, if we haven't dealt with that issue, then we have to deal with that issue, and we'll deal with that when it comes back. [*indistinguishable for 1-2 seconds*]. We know what the situations are going to be."

Director Jack Siedman: "Yeah. Yeah. I mean there is a real big difference between the person who buys a vacant lot and puts up a 10x10 and gets a neighbor to run them a hose, which would definitely be . . . and somebody, which is happening more and more frequently, who buys the adjacent property but for some reason cannot combine them because they don't hold title or something like that, and they should be allowed to . . ."

Director Paul Kayfetz: “Yeah. I think we put the period there after [*briefly indistinguishable*] and throw out the last clause.”

Director Vic Amoroso: “And leave open to further interpretation is what you are saying [*briefly indistinguishable*], does that sound right?”

Paul Kayfetz: “So moved.”

Phil Buchanan: “Maybe I can just run off a fresh copy of it real quick so we can get it signed?”

Director Jack Siedman: “Yeah.”

Director Paul Kayfetz: “We haven’t approved it yet.”

Director Jack McClellan: “It hasn’t been approved.”

[*briefly indistinguishable, directors talking at the same time*]

Phil Buchanan: “Well . . . “

Director Paul Kayfetz: “We have a motion.”

Director Joan Bertsch: “Second!”

Director Vic Amoroso: “Okay, Joan seconds.”

Director Joan Bertsch: “Aye.”

[*other directors saying “Aye” at the same time*]

Director Vic Amoroso: “It passes, ok”.

Director Jack Siedman: “Phil, we already voted, where is it?”

[*Laughter*]

[*Discussion then turned to the Committee Reports; after Cela O’Connor’s report, the following discussion occurred:*]

Director Jack McClellan: “Before we move on, I want to say that I voted for the resolution under the understanding that the discussion we had is part of the legislative history of that thing . . . “

Director Jack Siedman: “Yeah.”

Director Jack McClellan: “. . . and so it does not, it does not apply . . . “

Director Paul Kayfetz: “That is correct, no, that’s clearly understood . . . “

Phil Buchanan: “Meaning what at this point?”

Director Paul Kayfetz: “. . . it doesn’t apply to any golf courses that people have.”

[*Laughter*]

Director Jack McClellan: “That Bill Beckman made . . . no, it doesn’t apply where it’s one household that’s got two properties . . . and two properties and there is no boundary between the two.”

Director Vic Amoroso: “The fact that, that is not objectionable when somebody reads it, ok.”

Director Jack Siedman: “Right. Right. Yeah. Because it’s only a technical property line but in reality it’s not. Agreed. Agreed.”

Director Paul Kayfetz: “If you have a whole compound with a bunch of uses, I don’t think it [*indistinguishable for 1-2 seconds*] . . . “

Director Vic Amoroso: “That’s true, I mean [*chuckles*] . . . “

Director Jack Siedman: “Alright, Jack, bring it home.”

Director Jack McClellan: “If it’s one family, its one family.” Director Paul Kayfetz: “Exactly”.

Director Jack Siedman: “Yeah.” [*directors talking at the same time*]

Director McClellan: “Alright, where are we?”

Director Jack Siedman: “Committees “

EXHIBIT C

SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY WATER SERVICE POLICY

SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY
4200 HOOD ROAD
PALM BEACH GARDENS, FL 33410-1810

Web Site Address: www.sua.com

WATER SERVICE POLICY

LIMITATION OF USE - Water service purchased from the Authority shall be used by the customer only for the purposes specified in the application or agreement for water service and the customer shall not resell or otherwise dispose of such water service supplied by the Authority. Water service furnished to the customer shall be rendered directly to the customer through Authority's individual meter and may not be remetered by the customer for the purpose of selling or otherwise disposing of water service for a profit to lessees, tenants, or others and under no circumstances shall the customer or customer's agent or any other individual, association or corporation install meters for the purpose of so remetering said water service for the purpose of making a profit. In no case shall a customer, except with the written consent of the Authority, extend lines across a street, alley, lane, court, property line, avenue, or other way, in order to furnish water service for adjacent property through one meter, even though such adjacent property is owned by that customer. In case of such unauthorized extension, remetering, sale or disposition of service, customer's water service is subject to discontinuance until full payment is made of bills for water service, calculated on proper classification and rate schedules and reimbursement in full made to the Authority for all extra expenses incurred for clerical work, testing, and inspections. Under no circumstances shall any source of water other than the Authority's be connected to the Authority's water supply system or any part thereof, be it on private or public property except with the written consent of the Authority's Governing Board. The Authority shall have the right of inspection at reasonable times during customer's installation to verify compliance with the Rules and Regulations.