

TIMPANOGOS SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

**APPROVED**

January 19, 2017

6:00 p.m.

Conference Room

**Board Members**

Present: Mark Johnson Mack Straw David Bunker Spencer Kyle  
Chris Condie Brian Braithwaite Dale Ihrke Craig White  
Trevor Coombs

Excused: Tracy Wallace Lynn Walker

District Staff: Jon Adams, District Manager, Shannon Hansen, Human Resource  
David Barlow, District Engineer Danette Smith, Board Secretary  
Brad Christensen, Electrical Foreman

Others: Ken Spiers, Bowen Collins & Associates  
Craig Carlile, Ray, Quinney & Nebeker  
Rich Mickelson, Provo City

**Call to Order**

Mark Johnson, Board Vice Chair, called the meeting to order. 6:04 p.m.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

**1. Approval of the December 15, 2016 Administrative Board Meeting Minutes**

Brian Braithwaite made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 15, 2016 Administrative Board Meeting. Dale Ihrke seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson, Mack Straw, Spencer Kyle, Brian Braithwaite, Chris Condie, David Bunker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, and Trevor Coombs. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

**Consent Calendar**

**1. Move the April 20, 2017 Board Meeting to April 27, 2017 to avoid conflict with the Annual Water Environment Association of Utah's Conference**

Trevor Coombs made a motion to change the date of the April 20, 2017 to April 27, 2017 to avoid conflict with the Annual Water Environment of Utah's Conference. Chris Condie seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson, Mack Straw, Spencer Kyle, Brian Braithwaite, Chris Condie, David Bunker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, and Trevor Coombs. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

**Finance**

**1. Financial Report**

Jon Adams said Joe Martin was not present, and if anyone had comments or questions to write them down and Joe Martin would answer them later. Jon said we do not have the close out numbers for year's end yet, we should have them mid-February. Brian Braithwaite clarified that those financials will be available when we have our off-site retreat. Jon said yes, as long as the retreat is not moved up from February 24<sup>th</sup>.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Communication**

**1. Administration Committee Report and Recommendations – Mark Johnson**

Mark said the Administration Committee, and the Chairs of the Finance and Engineering Committees met the day prior, to discuss the retreat. Mark said it was suggested to have the retreat in February at last month's board meeting. They scheduled a tentative date of February 24<sup>th</sup> and put together a preliminary agenda, which was handed out to Board members. Mark was going to make arrangements to have it at Fox Hollow Golf Club. Jon said in the committee meeting they talked about areas of discussion as well as having a facilitator come in; somebody that would give a history of the District and talk about enterprise fund. We want to discuss the Master Plan, Future Expenditures and Liabilities, like appropriate cash balances, bonding discussions, and how we want to finance and also the District's role in collections. We have transmission lines, but we also provide services for cleaning to the cities, by contract. We want to discuss that as well as the long-term service agreements we have with the District members. Those agreements can impact the bonding.

Mark said the items on the agenda were things we felt were absolutely necessary to have a better understanding of our financial position and financial responsibilities. There has been a lot of conversations about our funding and the amount of money we have had and should have on hand. Mark said we are suggesting those conversations ought to continue. The retreat may be a good opportunity to get the information we need to make a better-defined judgement on those financial and bonding questions; those will be dependent on the capital facilities plan and the asset management plan. Mark thinks it is a really good idea to have this sooner than later, and hopes that Friday, February 24<sup>th</sup> works. Mark said it would be the entire day; this is a short agenda, but he guarantees it is going to take all day to get through the items on the list.

Chris Condie asked the District staff that would be attending the meeting. Jon said himself, David Barlow, Joe Martin, and Shannon Hansen would be there. Spencer asked if the Administration Committee chose the February 24<sup>th</sup> date. Mark said they looked at the calendar and had to speculate the best available day; they felt Friday was most available for people and by pushing it off until the end of the month it would give time to prepare. Spencer said his concern was that he would not be able to meet that day except for the morning. He wondered if it would be better to send something out and get some feedback on which day would work best. Trevor Coombs asked who would be available, and everyone said that day would work for them. Trevor said if there were some important items or some that Spencer wanted to discuss that maybe we do those in the morning. Spencer said to keep it on the 24<sup>th</sup> and maybe bump up a few items that he would like to be present for he would appreciate that.

Spencer said the item that concerns him the most is the discussion of transmission lines in the future. He does not know where that is coming from, but if there is a push from the Board to get out of the business of something that has always been done, that is alarming to some of the faster growing cities. Mark said not to read anything into it that is not there; the push was because it is something we have to define as it is part of the cost factor for the future. Brian said if we were to do something that dramatic, it would need to be done over a period of time to allow the cities to prepare for it. It is a great to start the discussion now, and if it makes sense we would figure out a way to implement it, but if it doesn't we wouldn't have to worry about it. Jon said it is a definition by the board of what the District is going to do in the future, because we have changed over our history, it is a philosophy that we'll develop and go from there. Jon said we have instances where there are multiple cities dumping into a line, that is a District line, if you have one city that comes in the plant through that line should that be the city's responsibility or does the District participate. Spencer said we are near capacity on a line that services Lehi, Eagle Mountain, Saratoga Springs, and if we are saying we are going to have the cities put that new line in, when previously it has been provided by the District, that send off all kinds of alarms with him. Jon said a discussion that would be helpful is, when there is a large development that comes in from one city that would cause us to upsize a District line that is ten years down the road on our master plan, what is our philosophy on that?

There was discussion about moving the transmission lines item up on the agenda. Brian said he did not think we would be making a decision in that meeting, it would be great to move that item up, have the discussion and then address it further in detail. David Bunker said he envisioned that we would have a healthy discussion, we could get to where there is a straw poll consensus, then come back at a board meeting and officially adopt them. Brian said in

1 a situation like this we would want to lay out the plans because he does not think any of the cities would agree to a  
2 high level, it is going to be whether we start down the path and then the cities are going to be involved. David  
3 Bunker said he hopes it is not just start down the path because we have been going down this path for many years.  
4 Brian said he is talking about the specific issue, that is a long term big impact decision. Jon said that will impact  
5 asset management. Mark Johnson said that item is more of a rules situation, because cities now do not fully  
6 understand what the District should help them with and what they should do on their own, so it is more to clarify that.  
7 Mark said when we say a straw poll, we do want to have an up and down vote on some of these, so we are headed in  
8 a distinct direction, but nothing is firm until we get into the Board meeting and actually vote to adopt the policies that  
9 are established. David Bunker said he is suggesting we do not have an official up or down vote, and that we come  
10 back at a regularly scheduled board meeting, recap these same things discussed at the retreat and have an up or down  
11 vote for anything we are going to change. Chris Condie said he would agree with that, it gives us time to go back  
12 and think about it, approach certain city employees, if we need to discuss it with them. We need that time to make  
13 sure we understand and we are not just voting on something that day. David Bunker said the emphasis is that we are  
14 trying to say “come on Board members we really have to make a decision.”

15 Chris said the March Board meeting is where will make decisions on the results of the retreat discussion. Jon said  
16 it could be later depending on the input and extent of involvement you need from the cities. Brian said if we are  
17 making decision in that meeting, it would have to be officially publicized. Jon said you are just going to be giving  
18 direction. Mark said we will be creating an outline in this retreat that will go to the next board meeting. We will  
19 need to have a straw poll, because we have fallen short in the past; we have got to make some decisions.

20 Chris asked if the issue with American Fork and the pipe that needs to be upsized, is an example of what this  
21 discussion is about. Mark said that is an example of some of the issues we have dealt with in the past and will  
22 continue to deal with in the future; it is not the reason we are doing this. Chris asked if there was any dispute in that  
23 example of who has to pay for what. Jon said from his perspective the board is going to look at that; we are going to  
24 do master planning, then when we look at our CFP out 5-10 years, we may update that, the direction may be to see if  
25 priorities have changed, those are the things that will come out of the discussions. We need to decide the philosophy  
26 we are going to follow. Brian said this is to define who owns what responsibilities, so it is clear to the cities if they  
27 are going to have a major impact, this is how it is going flow through the system, so they are aware. Mark said that  
28 example points to several problems with our system or our philosophy, not the least is how do we track cities growth,  
29 how do we know the timing of when those transmission lines need to be upsized; is that in our CFP and if so, what is  
30 the mechanism to identify funding for those and at what point do we do an engineering analysis to figure out what  
31 the funding is. Chris said in Lehi alone, west of the river on 2100 North, there are thousands of new units coming in.

32 Dale Ihrke said he wouldn't know, without a map, where the trunk lines come in and who owns what. There  
33 needs to be some preparation before this retreat or we are going to be spinning our wheels because we will not have  
34 the background information to make an informed decision. Jon said we could have some committee meetings, and  
35 identify some of the stuff that we know we are going to need. We will probably think of things at the retreat that we  
36 will have to go back and research, but we can have as much information as we think we are going to need. Mark said  
37 he thinks we have enough new members on the board that there is a large education component that has to take place.  
38 Mark said he has been on the board for a long time and there are still transmission lines he doesn't think he could  
39 identify. We all ought to be able to, and we and we all ought to understand our system pretty well before we start  
40 making key decisions in the future. David Bunker said we are talking about having information and support staff, it  
41 might help to have it here at the District. The Board discussed it and decided to reorganize the District Conference  
42 Room to make it adequate to have the retreat here. Jon said he would like to see the Administration Committee meet  
43 again and maybe fine tune this agenda and put in some time allocations, so if we get a facilitator they can keep us on  
44 task.

45

## 46 **2. Manager's Report**

47 Jon said we advertised and filled three positions to get a better handle on the budget salaries. One will start  
48 Tuesday and two are part time that will go to fulltime. We have one other position that we will advertise in the  
49 operations department. In plant performance, one of the goals of our upgrade was to be able to address the

1 phosphorus issue; we have been all over as we have played with the facility, and we have some fine tuning to do.  
2 We have been going through process modeling, going through some training efforts, and Jon has been moving things  
3 around to see what we can do on the phosphorus. Last month the average was 0.58 mg/L, which is below the 1.0  
4 mg/L we have talked about. It comes at a price; the BOD and TSS went up a little. We tried to hold the nitrogen  
5 down, because that is the other nutrient they will be governing. Jon said to pay particular attention to that, influent  
6 total nitrogen for a facility that is largely domestic and little commercial, 51.6 mg/L is high, that will be an issue for  
7 us and we will continue to work on that. Jon said our experience so far says we would not be able to meet less than  
8 1.0 mg/L year-round, until we get those blowers automated and the air valves. We will find out what happens when  
9 the phosphorus is low, what is high. That will help us to identify, if the state does ratchet the limits down, where our  
10 money is best spent; should we focus on the nitrogen or the phosphorus.

11 Jon Adams said he invited Rich Mickelson, Laboratory Director for Provo City. Provo is a member of the  
12 Water Research Council. Rich attended a meeting at the Utah Lake Technical Steering Committee, and will give  
13 the Board a brief summary of the meeting. Rich Mickelson gave the board a handout that the DWQ presented to  
14 the Technical Committee for the Utah Lake Commission. This is their attempt to get public input and to distribute  
15 their million dollars that the water quality board has allocated to them. Many of the cities are members of the Utah  
16 Lake Commission, and Eric Ellis is the Chairman for the Utah Lake Commission. The DWQ would like to create a  
17 steering committee which will be co-chaired by Eric Ellis and a member of the Dept. of Water Quality. There is a  
18 preliminary list of members for the Steering Committee. The committee will consist of eleven people; two from  
19 POTW (Public Owned Treatment Works). The Steering Committee is an interest group that would direct and  
20 design what the criteria they are going to be following and looking at. The Steering Committee would then pick  
21 and choose a science panel, who would then go and design the experiments. There are eleven people on the  
22 steering committee. Rich said they want to come to a consensus where three quarters of that group will vote to say  
23 what we all agree on, with only two from POTW, and one from the Utah Lake Commission, everybody else is  
24 either Federal or the State; we will never get any representation.

25 The Water Quality Board has issued \$1 million; Provo, Orem and TSSD are basically putting in \$275 thousand a  
26 year; over three years, that is over three quarters of a million dollars in research. This was brought up and discussed  
27 in the meeting for about an hour and then pushed to the next meeting where there will be comment periods to this  
28 document. Those comments will be due by January 27, 2017 to Eric Ellis. Rich said Provo will be putting  
29 something together, Spanish Fork has already responded, and Rich anticipates that Orem will respond. Rich said  
30 the individual cities should respond to this document because that will be the governing body that will decide how  
31 they are going to spend their million dollars, as well as get representation to the next technical committee which  
32 will be on February 15, 2017. This document (revised) will be revisited at that meeting again and hopefully be  
33 discussed in detail and revised again. The next technical committee will be in March. It has been difficult to find  
34 out when these meetings are. They are trying to present this in a resolution form from the Utah Lake Commission  
35 Technical Committee by the March deadline so the following week it can go the general board of the Utah Lake  
36 Commission. The importance of that is there will be a representative from each of the cities sitting on that board for  
37 the Utah Lake Commission. It would be wise if the different mayors were brought up to speed on what the Utah  
38 Division of Water Quality is attempting to do here. We simply do not have representation from this community.

39 Trevor Coombs asked who we send our responses to. Rich said to send them to Eric Ellis. Rich said he sent Jon  
40 an email summarizing that and a timeline, so Jon can forward that out. David Bunker asked who came up with the  
41 list of Federal and State representatives and the token local representatives. Rich said Erica Gaddis with Utah  
42 Division of Water Quality came up with the list, they see it as their money that they have to spend and do it in a  
43 public open format. Rich said this is phase two of their water quality study, phase one has not even been completed  
44 yet. They are already moving to phase two because they have the money and they are in a hurry so they can spend  
45 the money and can get the research done by 2019. Rich said there are six major points they wanted to accomplish  
46 and as far as he is aware, not one has been completed and they are already moving on to phase two. Brian said he  
47 read a statement in the paper by Mayor Curtis, Provo, about some legislative things that are happening, like the  
48 limits on phosphorus. Brian asked if he trying to use this as something to push the legislation from happening  
49 because there won't be a discussion on this. Is this a tool we can use or is this not beneficial to us and that is

1 completely different discussion that will not be related? Rich said there was legislation passed in 2016 which  
2 forced the hand of the DWQ, that if they went through and did things they thought were a good idea, they could be  
3 questioned by the different POTWs and be made to do a peer review process. On the document they are doing right  
4 here, they have incorporated the peer review process in the science panel. Rich said he, as a scientist, has never  
5 heard of people design the experiment, perform the experiment and then be their own peer review. The legislative  
6 policy issues that are currently being discussed or lobbied that will be in the next session are ones that Provo, Orem  
7 and TSSD are involved in. If you have to spend a million dollars on the process like phosphorus or nitrogen  
8 removal then it needs to be a policy discussed in the legislative session or with people that are setting the policies,  
9 not in the rules committee where the DWQ is determining what we need to comply with.

10 The Federal Level EPA has just come out with a new document on the HAB (Harmful Algal Bloom) that is open  
11 for public comment that will need to be received by February 17, 2017. The document talks about swimming in the  
12 HAB; Utah Lake criteria is set at 100,000 cell counts and the Federal level has now come back and said they are  
13 going to set the level at toxic cyanobacteria; the actual toxins are harmful not the algal blooms themselves. No  
14 deaths have been attributed to drinking water that has been contaminated with cyanobacteria. The federal level has  
15 said the World Health Organization set the threshold for toxins at 20 ppm toxic, the EPA now has set the threshold  
16 for toxins at 4 ppm. We had 0 toxins in the water column in Utah Lake last year, even when they talk about 35  
17 million cell counts, those are the cell counts, the toxins were 0, except one sample which was the scum off of  
18 Lincoln Beach. In the integrated report that was put out by DWQ in 2016, there were pages and pages of comments  
19 and their basic response was that they listened but are still going to do what they want to do.

20 Rich said their science vs the science we have been doing is conflicting because we look at the data and we each  
21 believe it says something different. This steering committee is going to make a recommendation to the water  
22 quality board when they get done with this whole process. Rich said they completed a three-year study at Willard  
23 Spur about a year ago, and spent over \$3.5 million; they only have \$1 million to do this study. It is not going to be  
24 enough money. They have put in this report that they will have the steering committee go out and get more funding.  
25 Rich believes they are going to come to TSSD, Provo and Orem; we are putting in \$250 thousand year and they are  
26 going to want that money. They will try to go after that money and the committee is 3 to 8. We are paying the bill,  
27 but do not get representation or vote.

28 Jon said the state does not have to guarantee an improvement in water quality and they have made that clear.  
29 What we need immediately from the local mayors on the Utah Lake Commission, is for them to voice their concern.  
30 We are trying to buy time so that the science can take place. The mayors are usually non-technical people and their  
31 focus has been recreation; there is a belief out there that the lake is going to become more pristine and recreational.  
32 We are saying that is not necessarily the case, let's do the science, just like reducing nitrogen could cause the  
33 blooms to get worse. Timpanogos can respond but if all ten of the cities respond that is better and puts pressure on  
34 the committees, the commission and Eric Ellis. We do not want The Utah Lake Commission to be used as a  
35 mechanism to rubber stamp this, in Jon's opinion that is where it is headed. We responded to the integrated report,  
36 and one of the things that probably everyone commented was you cannot use cell counts, that just says there is  
37 algae there, you have to use toxic counts. They disregarded those comments. Of the concerns we expressed, zero  
38 were included in the updated integrated report. The research council has prepared an appeal to the DWQ. The  
39 letter that went out to the public from Mr. Baker said thank you for all your comments, we believe this has made a  
40 stronger report. It did not change the report. We need some push back from local representatives that can help us  
41 bring some reason and make sure this is a collaborative effort. In Jon's opinion, the representation should be at the  
42 same percentage as you have sitting on the commission.

43 Mark Johnson said you need to introduce a political component. That political component will be persuaded by  
44 the science, but more so by the money. They need to be involved, and more than just the mayors; there are local  
45 state representatives that ought to be involved in this. Chris Condie asked Jon if he has attended those Utah Lake  
46 Commission meetings. Jon said he has attended some, but those meetings have not been advertised, and it is hard  
47 to find out when they are. The meeting sites change and the locations change, we have requested five times to be  
48 placed on their list. The mayors from each city in the District have a seat or representative there, but the District

1 was never included in the membership. When it comes to the wastewater aspect there wasn't any representation  
2 until someone like Mayor Curtis brought forth our concerns.

3 Craig Carlile said every year at this time the Chamber of Commerce have a breakfast with the legislators to  
4 present them objectives the chamber is going into this legislative session. This issue came up as Mayor Curtis, and  
5 the Mayor of Orem were there. Legislators in attendance were Dean Sanpei, and he gets it; Deidre Henderson was  
6 there and she was a little confused and thought it was coming from the Federal Government. Dean Sanpei said his  
7 understanding is that science does not support it. Mike Mckell, Kay Christofferson, and Brian Greene were also  
8 there. Craig Carlile said he thinks they get it and there is some movement politically with some of those people.  
9 Craig said legally, when you have the regulatory agencies set rules, when it goes to a court, the courts defer to the  
10 regulatory agency rules because they are the experts. Once it gets into the rulemaking, it is virtually impossible to  
11 win a court case against them. When Mayor Curtis says these high-level policy decisions ought to be made at the  
12 legislative level, Craig would emphasize that you want it to happen there, because if it gets into rulemaking we are  
13 toast.

14 Brian Braithwaite asked if this is a Utah Valley issue. They are poking at us, but the DEQ is talking about State  
15 water and the impacts. Why wouldn't we engage the Utah League of Cities and Towns; if this is going to hit the  
16 State of Utah and impact all of us? They have a direct conduit to the mayors and the city councils to help drive  
17 legislation. Should we be focusing on Utah Valley or should we be looking at the state. Rich said the policy we are  
18 involved in right now with the lobbyists, are with several other entities across the state like South Valley, Central  
19 Valley, and North Davis. It is larger than Utah County; Utah Lake is on the national bullseye. Jon said the EPA  
20 has used us as a poster child based on what DWQ is telling them. Also, EPA supports adaptive management, which  
21 is what we have tried to propose; let's go to the 1 mg that was proposed on phosphorus, see the benefits, and effects  
22 and study it. The EPA will support that, the state is not doing that. We want to try to pull them back and say let's  
23 do this correctly. It is a state wide issue, but we have to hurry with some things on Utah Lake because the state  
24 DWQ is moving ahead. If they get this study directed the way they want and to back up what they are saying, we  
25 are in trouble legislatively. They will have their science, which they do not have it at this time. We have science  
26 that says they are not going the right way. That is why time is of the essence.

27 Dale Ihrke said he is happy to go to the Alpine Mayor, but it would be helpful if TSSD gave them some step by  
28 step instructions. Jon said we have engaged Attorney Amanda Smith, and lobbyist Kate Bradshaw. Amanda  
29 prepared some talking points to take to the Mayors and Jon will be able to send those out. Dale asked if they want  
30 letters coming from the Mayors to go the Utah Lake Commission. Jon said yes. Brian suggested sending those  
31 talking points to the city councils as well as the mayors. It is important if the mayor send it if possible, but to  
32 encourage the city councils to know it because they can help drive influence on it. If it is statewide, the legislators  
33 will listen to all the cities. Jon said we have Amanda and Leland Myers meeting individually with legislators and  
34 trying to educate them. Chris Condie asked whether or not it would be useful to do a resolution from a mayor and  
35 city council, as sometimes that will help. Rich said Mayor Curtis is prepared to present in the February  
36 transportation group at MAG, where all the mayors will be, to get a consensus resolution from that group of who is  
37 supporting this. Chris said he heard about where several legislators from Utah County are get together and invite  
38 city and county officials. There is a get together this Saturday at North Pointe Elementary, between 6-9. Anyone is  
39 welcome to go and Chris said he plans to attend.

## 40 41 **Action Items**

### 42 **1. Adoption of the District's Procurement Policy**

43 Jon said this was sent out last month for review. This was prepared by the Association of Special Districts and  
44 reviewed by their legal authority. It is basically about a hundred-page summary of the state's 300 pages of  
45 procurement. It has been reviewed. We did incorporate two things that were different from the template; on petty  
46 cash, we put 7 points in there that gave better control of petty cash. We also put 5 points in under the Appeal to the  
47 Board of the District Trustees. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the procurement officer, shall appeal that  
48 decision to the District Board of Trustees and it outlines the 5 steps to do that. Those are the only changes that we  
49 made to the template. We have not changed any of the amounts that were previously there. In the old document the

1 procurement office could sign up to \$50,000 once the budget was approved, typically when Jon buys a vehicle he  
2 brings it to the Board anyway. If the board approves Jon to purchase covers and approves the payment schedule,  
3 then he may sign the \$74,000 check because it has been approved. Also, the utility bills can be around \$100,000 a  
4 month. Other than that, we are locked in and follow the purchasing with the amounts that were defined in state  
5 statute. There are procedures for purchases less than \$500, and procedures on quotes for purchases from \$500 to  
6 \$2,000, and purchases from \$2,000 to \$50,000 there are at least 3 written quotes. Then over \$50,000 you do the  
7 formal bidding or you can use the state contract; we have not changed any of that or raised any of the limits we have  
8 had.

9 Chris Condie said on the \$25,000 to \$125,000 it says you will obtain a minimum of two competitive quotes and  
10 then over \$100,000.00 it may invite at least three contractors. What is the intention of the words may invite? Jon  
11 said it gives us an option, depending on the nature of what you are looking for and what you feel is in the best  
12 interest of the District; then you have to document it. Chris asked is it possible that on a particular project there may  
13 only be two companies we are comfortable bidding the project out to, there may not be a third or fourth? Jon said  
14 that can happen and you document that you didn't get any other response. Chris asked if it guarantees that anything  
15 above \$25,000 or \$100,000 that we are going to do a minimum of 2 competitive bids. In the policy, it states that  
16 "from \$25,000 to \$125,000: The District may procure small construction projects costing more than \$25,000 up to a  
17 maximum of \$125,000 by obtaining a minimum of two competitive quotes that include minimum specifications, and  
18 will award the work to the contractor with the lowest quote that meets the specifications". It states that "over  
19 \$100,000: Between \$125,000 and \$2,500,000, the District may invite at least three contractors from the approved  
20 vendor list to submit quotes or bids that include minimum specifications". Craig White said that is if you have an  
21 approved vendor list, if you do not go through an approved vendor than you have to put it out to bid. To go through  
22 the process to get the approved vendors is just as onerous as going out for bid.

23  
24 **Craig White made a motion to adopt the District's Procurement Policy as presented. Chris Condie**  
25 **seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson, Mack Straw, Spencer Kyle, Brian Braithwaite,**  
26 **Chris Condie, David Bunker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, and Trevor Coombs. The motion passed with a**  
27 **unanimous vote.**

## 28 29 **2. Election of the Timpanogos Special Service District Administrative Board Chair and Vice Chair**

30 Mark said according to the District's By-Laws, Tracy Wallace cannot be put in as Board Chair and Mark Johnson  
31 cannot be put in as Vice Chair.

32 **Chris Condie nominated himself as Board Chair. Spencer Kyle seconded the nomination.**

33 David Bunker said he appreciates Tracy Wallace and what he has done for the Board as a Chair. He has been  
34 doing a great job, and according to our By-Laws there is a rule there for some change and that is why we are doing  
35 this. As board members, we know he was dedicated and put in a lot of time to do a good job for this District.

36 **David Bunker nominated Mark Johnson as the Board Chair. Trevor Coombs seconded the nomination.**

37 David Bunker said Mark Johnson is the longest tenured board member, not that length of time has anything to do  
38 with being a chair, but there are definitely some advantages to knowing where the Board and the District has been in  
39 the past. That history is important to us so we can use it to make good decisions going forward. David said Mark  
40 has been the Vice Chair and there have probably been meetings that he has been involved in and has good knowledge  
41 to carry forward. There is stability in having someone serve in a couple different positions consistently.

42 Trevor recommended to have one person count the ballots and have someone else observe the count.

43 **Board members voted for Board Chair by written ballot. Mark Johnson had the majority vote to become**  
44 **the Timpanogos Special Service District Administrative Board Chair.**

45 Mark said he would take nominations for Board Vice Chair.

46 **Trevor Coombs nominated David Bunker to be Vice Chair. Dale Ihrke seconded the nomination.**

47 Trevor said David has been representing Cedar Hills and he has applied for the at-large position. Trevor is not  
48 sure if David will get that position or not, but if David does not get the at-large position, Trevor is willing to step

1 down as American Fork's representative. Trevor said it is not that he does not want to be on the board, but with  
2 David's institutional knowledge he believes he would represent American Fork better.

3 **Craig White nominated Dale Ihrke as Vice Chair. Brian Braithwaite seconded the nomination.**

4 **Board members voted for Board Vice Chair by written ballot. David Bunker had the majority vote to**  
5 **become the Timpanogos Special Service District Administrative Board Vice Chair.**

6

7 **Adjourn:**

8 **Brian Braithwaite made a motion to adjourn. Trevor Coombs seconded the motion. All present "Aye".**

9 **Meeting adjourned. 7:36 p.m.**

10