

TIMPANOGOS SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD ELECTRONIC MEETING MINUTES  
January 20, 2022 6:00 p.m. Conference Room (Electronic-Zoom)

APPROVED

**Board Members:**

**Present:** David Bunker Chandler Goodwin Mack Straw  
Sullivan Love Mark Christensen Blaine Thomas  
Richard Nielson Craig White John Goodman  
Brian Braithwaite Jay Meacham Chris Condie  
\*Dale Ihrke

**District Staff:** Richard Mickelsen, District Manager Shannon Hansen, Administrative Manager  
David Barlow, District Engineer Danette Smith, Board Secretary  
Joe Martin, CPA

**Others:** Craig Carlile, Ray Quinney & Nebeker Brandon Wyatt, Bowen Collins and Assoc.  
Wade Stinson, Aqua Engineers Kasey Chesnut, Horrocks Engineers  
Christina McCulloch, JUB Engineers Trevor Lindley, Brown and Caldwell  
Ryan Bench, Carollo Engineers

**Call to Order**

David Bunker, Board Chair, called the meeting to order 6:02 p.m. and acknowledged the need to hold an electronic meeting.

“I, David Bunker, the Chair of TSSD Board, hereby determine that conducting the Board meeting at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Due to the State of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location.”

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

1. Approval of the November 18, 2021 Administrative Board Meeting Minutes
2. Approval of the December 16, 2021 Administrative Board Meeting Minutes

Craig White made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2021 Administrative Board Meeting and the December 16, 2021 Administrative Board Meeting. Brian Braithwaite seconded the motion. Those voting “Aye” – David Bunker, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, John Goodman, Brian Braithwaite, Blaine Thomas, Chris Condie, Craig White, Jay Meacham, Richard Nielson, Sullivan Love and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously.

**Consent Calendar**

1. COP Pay Request #6
2. TO 2022-01 Master plan Phase 1 Program Management
3. TO 2022-02 Package A Thermal Dryer Preliminary Design
4. TO 2022-04 Package B WRF South Area Improvements Basis of Design
5. TSSD Check Register

1 Chris Condie made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Mack Straw seconded the motion. Those  
2 voting “Aye” – David Bunker, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, John Goodman, Brian Braithwaite, Blaine  
3 Thomas, Chris Condie, Craig White, Jay Meacham, Richard Nielson, Sullivan Love and Chandler Goodwin. The  
4 motion passed unanimously.  
5

## 6 Financial Report

7 Brian Braithwaite said when the Finance Committee met, they discussed the requirements for meeting the financial  
8 obligations. It is required to review the check register once a quarter, but they feel it makes sense to include the register  
9 on the consent calendar and have it available each month. Brian said it will keep us in a better position of being able to  
10 see if there is an issue.

11 Joe Martin reported on the November financials. Joe said they changed the format to simplify the income statement.  
12 The number of expense line items was reduced to match what was submitted for the budget. The District is in good  
13 financial shape. Joe said we underestimated impact fees for 2021. We budgeted \$4.2 million, and Joe thinks we will hit  
14 \$12 million by the end of the year. Joe said the District is very healthy when it comes to our cash balance. The District  
15 has spent \$10 million on capital projects in 2021.

16 Joe said they have been reconciling impact fees for the year and it came to their attention that some cities were  
17 paying the old impact fee rate. The old rate was \$1,708.00 and in February of last year it went up to \$1,785.55. The  
18 multifamily was \$1,110.00 and in February last year everything should have changed to the same rate of \$1,785.55.  
19 They went through all the documents submitted by the city after March 2021, and anything submitted under the old rate  
20 was calculated. Joe said it looks like there are some significant amounts we were not paid that we should have been.  
21 Joe said it is a concern to him as they are preparing for the audit. Some cities have reported back that those permits were  
22 issued at the old rate, but then the District is not being paid until September or October. Joe thinks maybe the city is  
23 issuing permits and not collecting the money right away, which shouldn't be the case. Now that we are at the end of the  
24 year, there is a question whether we going to have a big receivable. The auditors are going to have to confirm that.

25 David Bunker said he is happy this is being reconciled and if there is a discrepancy, we need to make sure it is  
26 corrected. David asked board members to go to their finance and building departments to check if they see a  
27 discrepancy with their cities. David said he would meet with American Fork City about this. Joe said every year when  
28 the auditors come in, confirmations are prepared for impact fees remitted by the cities. There is almost always a city or  
29 two that needs to correct an underpayment or overpayment. This is going to make it a little more complicated. Joe said  
30 he is hoping that the cities can get on this right away so by the time the auditors come next month this will be mostly  
31 resolved. Mark Christensen asked the de minimis value that we need to look for. Joe said he is not worried about  
32 anything under \$1,000, and anything under a \$100 could be a rounding issue. Mark said we need to set a threshold and  
33 for just a few bucks we really do not want to waste too much effort.

34 \*Dale Ihrke arrived. 6:23 p.m.  
35

## 36 Action Items

### 37 1. Collection CMMS Award

38 Rich said Sullivan Love would present action item 1. Sullivan said the District sent out an RFP for the Collection  
39 System Asset Management Solutions. Eight proposals were received and were reviewed and scored by staff and the  
40 engineering committee in accordance with the RFP. The RFP outlined that the top four scorers would come and present  
41 the solution they could provide for the District. The presentations were made, questions were asked, and they were  
42 scored again according to the RFP. Sullivan said there were two top scorers, so they went back to the consultants and  
43 asked them to get feedback from member cities and those using the software. Sullivan said District staff members also  
44 participated in this process as they will be the ones who will implement this software. After additional feedback from  
45 consultants, cities and staff, Cityworks was scored as the top software solutions. Sullivan this bid is for (4) four-year  
46 cost of \$213,500.00. Sullivan said we wanted to make sure that our operators were comfortable with implementing the  
47 software and using it in the field. Rich said District staff who will be using this were part of the whole process including  
48 the presentations and scoring process and they followed the RFP in the scoring and the selection process.  
49

1 **Brian Braithwaite made a motion to approve a contract with Cityworks for the Collections CMMS for a cost**  
2 **of \$213, 500.0 for a four-year period. Blaine Thomas seconded the motion. Those voting “Aye” – David Bunker,**  
3 **Dale Ihrke, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, John Goodman, Brian Braithwaite, Blaine Thomas, Chris Condie,**  
4 **Craig White, Jay Meacham, Richard Nielson, Sullivan Love and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed**  
5 **unanimously.**

6  
7 **2. City Contracts (Service Area – Dry Creek, SVSD, Highland, Lehi, Vineyard, Eagle Mt.)**

8 David Bunker said Action Item 2 is not quite ready and would need to be tabled until next month.

9  
10 **Dale Ihrke made a motion to table Action Item 2 until next month. Richard Nielson seconded the motion.**  
11 **Those voting “Aye” – David Bunker, Dale Ihrke, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, John Goodman, Brian**  
12 **Braithwaite, Blaine Thomas, Chris Condie, Craig White, Jay Meacham, Richard Nielson, Sullivan Love and**  
13 **Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously.**

14  
15 **3. Electronic TSSD Board Meetings**

16 David Bunker said they discussed electronic meeting participation at the November 18, 2021 Board Meeting. It was  
17 requested to have further discussion and give direction which way to go. This is related to when we have board  
18 members present at an anchor location and have board members who are not present to participate by electronic  
19 technology. Mark said he is sits on the 911 Utah Valley Dispatch Board anchored in Spanish Fork. Mark said due to  
20 the nature of the location, they transitioned to an online platform years ago, which allows members to participate  
21 remotely. It works incredibly well and saves a ton of time in travel and lets board members participate electronically. It  
22 does require an investment in some technology, and Mark understands it would take some retrofitting in the District  
23 Conference Room to make it a seamless technology. Mark said Saratoga Springs allows their council members to  
24 participate remotely. Mark said it should not be the decision of a chair, because all of us are voting members and have a  
25 say in the meetings. He does believe that the meetings should be conducted in a way that make a lot of sense and are  
26 well managed. Mark said, as a board, we ought to embrace the technology, spend a little bit of money, and make sure  
27 that we as board members have the opportunity to participate remotely if that is what works best for our given situations.

28 David Bunker agrees this it is not the decision of the chair or any one board member. Mack Straw said being out in  
29 Eagle Mountain it takes a little a time to get through all the traffic and he would be open to that idea if we are willing to  
30 make the proper arrangements and improvements. Mack said like most cities, they meet in person but have the option to  
31 remote login and that has been very helpful. Dale asked if we knew the cost to implement the technology for this. Rich  
32 said he was not sure, the OWL Technology, some are using to pick up the video of who is speaking is less than a couple  
33 hundred dollars. The problem we have in our conference room is that it echoes, so we may need to put some type of  
34 noise reducer around the room. There may be technology so the Chair can see and direct who has comments. Rich said  
35 he would guess it would be under \$5,000.00.

36 Brian said he would like to see the cost. The biggest problem we have is that it will cost a little more because we  
37 have more participants. Mark said we are all members of big communities where there are dozens of people  
38 participating remotely. Mark said simple is best, the feedback issue is generally making sure the way the inputs are  
39 running into the system are not blaring out of the speakers but are actually running through the software. Dale Ihrke said  
40 in general he is supportive of this and there have been times he was sick that he would have participated if he had the  
41 option, and this would also save driving time. David said with other larger groups, one issue he sees is when he is  
42 remote and there are people in the room, he cannot see them and can hardly hear them. For a voting body, like ours, it is  
43 really important that we can hear each other, and it is helpful to see each other, especially when making motions. David  
44 said it seems several board members are interested to looking further into this and getting a cost. Rich said he would  
45 look into it and get a cost. Blaine said with technology and the way things are we are foolish if we do not look into it  
46 and see what the advantages are. David said this would be brought back to the board with a firm cost and that will help  
47 us make a better decision.

48  
49 **Communication**

50 **1. Managers’ Report**

1 Rich said the District has been participating with DWQ to track coronavirus in the wastewater stream. In April of  
2 2020 we participated in the initial measurement of the coronavirus coming into the plant. The data can be seen on the  
3 DWQ website. Rich said the health department took control of this in 2021 and they let us know there is grant money  
4 available for our effort in grabbing these samples and making them available for testing. We need to send invoices over  
5 the next 6 months, and they will be refunding us about \$6,000.00.

6 Rich said following up on December's board meeting regarding whether we need to increase our biosolids budget, it  
7 depends on the treatment part of the facility and how many biosolids we end up with. Every year around November we  
8 usually make an adjustment to that line item. We may need to do the same again this year. Rich said we had to increase  
9 that \$200,000.00 in 2021. Part of that increase is due to new flow coming to us, it also includes the 3% increase on the  
10 landfills, which are built in. Rich tries to keep that as close as he can and then make those adjustments in November.

11 Rich said the changes we have made have had a significant impact with the effluent phosphorus. The 2021 yearly  
12 average is 0.59 mg/L for 2021. Our limit is 1.0 mg/L, so we have done well. We do not have a parameter on effluent  
13 TIN (Total Inorganic Nitrogen), but the state would like us to be below 10 mg/L. Our yearly average for 2021 is 8.77  
14 mg/L. The last few months the state seems to be pushing toward a nitrogen limit. Rich said that is something we need  
15 to be aware of and we have planned for that contingency if they do put a limit on us.

16

17 **Closed Meeting**

18 There was no closed meeting.

19

20 **Adjourn: Blaine Thomas made a motion to adjourn. Mack Straw seconded the motion. All present "Aye".**

21 **Meeting adjourned. 6:56 p.m.**