

TIMPANOGOS SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD
WORK SESSION

APPROVED

Date: January 29, 2015 6:00 P.M. Conference Room

Board Members

Present: Tracy Wallace Mark Johnson Craig White
 Jay Meacham Brian Braithwaite David Norman
 Keith Blake Dale Ihrke Chris Condie
 David Bunker

Excused: Sean Fernandez Spencer Kyle Craig Whitehead

Others: Jon Adams, District Manager
 Danette Smith, Board Secretary
 David Barlow, District Engineer

Conducting:

Tracy Wallace, Board Chairman. The meeting commenced at 6:00 p.m.

I. Update from District Manager on the Status of the Utah County Water Quality Research Group

Jon said we started with the water quality research group in the Salt Lake Valley (Jordan Valley Water Group). We tried to piggy back on them, they accepted us and we had money approved in our budget to go into that group. Part of that would be to do research on Utah Lake and the impact it had with the Jordan River and the phosphorous and nitrogen issue. It was determined that we ought to form a Utah County group and bring Provo and Orem in. That was done and almost two years ago there was a meeting, where they invited the mayors. That was done through the Utah Lake Commission. Reed Price, who was over the Utah Lake Commission spent a lot of time meeting with mayors and different groups to get them headed in a direction. There was an allocation, which was approved in the budget, to get this going. There has been an ongoing hesitancy with some of the communities; they want agreements that are shorter term and want to know that safeguards are built in.

The Jordan Valley Water Quality group issued a memo last week stating they can't wait any longer; they have lost valuable time on this issue. They wished us good luck but let us know we are not going to be part of their group. They have full time employees and have done a lot of research, but that is where they left us. Jon said he tried to contact Reed Price, since that group had issued their statement, to see if there had been thoughts from the other communities. Jon said we have the largest appropriation of the Utah County group, which is about 50% of their budget; we are obviously the largest entity. We are the only one that discharges directly into the lake, so that research is more valuable to us. The Jordan Valley group thought some of the safeguards were going to eat up some of the research money. That leaves us out of that group, and we still have a need. Jon said he has talked to that group to see if they would be willing to allow us back in. Jon said it is kind of slim, but they certainly do not want anything to do with the other entities. Jon sees benefit for us to piggy back, coordinate efforts through them and take advantage of what they have already done. Jon does not want to spend the time or the resources if the board does not think there is merit in it, but the money is already approved for this year's budget.

Keith Blake said he thinks we should pursue this; we are directly connected to it, there is advantage there, and value in it. Brian said he believes the need for being on top of this is really important, he doesn't know that

1 he cares if we are with that group or we have our own group down here. Since the other entities down here have
2 proved that they are not interested, it doesn't seem likely to continue the Utah County Group. Brian thinks we
3 ought to be doing all we can to get in with the Jordan Valley group. The EPA is going to come down with
4 regulations, and if we are not prepared for it, we can easily get burned by it. We need to get ahead of this. Jon
5 said we can ask them to add us into their existing agreement. Brian said even though we have it in this year's
6 budget, it is really more than a one year commitment; we would be committing to multiple years. David Bunker
7 asked Jon if we need to choose one or the other; either stay with the Utah Lake Commission or go with the Jordan
8 Group. Jon said the way it is right now, the Utah County group is dead in the water. Our only option currently, is
9 to go back with the Jordan Valley group. The Utah Lake Commission is not dealing with this issue now. We
10 cannot do it ourselves, but if we can put our money where they are already set up, there is benefit that we will
11 pick up a lot of information that we would have spent time just trying to get. If we go back in there with our
12 money, then Jon hopes other Utah county communities, like Orem, might join too.

13 David Bunker asked what the relationship was between that group and the dischargers down here in Utah
14 County. Craig White said the only one they have a relationship with is Jon. David Bunker said when they look at
15 the water quality coming out of Utah Lake, do they say wow you guys have big issues or are they saying you are
16 doing what you can, and we will partner up and tackle this together. Craig White said his understanding is that
17 they haven't looked at Utah Lake at all. Craig White said we are ten years behind here and we are trying to catch
18 up. Jon said Utah Lake has some things that are unique; there is a certain amount of natural phosphorous in there.
19 Jon said his concern is that he does not want to fund them so they can do research and then point the finger at us.
20 We have to be cautious. The Federal Government used to provide research money. That money has since gone
21 away. Now they leave it up to the entities to do the research. By doing research, we gain information to make a
22 good argument. We would like to build the case to say, we built this plant to biologically remove phosphorous
23 and nitrogen. If they impose limits across the board; we are looking at .01 mg/L phosphorous, we can't do that
24 biologically. There would need to be chemical addition in order to meet that standard. The real question is
25 whether it is necessary and what difference it will make in the lake. What portion of nutrients do we contribute to
26 the lake? We may not need to put in additional treatment to go from 1mg/L to .1mg/L, which would save money.
27 Tracy said this group has the experience; they already have the protocol set up. They understand how to set up
28 the parameters to do the study, even though this will be a new study area. Dale asked if there was a partnership
29 between the Jordan study group and the state. Jon said yes, they are willing to work together. The group wants to
30 be professional but they want to hold the state accountable too. It is a good workable relationship, though at times
31 it can be tense. David Bunker said he thinks this is a good thing, and he wants to spend our dollars in the best
32 possible way. What he sees from this group and the experience and time they have into this, why wouldn't we put
33 our money with them? David Bunker said he does not want to put our money in with them and still have to pay
34 into another group that is not getting us anywhere. Jon said he would start working to try and get us back into the
35 Jordan Valley group.

36 37 38 **II. Discussion and prioritization of topics related to current and anticipated future issues**

39 Mark Johnson said there was an Administration Committee meeting in November. Dale sent over some
40 items that he felt were important to have as future topics of discussion. Those were discussed with some of the
41 other members of the Administration Committee. They decided that as the District grows, they see a lot of things
42 happening in the future and we should get in front of these issues. Mark said he feels we are seeing a lot of
43 lawsuits now in the District and as the District grows we are going to see those continue. Regardless of what
44 happens with the lawsuits we have now, those issues are going to come around again. The best thing to do is
45 make a list of items that we ought to get in front of, so we are not in a reactionary mode. We need to have some
46 kind of preparation done so it is more of a proactive approach.

47 Mark said the lists the Board members have in front of them are the issues that were decided to have a
48 brief discussion on what to move forward on and how to prioritize. Most of these would go into the suitable
49 committees, for preliminary discussion, and preparation for presentation to the Board. The Board reviewed the
50 list to determine if it needs action, the appropriate committee, projected cost, time completed and whether it is
51 low, medium or high priority.
52

1 • **Develop a public education and relationship program**

2 The Board decided that this would be an Administration Committee issue, would be about \$10,000 to get
3 this going and high priority. Time to identify a consultant, and start getting some ideas would be 4-6 months.
4 Brian said we ought to be modest about what we do this year; like have some consulting and reach out to the
5 community.

6
7 • **Improve the delivery of packet information to Board members (Electronic processing procedure)**

8 Mark said this is something we have already discussed and there has been some progress. The
9 Administration Committee talked about doing a stipend of \$500.00 to every board member. They can use that to
10 buy their own electronic device and the District would begin to create their board packet in PDF formats. There
11 was still the question about the frequency of the stipend. The suggestion was to give the stipend every four years
12 and then for new members on the Board. If that was found to not be sufficient, it can be moved to every 2-3
13 years. The time period was set for 2 months to get the board members \$500.00 and 3 months to begin sending out
14 electronic board packets. The packets could be sent out by email, dropbox, or put on the District's website for the
15 board members to receive them.

16 Dale asked if there could be a 72 hour deadline for board documents to be sent out. Jon said the only
17 thing that may be hard to get out is the financials, especially if the meeting comes earlier in the month. The board
18 said they would be fine with the financials being in draft form in order to receive them within the time limit. Dale
19 said there are documents that are handed out at board meeting, which doesn't give much time to review. He
20 believes those can be sent out as part of the electronic documents for board meeting. Jon said there are
21 exceptions, where it is in the best interest of the District to hand out at board meeting. The board said exceptions
22 are ok. Jay Meacham said since we are moving into electronic packets, he encourages Board members to obtain
23 district email accounts, especially with the legal issues. Mark said if personal or work email accounts are used for
24 anything that happens here with the District, it can be GRAMA requested. It probably would be wise to set those
25 up. This would be high priority.

26
27 • **Legal liability risk mitigation**

28 Mark said he believes the District is going to see the opportunity for lawsuits increase. It happens with
29 growth. He would like to know the best way to handle this. You cannot forecast a lawsuit, but you can put
30 yourself in a position so you can prepare to reduce any liability. The board decided it would be an Administration
31 Committee issue, and an ongoing issue, with medium priority.

32
33 • **Website improvement**

34 Jon said staff is working on this. There is a meeting next week with a company who has helped some of
35 the cities with their websites. This is high priority with a projected cost of \$5,000.00.

36
37 • **Development of a long term strategic plan – long term goals and vision**

38 Dale said he worked with the city of San Jose for 20 plus years and was the plant manager for the last six
39 of those years. That plant is about 6 times the size of this facility. Dale learned a lot of lessons, by failures and
40 accidents. Dale sat down and brainstormed some of the risks and how to mitigate them and some of the
41 opportunities that we went after as a utility. Dale said he started out with a long term strategic plan. Dale
42 believes it is effective to have the board meet once a year to have a work session to go over the top issues that
43 they see for one year to five years and set some long term goals. This should be discussed by the board as a
44 whole and is set for medium priority to be completed this year.

45
46 • **Training – safety and technical**

47 Dale said there is an OSHA list for required training and staff should have a record to show they are up to
48 date. Jon said safety requirements are continually changing. Jon would not dare say he is up to speed on all of
49 those requirements. When you are looking at safety training programs and policies, we would probably need to
50 look at some kind of investment to get us where we need to be. Tracy said this is something that Jon should plan
51 to bring back to the Administration Committee after about four months. He could show the training safety and
52 training schedules, what the requirements are, and what we are doing to meet those requirements. Then we would
53 be able to maintain.

1 Craig White believes training for employees is under the direction of the District manager. Craig said he
2 gets concerned when he sees board members trying to micromanage the management. CraigWhite said it is the
3 Board's job to make sure they give Jon the resources and the support so he can fulfill his job. If the training is not
4 being done and there is lapse, we go to Jon. If we do not give him the resources then that is another thing. Craig
5 White said he gives a monthly report to his Board letting them know how many accidents, employee injuries and
6 property damage. Tracy agreed that the Board's purpose is to have staff come to them and say this is how we are
7 doing it. Jon said the fact that employees know the board is behind safety is important.

8 Craig White said in this last budget, we did not budget anything for conferences, how can the employees
9 get trained if we are not budgeting money for conferences. In the recent past training and safety money has been
10 cut. It was looked at as "it is not absolutely necessary, just do your best." Jon thinks this is where the Board can
11 help. Dale said he does not want to micromanage, but in the last year he has not heard anything back regarding
12 training. He would like some report back to the board with regard to training. He is 100% for the employee and
13 does not want to seen anyone get hurt. It is the responsibility of the Board to make sure the resources are
14 provided to do that; safety is one aspect, training is another. Dale said you may think you do not have the training
15 budget and there may be training out there that will help in many different ways. Jon said we take advantage of
16 what is sponsored here and piggyback with the cities when available. Brian suggested we send this to the
17 Administration Committee to define what responsibilities are in this. The board needs to make sure the resources
18 are there and work with Jon to figure out the right process, which will be proposed to the Board to see if they
19 agree. This was set for medium priority, and four to five months to be ready.

20
21 • **Short and long term odor control plan**

22 Mark believes this is something we should continue because it is one of our future potential liability risks.
23 Mark believed this should be looked at by the Engineering committee. Jon believed there is an aspect for each
24 committee; it should go through the process of the Administration, Engineering and Finance Committee with help
25 from staff. Staff needs direction as to the level we want to have. This will dictate what technology we will seek
26 out and what the cost is for that. Mark thought we should start with the engineering committee to review the
27 technologies that are available and what we can do. They can make a recommendation to the Board or send it to
28 another committee. Dale said this is as much political as it is engineering. We should invite municipalities we
29 serve to help us solve the problem. This is their plant as they are paying the bills, and they should be part of the
30 solution. Dale said wastewater treatment plants stink and they always will, you can do everything and you are
31 still going to smell. Dale said the public education is a very important part of this. Mark agreed. The creation of
32 this District was to serve the general public. To Mark this falls under public relations and we do have to get our
33 customers involved. We need to have the information first before we invite people in. Brian said this should be
34 included as part of part of the public education as one of the key components. Mark said people need to
35 understand the good we do in this community; they only concentrate on the bad.

36
37 • **Formal condition assessment of critical assets –what's happening with things you can't see**

38 Dale said a typical plant will last around 50-60 years, before they start falling apart. We can extend the
39 life of the plant, and save money by assessing the condition of the plant. Dale said they would look at older
40 pieces of the plant, such as sewer lines, tanks from the inside to assess the condition. It did cost money, but there
41 was a formal system of ranking it in a report that showed the condition and saves money in the long run. This
42 would be looked at by the Engineering a Committee with medium priority. Brian said we should have something
43 in place for this year that shows how we will do it. This is set for low to medium priority to have a plan in 6-8
44 months.

45
46 • **Formal regulatory compliance audit including environmental, health and safety audit**

47 Dale said bring in consultants for a detailed audit, which looks at all different aspects of the plant. This
48 would be for internal use only. This would go to the Administration Committee and be turned over to other
49 committees.

50
51 • **Energy Management Plan**

52 Mark said this would go to the Engineering Committee and be set for low priority. Dale said he is not sure
53 of the opportunities here, but some plants have a goal of energy self sufficiency in 20 years. Dale does not know

1 if that is realistic or not. Dale asked what goals the Board has for a long term energy plan; to become energy self
2 sufficient in 20 years; or even energy producers.

3
4 • **Cost reduction**

5 Dale said this could be things like LED lights, which are expensive upfront, but save money in the long
6 run. Jon said the new buildings have some LED light fixtures; there are certain places that LED lights do not
7 provide enough light. Mark said that as a government agency there are programs out there that help with this.
8 This would be reviewed by the Financial and Engineering Committee. It is medium priority, with a completion of
9 6 months.

10
11 • **Long term water usage - recycled water program**

12 The board discussed this and decided to hold off on this unless we hear from a municipality whom is
13 interested.

14
15 • **Benchmarking with other plants – rates, staffing, costs**

16 Dale said he would not consider this high priority, but it can be a useful tool. How are we staffing
17 compared with other districts as far as staffing, costs with other facilities that are similar in size and nature. Brian
18 said this could be a positive thing. If we are processing this at cheaper rate than other district's that is something
19 we can make public. If we can't process cheaper because of geography or other issues, than we recognize that,
20 but also prepares us if we are questioned. This is going to the Finance Committee, and is low priority, not to be
21 done until next year.

22
23 • **Plant contingency plan review**

24 Dale asked if we are comfortable with our plan for a major emergency or natural disaster. Dale said San
25 Jose's goal was to not let the plant go down. Jon said there is enough fuel to continuously run the generators for
26 72 hours. To continue past those 72 hours, it would wipe out the fuel budget after 7 days. Jon said in order for
27 him to keep employees here at the plant, the governor would need to declare a state of emergency. If the
28 employees get sick, how would we run? Dale asked if the Board knows what the contingency plan is and if they
29 are comfortable with it. This will go to the Administration Committee, where a list will be developed that will go
30 to the Board. This is low priority, and will not be done until next year. Brian said this should be published so the
31 community is aware.

32
33 • **Asset management program – CMMS system**

34 Dale said asset management is a full program, to know what you have, where it is to look at the entire life
35 cycle of the plant. It is a way of looking at your assets and managing them. It helps to know what has to be
36 replaced when, so it is plugged in as part of the financials to help set the rates. Jon said we have GIS, and
37 computerized maintenance management program. It is up to the Board what level the board wants to do this. The
38 GIS is in the beginning stages. This is going to the Engineering Committee, with a low priority that will be
39 ongoing.

40
41 • **Pretreatment Program Audit/Best Practices/policy review**

42 This falls in the same thing as the self audit for environmental, health and safety and gives an idea of how
43 we are doing in this area. The Board decided to group this issues in with the health audit.

44
45 • **CMOM Audit -The Districts role in maintaining other City Collections systems**

46 Jon said one of the most critical issues we have is the agreement we have with helping the cities with their
47 collection systems, and to make sure the District is protected for providing service to the cities. Craig White said
48 the CMOM needs to be changed to SSMP (Sanitary Sewer Management Plan). The State has put every
49 municipality under permit for their collections system. Craig White asked how TSSD relates to the city's permit.
50 This would be determined city by city. There is the policy decision of what should we be involved. Jon said there
51 are two issues, what is the District' role and what do we do to follow that through. This will go through the
52 Administration Committee, set with high priority to be looked at within 3 months.

1 • **Future permit issues**

2 Jon said the issues facing us right now are the phosphorous and nitrogen proposed limits. We must get
3 involved directly with the research. The first set of regulations will begin in 2019. This will go to the
4 Administration Committee, be high priority and be done in 2-4 months.
5

6 • **Succession planning – documentation, training**

7 Jon said this is one reason we hired a District Engineer. The hierarchy from inside now has somewhat of
8 career ladder. We have some incentives and folks that can take positions are required to be certified by the state.
9 We have some potential hopefuls within the system. It is in process, but it need to be formalized. Mark said Jon
10 could bring a personnel chart to the Administration Committee to have a discussion.

11 Dale said documentation, like O & M manuals should be up to date. Jon said we are in the process of re-
12 doing round sheets and O & M training because of the plant upgrade. Dale said there is the concern that long
13 term employees know O & M, but that may not be passed on to newer employees. Dale said it is a good idea to
14 have those long term employees document maintenance, so when they retire that information does not leave with
15 them. This was made low priority to be done next year.
16

17 • **Salary comparison review (relating to other facilities)**

18 • **Benefit comparison**

19 Jon said the Board would need to give direction whether they want someone from the outside to do these
20 or be done internally. Jon said we are member of Technet, who do these comparisons. Jon said he advertises a
21 job and pulls up a description to make sure it is current. He can also pull up position descriptions from other
22 facilities to see if we are in the ballpark. These would go to the Finance Committee, with a medium priority to be
23 done in September to get ready for the 2016 budget.
24

25 • **Cash on hand policy**

26 This is high priority being done currently by the Administration Committee.
27
28

29 Meeting adjourned 8:24 p.m.
30