

TIMPANOGOS SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT  
ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

APPROVED

May 17, 2018                      6:00 p.m.                      Conference Room

Board Members

Present:

Mark Johnson	*David Bunker	Brian Braithwaite
Lynn Walker	Chandler Goodwin	Craig White
Chris Condie	Mark Christensen	Sullivan Love
Mack Straw	Dale Ihrke	

Excused:                      Commissioner Bill Lee

District Staff:

David Barlow, District Engineer  
Shannon Hansen, Human Resource  
Alan Robinson, Maintenance Coordinator  
Danette Smith, Board Secretary  
Michael Scheetz, Laboratory Director

Others:

Craig Carlile, Ray Quinney and Nebeker  
Brandon Wyatt, Bowen Collins & Associates  
Brandon Heidelberger, Brown and Caldwell  
Stan Lockhart, IM Flash Technologies  
Ryan Mills, IM Flash Technologies  
Brian Verwer, IM Flash Technologies  
Nathan Hyde, IM Flash Technologies (Legal)  
Marty Banks, IM Flash Technologies (Legal)  
Mike Smith, IM Flash Technologies

**Call to Order**

Mark Johnson, Board Chair, called the meeting to order. 6:01 p.m.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Approval of Minutes**

**1. Approval of the April 19, 2018 Administrative Board Meeting Minutes**

Brian Braithwaite made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2018 Administrative Board Meeting. Lynn Walker seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Brian Braithwaite, Chris Condie, Lynn Walker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, Sullivan Love and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously.

**Consent Calendar**

There were no items on the consent calendar.

1 **Finance**

2 **1. Financial Report**

3 Joe Martin was excused from board meeting. The Board reviewed the financials.

4  
5 Mark Johnson said he would like to have IM Flash give their presentation under Communication Item 4 –  
6 Presentation by IM Flash Technologies.

7  
8 **Communication**

9 **4. Presentation by IM Flash Technologies Regarding a Future Potential Spike in Flow**

10 Mark Johnson said IM Flash contacted him regarding a process change they are going through, which involves  
11 flows. Mark asked to have IM Flash present this to the board.

12 Stan Lockhart, IM Flash Technologies, introduced those attending from IM Flash. Ryan Mills, IM Flash, gave  
13 some background on how they operate and manage their wastewater and water treatment systems. In their current  
14 operation they have drain segregation and reclaim systems in place that have been operating since early 2007, when  
15 they started their manufacturing. Those existing systems have reduced their sewer discharge by an average of 1.1  
16 mgd - 1.2 mgd. Mr. Mills said they put a high emphasis on making sure they are responsible with their wastewater  
17 and they reclaim as much as possible. They realized a couple of years ago they needed to get to another level of  
18 reclaim and evaluated reclaim systems at Micron worldwide sites.

19 \*David Bunker arrived. 6:11 p.m.

20 Brian Braithwaite asked if the reduced discharge of 1.1 mgd - 1.2 mgd is not coming to the District, where does  
21 that water go and who is testing it to make sure it has been treated properly? Mr. Mills said they take those waste  
22 streams and re-treat, clean them up and send them back into their process. The only thing that gets discharged is the  
23 water they cannot get to a quality level they can reuse. With this research they have tried to find opportunities to  
24 reclaim more water to reuse in their factory over and over again. They have identified and obtained funding and are  
25 in execution on three projects. The first project is in operation today and they have turned it over to a fully functional  
26 system. This project was identified to be able to avoid a .3 mgd increase in the future. The second project is a reject  
27 recovery process they have identified, which will be operational in November. Mr. Mills said the third project they  
28 are really interested in is a local scrubber reclaim identified in one of their Asian fabrication areas. It will reduce  
29 their sewer discharge by about .4 mgd in the future. This project will not be operational until May 2019.

30 Mr. Mills showed a chart with actual and projected flows for IM Flash. Their projections show where they will  
31 be with full output of their fabrication areas. Historically, projections have been fairly close to their actual discharge.  
32 The reject recovery implementation occurs in November, and the projected flows drop, then in May of 2019 the local  
33 scrubber reclaim is implemented and the projected flows decrease as more and more processes are converted over to  
34 that reclaim system. The main issue is the temporary time period where they are over their 3.2 mgd permit limit.  
35 Mr. Mills said they feel the risk of going over the 3.2 mgd limit is low; they are being proactive by coming to the  
36 board tonight. The current forecast shows a temporary exceedance until that system is operational but once it is  
37 operational, their long-term sustainability is below the 3.2 mgd permit limit. One solution being brought tonight is a  
38 possible accommodation to temporarily exceed the 3.2 mgd permit limit, without a violation of their existing permit.  
39 Mr. Mills said they are forecasting they will go over about .1 mgd to .2 mgd over a period of 9 to 10 months. In July  
40 it is touching the permit limit, and also in August, September and October. There will be a reduction in November,  
41 with implementation of the reject recovery project and then it increases back up as further ramping occurs on the  
42 project.

43 David Bunker said the amount we are talking about will not really affect the plant's ability to take this flow; it is  
44 really more an issue for IM Flash's permit. Mark Johnson said his interpretation is the permit limit was tied to  
45 impact fees, or an RDA which had impact fees in it. Mark Johnson said he believes their permit limit was set by  
46 looking at the forecast to what we could handle and what they would produce. Mark Christensen asked staff how the  
47 permit reads, if they exceed the limitations established? David Barlow said he did not have it front of him but he  
48 thinks it is treatment to mgd and anything above that then to look at impact fees. The question David Barlow has is  
49 what this does as far as strength of wastewater. Mr. Mills said the reclaim process they are implementing is in their  
50 fluoride treatment system, so the fluoride removal processes should be more efficient than they are today. You

1 shouldn't see a significant change in concentration. Mr. Mills said the concern is a permit violation, once the 3.2  
2 mgd is approached, they have to get a permit modification. Chris Condie asked what their understanding is,  
3 according to the permit, if they exceed their limit. Mr. Mills, said he assumes it would be impact fees to increase the  
4 permit level, he is not sure.

5 Craig Carlile said when they did they RDA, Micron had to have a commitment that there would be a certain  
6 amount of treatment available to them, which was 3.2 mgd. In all the planning for your impact fees and user rates,  
7 we have always basically reserved that amount of capacity for Micron. They paid impact fees, through the RDA, in  
8 order to reserve that amount. Craig Carlile said typically, in your discharge permits, you do not have a limit of the  
9 amount of effluent coming to the plant. You are dealing with the strength issues in your discharge permits. Craig  
10 Carlile said all of the communities have adopted pretreatment ordinances where industrial users have to pretreat their  
11 wastewater so the district does not get strengths that are going to cause an upset to the process. IM Flash is  
12 pretreating, whether it is 3.2 mgd or something else, they are still going to pretreat so they do not exceed those  
13 strength limits. Usually when you have a violation of permit, it has something to do with the strength; with the  
14 pretreatment ordinances it would give the ability to enforce and there are penalties. Craig Carlile said we could go in  
15 and enforce, as they are exceeding the permit limits, and impose some penalties. Craig White said under our  
16 pretreatment rules and regulations, they are probably classified as a significant industrial user and the minute they  
17 exceed that permit limit, whether it harms us or not, we would be required at the end of the year to do a public notice  
18 saying they have violated their permit. Craig White said you really want to get a variance so we do not have to go  
19 through the process of doing the legal notices.

20 Sullivan Love asked what kind of impact this would have on any collections systems or lift stations. David  
21 Barlow said this small of amount should not have an effect on those systems. Dale Ihrke asked when they would  
22 need a decision on this. Mr. Mills said the June, July time frame is when they are right close to the permit limit;  
23 August is when they show to trigger over that limit. It is something they would want in place as soon as possible or  
24 at least have clear direction on what they need to do to accommodate this temporary time period. Chris Condie asked  
25 if this came back as an action item to approve a variance up to 3.5 mgd through May of 2019, would that be  
26 sufficient? Then in June of 2019, it would go down to the 3.2 mgd limit. Mark Christensen asked the fees charged  
27 for a temporary violation of the permit. Craig Carlile said it could be up to \$10,000 per day for a significant  
28 violation, it could actually be whatever you decide. All of that anticipates that it is causing some upset here at the  
29 plant due to the strength of the effluent; this is really something not assessed before.

30 Marty Banks, IM Flash Attorney, said this permit anticipates that in the event there were a violation of any  
31 limitation, including the flow limitation, there is a notification provision. In paragraph two section c it provides that  
32 the permitted party would describe the cause of the exceedance, the expected duration and a description of the  
33 remedy; this one it would only be a flow exceedance. In addition, the permit provides for circumstances, where it  
34 may be warranted, the notification processes by the permittee, doesn't prevent the District from imposing a civil  
35 penalty, if appropriate. Mr. Banks would concur with Craig Carlile this is not that situation with this type of an  
36 exceedance, in contrast to a serious exceedance of a significant parameter in the discharge. The permit could be read  
37 that in these circumstances the notification remedy would be more than sufficient without any associated civil  
38 penalty.

39 Mark Christensen said he is all for it being fair, and appreciates the proactive nature. He thinks the conversation  
40 needs to be had, as a board, what standard we are going to establish when someone exceeds their flow and their  
41 permit. In this case, it is a flow conversation, but that may not be true of future users. Mark Johnson agreed the  
42 board ought to have that discussion. Craig Carlile, said he believes Micron is the only permittee in the District that  
43 has a flow limit. Craig Carlile said the District has a uniform pretreatment ordinance that every city has adopted, it  
44 allows the District, with each city, to be able to go in and address a user within that city, who may be in violation of  
45 their discharge permit. This is for industrial users who have to pretreat to get the strength of their effluent down to a  
46 level that we can accommodate. It is supposed to be uniform but over time things have been changed by cities  
47 without the District knowing. That needs to be fixed and we are in the process of doing that.

48 Mark Johnson asked if the board is willing to look toward an action item at our next meeting with the solution to  
49 give IM Flash the accommodation to temporary exceed 3.2 mgd without violating their existing permit, or a different  
50 or alternative solution. Brian Braithwaite said it seems pretty straight forward, as long as we have the capacity, we

1 know the timing, and the maximum expectation. Dale asked if we could have staff, and the pretreatment coordinator  
2 look at this and send something to the board to know whether this is ok or if there are any issues. Mark Johnson  
3 asked David Barlow to go through all the information and prepare a report. We will list it for an action item for next  
4 month, but will have a discussion first in regard to David's report. Mark Christensen said he would like to see the  
5 specific language relative to what happens if a permit is violated. In this case they seem to be the only one with a  
6 limit on flow; he would like to see that before he makes a decision.

## 7 8 **2. Capital Improvement Projects Quarterly Update/Asset Management Phase II**

9 David Barlow said the board has requested to have quarterly update on the capital projects. This update is for the  
10 first quarter of 2018. David said we contracted with Bowen Collins and Associates to help out on project  
11 management. We sent out RSOQ's to engineering firms and had seven SOQ's come back. David said we can  
12 prequalify firms and if the total project amount is under \$50,000 in design fees and construction management, we can  
13 assign those projects out without going through a formal RFP. The summary in the packet lists all the projects and a  
14 description of each. David said the two projects included in the action items tonight are 2018 Headworks  
15 Improvements, and the 2018 Collection Shop Drainage. The Remove Lehi Flume project is a nested flume we are  
16 not using anymore and it is causing sediment to back up into the line. This summary also shows the 2018 budget of  
17 these projects, what is projected to be spent in 2018, what is going to roll over to 2019 and their current status. We  
18 have a couple of projects that are large enough that we are not going to be able to complete it in one year. Brian said  
19 this is a great report.

20 David said there are two O & M projects, Collection System Evaluation 54" Outfall, and Sewer Line Repair 54"  
21 Outfall. In his opinion these should be completed before removing the flume. There is some buildup of sediment in  
22 that line. The original budget was \$200,000 combined cleaning/inspecting, but our estimates are just under  
23 \$400,000. Mark Christensen asked if there is enough flow in there that it scours that sediment. David said no, it is  
24 slow moving through there. Mark asked how much sediment there is in this pipe. David said it is a 54" pipe and  
25 some areas measured 12" sediment.

26 Craig White asked if there is a reason our own crews are not cleaning this line. David Barlow said we do not  
27 have the right trucks to clean a line that big. They make a recycler vac truck, but we do not have one, we thought  
28 about purchasing one on our next purchase. Craig White said his sewer district just purchased one, they are about  
29 \$375,000 - \$400,000. Chris Condie asked if we would need to make an amendment to the budget to add \$200,000.  
30 David Barlow said he would have to check the fleet, there may be something budgeted for a vac truck. Mark  
31 Christensen, said when he is asked these questions, he would like to know what the current budget is, how much  
32 have we spent and how much is remaining. It is a viable project, but Mark would ideally like to know how much we  
33 had budgeted in the O & M lines. Having this conversation outside of fully being able to understand the totality of  
34 that is a concern he would have.

35 Sullivan said cleaning those larger lines takes a little different skill level, if we had the right equipment would our  
36 collections crew feel comfortable doing that? David Barlow said there would be some training involved. The other  
37 issue is their time allocated is spent on the individual cities. We would either have to increase staff or take some of  
38 the time away from the cities. Brian said he didn't think there is an obligation by TSSD to have to go out and help  
39 the cities. Our primary focus is to do our main lines, and as we have additional service capacity, then the cities get  
40 that. Dale said he thought there was an understanding that we provide service to cities to certain capacity and they all  
41 know that capacity and how much time they have. To pull that back from the cities forces them to go out and get  
42 their own services. Brian said he did not think any city is not doing their own service at this point in time. Vineyard  
43 may be the exception. Mark Johnson said he believes there is a contract for a certain amount of cleaning by the  
44 District. David Barlow said he thinks there is treatment contract and a cleaning contract, but he does not know their  
45 status. Brian said he would like to see those because as Saratoga Springs and Lehi are growing, we would need to  
46 continue to buy more and more trucks just to cover that; that doesn't make sense. Mark Christensen said Saratoga  
47 Springs and Lehi have their own crews out cleaning. TSSD cleaning is a supplement to what they are doing. Mark  
48 Christensen said the District is contracted for a certain amount of days; if they choose not to provide that obligation  
49 that would be fine, but the city would be looking for a reduction in that contract. Dale said this was discussed at the

1 retreat last year, but until we make that decision we are obligated to provide that service. Brian said he would  
2 suggest the district move away from that; lets finish whatever we are contractually obligated.

3 Mark Johnson said the cities that were using more than the contract are the cities that did not have the capability  
4 or equipment the larger cities did; and in all fairness the larger cities just got equivalent days. It has been beneficial.  
5 Brian said he does not disagree. Highland does not own a jet truck yet, we have had to rent some, but primarily use  
6 the District's truck services. Brian said he is sure Cedar Hills and Alpine are in that same position. David Barlow  
7 said the way it is set up now he believes it is based on a percentage of your flow. Brian said that clearly shows that  
8 it becomes less and less because we have the same amount of trucks and flow is increasing. We ought to look at the  
9 contract because it does not make sense that we continue; cities can probably do it cheaper. Chandler Goodwin said  
10 he didn't think they could do it cheaper. Chris Condie said if the demand is growing because cities within the  
11 District are growing, shouldn't some of the fees be going towards helping to increase the fleet, to help meet demand.  
12 Mark Johnson said he believes this is a really important decision to have, but would be appropriate to have in a  
13 retreat. Dale Ihrke said this is a project for this year, and he is concerned about waiting to buy our own truck. Dale  
14 suggested we fund this appropriately and get moving on it and have staff come back tell us what they need and get  
15 that project done this summer. David Barlow said we can have a proposal by next board meeting. Mark Johnson  
16 said go ahead and do that and we can discuss it then.

17 Dale said land acquisition shows we are going to spend 100% and he does not think we are going to spend that  
18 this year. Mark Johnson said the land acquisition is specifically for the compost, and that is one that has been on this  
19 list for a while so we probably do need to discuss at one point.

## 20 21 **Action Item**

### 22 **1. Proposal from Horrocks Engineers**

#### 23 **A. 2018 Headworks Improvements**

#### 24 **B. 2018 Collections Shop Drainage**

25 David Barlow said we can go through the SOQ's and find a firm and have them submit a scope and a fee; as long  
26 as it is under \$50,000 per year we can assign that to them without going through a formal RFP process. David  
27 Barlow said we have these two projects and he asked Horrocks Engineers to submit a proposal on this. We had  
28 seven firms and Horrocks was the only one that had an in-house surveyor that said they are willing to do a small  
29 project. They submitted this proposal for both projects and it is just under \$35,000 for both. Mark Johnson asked if  
30 the \$50,000 for the year is accumulative. David Barlow said it is a total for all projects. David Barlow said with the  
31 SOQ process, it is different than the RFP, because those SOQ's will stay on file for three years and each project has  
32 its own scope. Craig White said even though those firms were pre-qualified doesn't the board need to authorize  
33 those seven firms to be used. David Barlow said yes, he understands that. Mark Christensen said it sounds like you  
34 have an immediate need to get rolling on some of these projects but he thinks Craig just brought up a really good  
35 point. What is your timeline and your need, because he does not want the board to be holding up David's ability to  
36 do these important projects? David Barlow said this is a fairly quick project, but you have a window to do it during  
37 the good weather. Mark Christensen asked if delaying this until next meeting is going to cause significant problems?  
38 It sounds like we are going to need to authorize the bidders and delegate the ability to award contract. David Barlow  
39 said the only thing it could impact would be raising the manhole because it is within area of influence with the  
40 railroad and he does not know their timetable to review this.

41 Mark Johnson said he agrees that it is important for us to be involved in the prequalification process. If we are  
42 going to follow that procedure we cannot move forward with this until the next meeting. Dale Ihrke asked if we  
43 know whether the board has to approve these seven firms? Craig Carlile said he was not sure, he has not seen the  
44 procurement for a while. His recollection, under the statute, is if you are under \$50,000 you do not necessarily have  
45 to come to the board. Craig White said that is per project; we are talking about if they have selected seven  
46 engineering firms, does the board need to authorize those seven engineering firms to be in the pool to use for the next  
47 three years? Craig Carlile said regardless of what the statute says, the board has always been involved in that  
48 prequalification whether it is over \$50,000 or under \$50,000. Craig Carlile said his understanding of the statute is  
49 under \$50,000 it does not have to come to the board. You prequalify, as long as you go out and solicit 2-3 bids. He  
50 would have to go back to the statute and verify because he has not looked at it in a long time and he could check that

1 quickly. Mark Christensen said he believes that professional service contracts such as engineering do not require  
2 you to take the low bid, they require that there is some sort of process in place. Craig White said except for Districts,  
3 they have to go out over a certain dollar amount. It is mandatory now and Craig White thinks under \$50,000 staff  
4 can do it. Mark Christensen said the engineering would be under that, but the construction portion would have to  
5 come back for approval because that would take the project over \$50,000. Craig White said his recollection is  
6 anything over \$125,000 has to come back, he is not sure what we set the dollar amount limit.

7  
8 **David Bunker made a motion to table this item until the next meeting until we can get clarification and**  
9 **review the procurement policy and make sure we are on track with this. Brian Braithwaite seconded the**  
10 **motion. Those voting “Aye” – Mark Johnson, David Bunker, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Brian**  
11 **Braithwaite, Lynn Walker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, Sullivan Love, and Chandler Goodwin. Those voting**  
12 **“Nay” – Chris Condie. The motion passed with a majority vote.**

13  
14 Craig Carlile asked if the board members had each received a copy of the by-laws, procurement policy. There  
15 ought to be a book that has those important documents that every board member has. We adopted a procurement  
16 policy a couple years ago. Mark Johnson said David Bunker and he had this conversation not too long ago that they  
17 really need to get that published and to every member of the board. Chris said the reason he voted no is because he  
18 is stunned we can't answer these questions tonight with the staff here. He cannot imagine why we have to prolong  
19 this another month because we do not understand our own procurement policy. Mark Johnson asked Danette to make  
20 sure the documents on dropbox are current and send a notice out to the board once dropbox is updated. David  
21 Bunker asked if the board can get their own TSSD email addresses, so that our dropbox link is attached to those  
22 email addresses? Shannon said she has them and will send them out to the board members. David Bunker said it  
23 would be wise of to use our TSSD emails when we do District business.

24 Dale said it is good to have a document, but he understands the procurement policy is massive, so he is not going  
25 to read the entire procurement policy. If we could get some highlight training on relevant topics, at some future date,  
26 that would be great. Mark Johnson said that would be good, and if the By-Laws refer to state code, he will not  
27 always go to the current state code. Craig White said the problem we have with the procurement is we adopted it  
28 three years ago, the legislature has now met three different sessions. Last year there was over 200 pages in their  
29 legislative bill for amendments, the year before was a cleanup bill of 300 pages. Even if you have the document we  
30 use and it is three years old, you cannot trust it.

## 31 32 **2. Resolution 2018-01 Public Entity Resolution – PTIF Account Management**

33 David Bunker said his concerns is that we have people who have access to our accounts who can move funds, do  
34 reconciliation, cash transfers and also have access to the PTIF. In his city there is a separation there. David believes  
35 Craig White is appropriate to have on this, but he would propose that we have someone different than Joe be  
36 authorized on the PTIF. David said he thinks normally, it would have been our District Manager, but we are absent  
37 that. Shannon said Joe does not do reconciliation. Joe will transfer money from the Bank of American Fork  
38 accounts to the PTIF, but she actually does the journal entries, so there is oversight. Craig White said Shannon  
39 emails him the bank statement, and the reconciliations for him to review on a monthly basis. David Bunker asked if  
40 Joe can transfer from Bank of American Fork to PTIF. Shannon said Joe only transfers from PTIF to Bank of  
41 American Fork and from Bank of American Fork to PTIF. David Bunker said in a perfect world we would not have  
42 the ability to have access to accounts at Bank of American Fork and the PTIF. David Bunker asked Shannon if she  
43 has access to do that. Shannon said no, she does the bank reconciliation and she does not sign on any checks. David  
44 said he understands we are a small district, as far as personnel that handles these kinds of things.

45 Mark Christensen asked who the two people are on the Bank of American Fork. Shannon said right now we have  
46 David Barlow, Joe Martin, and Craig White who can sign checks. David Bunker asked when this has to be done.  
47 Shannon said the end of June. Craig White said Joe already has this authority and is doing this now, all we are doing  
48 is making this legal with PTIF for their new regulations coming June 30<sup>th</sup>. We are just reemphasizing what we are  
49 already doing. David Bunker said just because we are already doing something doesn't mean we are doing it right.

1 Chris Condie suggested having the Finance Committee Chair, Brian Braithwaite, be the second authorized transfer,  
2 temporarily, until a manager is hired.

3 Mark Christensen said when the auditors were here a few weeks ago he asked if there were adequate controls in  
4 place and they verified there were. He is operating on the assumption that they have looked at this and signed off on  
5 it; if that is the case he is ok with it. Craig White said the auditors do look at who is authorized to make transfers.  
6 David Bunker asked Craig Carlile if it was possible to put Brian Braithwaite on as an authorized person to do  
7 transfers. Craig Carlile said yes. David Bunker said he would feel comfortable putting Brian Braithwaite on there  
8 until we get a District Manager.

9  
10 **David Bunker made a motion to approve Resolution 2018-01 Public Entity Resolution certifying authorized**  
11 **individuals for the PTIF Accounts, that we have Craig White and Brian Braithwaite as those authorized.**  
12 **Chris Condie seconded. Mark Johnson took a roll call vote on the motion. Those voting “Aye” – Chandler**  
13 **Goodwin, Sullivan Love, Dale Ihrke, David Bunker, Lynn Walker, Chris Condie, Brian Braithwaite. Those**  
14 **voting “Nay” – Craig White, Mark Johnson, Mark Christensen and Mack Straw. The motion passed with a**  
15 **majority vote.**

## 16 17 **Communication**

### 18 **1. Engineering Update – Brown and Caldwell**

19 Brandon Heidelberger, Brown and Caldwell, reported on the Phosphorus Removal Reliability Improvements  
20 Project. Brandon said there has been quite a bit of sampling and lab work done over a two-month period. They are  
21 taking that data and doing their evaluations to model the process that will help set the design procurement for the new  
22 blowers. During the study period the plant was actually was removing quite a bit of phosphorus, down to less than .5  
23 mg/L; that has since crept up lately. It is a good indication there are all the right pieces to do what this plant was  
24 meant to do. Brandon said he would like to propose a workshop for next board meeting, to go more in depth on this  
25 project, and the conversations we’ll be having with Division of Water Quality. Sounds like DWQ will be wanting to  
26 talk to us within the next month to start the negotiation process. There are a few things they will want to talk about.  
27 They will want to set an interim limit, and see a schedule with milestones of design views of work to be done, and  
28 approved construction permits.

29 Brandon reported on the Biosolids Management Project. There was a four-week testing on the biosolids. The  
30 fecal coliform counts came back well below class B solids requirements. The testing for the sour test, we didn’t  
31 think would pass, which it didn’t. That means as we start to look at options of what to do with biosolids, there will  
32 be some limitations on land application of those solids. Brandon said they are also looking at composting  
33 alternatives, with landfill as the baseline. Brandon said he would like to do a more formal, in-depth update at the  
34 July meeting on short term solutions. Dale asked if they are still investigating shipping the solids to another facility.  
35 Brandon said they have looked at that and have contacted two facilities, but he doesn’t think that is going to be a  
36 viable option. Dale said he is getting nervous because two and a half years is not too far, to buy land and equipment  
37 and get a new process going. Brandon said he agreed, a schedule is foremost on their minds, and getting information  
38 to make an informed decision. Come July there should be some good information to discuss with the board.

### 39 40 **2. Capital Improvement Projects Quarterly Update/Asset Management Phase II**

41 Dale Ihrke said they discussed Phase II in their Engineering Committee Meeting and he sent an email to Mark  
42 Johnson regarding this. The Board members have a copy of that email. Dale said he has experience in the startup of  
43 a CMMS system in San Jose, and it is a lot of work. They had three full time staff on for a year. This plant is not the  
44 same size, but it still takes a lot of effort. Dale said David Barlow didn’t think the District had the staff to dedicate to  
45 this. When you do an asset management program it is a change in the way you do your business; the new CMMS  
46 systems require a lot of input, data and staff to help put that information in. Dale said in San Jose they had to train all  
47 of their staff how to put in their information. It takes a lot of work and someone needs to be the champion of this, in  
48 house, someone has to manage it on a day to day basis. We recommend a starting point may be to have a training on  
49 the CMMS systems at the July meeting; what they do, why they are important in asset management, what it takes to  
50 get one going, and the long-term benefits.

1 Mark Christensen said they are doing something in their city that is comparable to this. It is a lot of work and  
2 requires a lot of dedication, but he thinks the assessment is slightly off. He agrees it will take a buy in from the  
3 board, but more importantly, we need to get our District Manager in place first. As a District, we need to get the  
4 right person here, get them fully committed to that process and they need to own it. Mark Christensen said we  
5 cannot even find enough depth to have the proper sign offs in place, from a money management component, we are  
6 probably biting off more than we can chew, without the new District Manager being here. Dale said yes, that was  
7 part of the issue, David Barlow is taking up some of the District Manager position, which is taking some of his time.  
8 To Brian it is not a matter of if we implement it, it is when and making sure we implement it a way that is going to be  
9 successful. The timing on that is important, and making sure staff and leadership are both there. Mark Johnson said  
10 when we adopted this asset management plan we decided to take a substantially different course on how we operate  
11 and manage the facility. Mark Johnson said he agrees with Mark Christensen; lets focus on getting our manager in  
12 place and have him get a good understanding of the plant and then let's have this discussion again.

### 13 14 **3. Manager's Report**

15 The board reviewed the manager's report.

16  
17 **Chris Condie made a motion to go into closed executive session to discuss land acquisition, personnel**  
18 **matters, or legal issues. David Bunker seconded the motion with the amendment that we are at the District**  
19 **Administration Building. Mark Johnson called for a roll call vote. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson,**  
20 **David Bunker, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen, Brian Braithwaite, Chris Condie, Lynn Walker, Craig White,**  
21 **Dale Ihrke, Sullivan Love, and Chandler Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously. 7:48 p.m.**

### 22 23 **Closed Meeting**

24  
25 **Chris Condie made a motion to go out of closed session and back into regular session. David Bunker**  
26 **seconded the motion. Those voting "Aye" – Mark Johnson, David Bunker, Mack Straw, Mark Christensen,**  
27 **Brian Braithwaite, Chris Condie, Lynn Walker, Craig White, Dale Ihrke, Sullivan Love, and Chandler**  
28 **Goodwin. The motion passed unanimously. 8:14 p.m.**

29  
30 **Adjourn: Chandler Goodwin made a motion to adjourn. David Bunker seconded the motion. All present**  
31 **"Aye". Meeting adjourned. 8:15 p.m.**