



RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, January 8, 2019 – 1:00 p.m.
2850 Burton Drive, Cambria, CA 93428

1/8/19: Added Regular Business Item 3.B. Attachment

MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Dean called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

B. ESTABLISH QUORUM

A quorum was established.

Committee members present: Karen Dean, Donn Howell, Mike Lyons and Harry Farmer. Absent: Jim Bahringer.

Staff present: Acting General Manager Monique Madrid, Strategic and Organizational Advisor Paavo Ogren, Finance Manager Pam Duffield, District Engineer Bob Gresens, Management Analyst Melissa Bland, Wastewater System Supervisor John Allchin, and Clerical Assistant Annette Young.

Public present:

Allan Dean
Crosby Swartz
Laura Swartz
Tom Laycook
Cheryl McDowell
Paul Nugent
Tom Gray

C. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Vice Chair Dean stated the Board of Directors appointed Donn Howell to be the Chairman and the Director on the committee. Do we want to do election of officers now or wait until committee appointments have been made?

Mr. Ogren said the latter is appropriate. Once the board has made the full committee assignments, they'll be looking for the appointment of a Vice Chair and Secretary.

Vice Chair Dean asked to table the election of officers until the next meeting.

D. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was no Chairman's report.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to Approve the November 28, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes

Committee member Lyons moved to approve the minutes.

Committee member Howell seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Lyons, Howell, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

3. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Discussion and Consideration Regarding 2019 Infrastructure Standing Committee Meeting Dates

Vice Chairman Dean introduced the item and asked does it work for staff to meet the first Tuesday of the month?

Mr. Ogren said we anticipate at the next regular Board meeting they will adopt their 2019 meeting dates. To best coordinate with the Board meeting dates, you may want to table this until the next meeting.

Ms. Madrid said you're going to have new committee members, so you'll want to consider what their schedules will be. Additionally, the Board is considering having two meetings a month, possibly the second and third Thursday. It was brought up that maybe some of the committees meet every other month.

Vice Chairman Dean asked should we set a date for a February meeting?

Committee member Lyons suggested Tuesday, February 5, 2019.

Vice Chair Dean said PROS is using the Vet's Hall on Tuesday, February 5, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. Can we meet on Tuesday, February 5, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.?

Ms. Madrid responded yes.

Committee member Howell motioned the next committee meeting be held on Tuesday, February 5, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. at the Vet's Hall.

Committee member Lyons seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Howell, Lyons, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Committee member Farmer stated the committees should probably meet once a month for at least two to three months, then begin meeting every other month.

B. Discussion and Consideration Regarding CIP Work Plan and Projected Revenue

Vice Chair Dean introduced the item.

Ms. Madrid said the Board President narrowed the field on what it was we were trying to prepare based on the projected revenue and proposed projects. We went through and eliminated redundancies. The Board approved an interfund loan of roughly \$103,000 for the deficit of \$466,000, and it was in scenario B for the Prop 218 process. We are scheduled to begin repaying it in 2021.

Public comment:

Cheryl McDowell: I thought the amount was \$160,000 for the repayment.

Ms. Madrid responded it was \$103,000. It's \$466,000 divided by 5.

Public Comment:

Paul Nugent: I would go with what my finances are and I would decide what I could do afterwards. Because of the way meetings are set up we do infrastructure first, then finance afterwards. I feel like that creates a level of inefficiency. I think we need to look at a work flow. The first step is start with policy, send it to finance to generate an outcome, then to infrastructure.

Ms. Madrid responded those are good points. I have concerns about there's a difference between regular operations and projects we're proposing, critical needs and planning. I think we need to do a part of each one and move forward to be more organized and efficient and to have better policies that guide us.

Mr. Ogren said these are valid points. The Board discussed the committees and the logic was on sequencing.

Committee member Lyons said this particular situation is complicated by the fact that we didn't have any money to begin with. Now the estimates have changed and other things have come in the way of expenditures that we recommended.

Vice Chair Dean said what we were working with before was based on not getting the rate increases. With Prop 218 passing, the money is different and priorities have changed. I think this work plan is great.

Ms. Madrid said staff worked hard to get it prepared. Melissa took the initiative to put it together and many other staff were also involved to get it done. The Finance committee is to allocate the money. What we've done is taken what the Board president asked or helped to define, which is three components: 1) What's the projected revenue; 2) What are the priority projects that you can do with that revenue; and 3) Within the period of time you have to complete them, which is from mid-February when the mid-year budget is adopted, to June 30. We've had two critical issues come up in water and wastewater that have to be handled. John and Melissa can explain more about that.

Mr. Allchin stated Lift Station A1 is experiencing difficulties with our program. The PLC is not responding to the computer, the computer itself is outdated and components are no longer available for it. It's a touch screen process that is no longer programmable. It's been pieced together for the last 10 years. The lift station is next to the ocean. If it goes down, there's no back up functions. There's no way for that lift station to operate once we lose communication. That lift station will begin to flow directly into the ocean. The lift station has been on the radar. It's been put off every year that it comes up on the CIP list and it gets cut from the budget. It's time that it gets fixed.

Ms. Madrid said if we have a sanitary sewer overflow, we would be fined.

Committee member Lyons asked if there is any option to delay payment of the existing fund deficit instead of reducing the interfund loan payment?

Ms. Madrid responded that it depends on what comes out in the mid-year budget. We'll have a better idea when we get to the point.

Vice Chair Dean said one of the expenses removed from the 2nd half of the fiscal year is Lift Station 9. Will that be done in the first half of next fiscal year?

Mr. Allchin said that it has already been done and was under budget. Initially PG&E was going to have us bring it up to current code, but they allowed us to return it to its original configuration.

Public comment:

Laura Swartz: We wanted to build reserves and I don't see that we're building reserves.

Ms. Madrid responded that we don't have enough wastewater funds to build reserves yet. We can either pay back the interfund loan or create reserves.

Public comment:

Laura Swartz: That's what the Board has to decide. Mr. Pierson wanted to build reserves.

Committee member Lyons said you're making a distinction between repair projects and capital improvement projects. Looking at the attachments in the minutes, it has this chart that says water, wastewater and SWF. That's what we, as a committee, recommended to the Board, through the Finance committee. I think you're saying is many of these items were repair or ordinary maintenance items and if that's correct, you're going to want Prop. 218 money to go for CIP projects. Do you intend to revise the spreadsheet?

Ms. Madrid responded yes.

Committee member Howell said infrastructure does encompass more than just capital improvements. Attention to maintenance is important and should fall within the purview of this committee.

Public Comment:

Crosby Swartz: If you see something that's failing or about to fail, you have the option of either replacing it or repairing it. Is there some threshold where the cost is too low to be considered a capital improvement?

Laura Swartz: I remember when the 218 was being protested, and the big thing that people were proposing, is that we're going to pass the 218 and use that money to take care of stuff that hasn't been taken care of.

Mr. Ogren said capital projects or maintenance is determined by Pam according to accounting rules that have to be followed and are audited. I think this gets back to Director Howell's statement that you're going to be focused on those things that are capital projects, but you're still going to be working with some of these things that Pam is going to call major maintenance. I think that distinction you'll work through and we just let Pam work with the auditors to figure out if it's expenses and maintenance or if it's capitalized as a project.

Committee member Howell said I think the public doesn't care whether it's maintenance or capital. They just want to know where the money is going and it's going where it said it was going to go.

Public Comment:

Tom Laycook: It sounds like a lot of what you're talking about is a scheduling issue. Your near-term capital improvements are going to be altered because of an emergency situation.

Committee member Farmer said Lift station A1 upgrade was originally number 42 on the CIP project list but has been moved up to number 1 because of the failure.

Committee member Lyons said if you go back to the original CIP list from the November minutes, this committee recommended mostly repairs and maintenance.

Public Comment:

Paul Nugent: I can see how we get into the weeds with this stuff because if you don't finish the job when you're doing the CIP then you get the easter egg of what we didn't do, and we have an emergency. I really want to get to the point where we're doing improvements too.

Allen Dean: The emergency repair you're talking about, is that the same that's over here though?

Mrs. Duffield points out that it's line item 28.

Public Comment:

Paul Nugent: Is it advantageous in doing everything at once?

Mr. Allchin responded are you asking to combine line 28 and line 42 and have a complete lift station overhaul? Now you're into an area that would be closer to \$400,000-\$500,000. This is a \$50,000 project that will still be current when we move on to line 42. The idea behind line 42 is to help engineers with safety issues at the lift stations. When they were installed, they weren't submersible pumps. The pumps are in dry wells adjacent to a wet well with pipes connecting them. We have to set up a confined space to get into the dry well to view the pump.

Public Comment:

Cheryl McDowell: Who would do the work? Have you got any bids?

Mr. Allchin responded no, it's a half-million-dollar job and would go to the lowest bidder.

Mr. Gresens explained that the original list was done before the rate increase, so they split up the work on the lift stations into short-term and long-term. We did our best with what funding we knew about and to max out the life of the lift stations.

Ms. Madrid said the numbering on the CIP spreadsheet is just row identification. priority ranking is a column in the middle of the spreadsheet. The priority ranking for this project was a 1.

Ms. Madrid stated the water fund is doing better than wastewater. The SCADA and SR4 well are two critical items that was brought to my attention right after the A1 lift station meeting. The SR4 well at the high school is failing and they need to reprogram the PLC.

Mrs. Bland commented that around 2012 or 2013 the PLC at SR4 was rewritten. When that happened it all depended on how that well was functioning at that point in time. Since then, certain aspects of how that site operates were removed from the process and then we just coded around those. The way the original coding was done isn't very fluid. It doesn't allow for you to rewrite and do these little turnarounds, so we're frequently having degradation of the programming to a point where we're not reporting correctly. The data the supervisor is receiving is not correct. That looks bad if we submit a report to the State that says one thing and then have to go back and fix it.

Mr. Gresens said we're having to do manual reporting to the State. We should be able to download data from the PLC to a thumb drive and that's not happening correctly.

Mrs. Bland commented that the water quality is good. The well is functioning how it's supposed to. It's just the data we're reporting isn't right.

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: Is it software or hardware? Is this the building that has termites and falling apart?

Mrs. Bland responded its software. The hardware is actually very good. We're fixing a recurring issue with the software, improving on the existing hardware and adding on true SCADA is what the line item is.

Mr. Gresens said our chief plant operator was told to install some PH and temperature sensors. They just did it and we had an instrumentation company come in and do it but that part still needs to be reprogrammed and the overall reprogramming of that PLC needs to be done.

Public Comment:

Paul Nugent: Is this equipment that's inside of the shed? The reason I'm bringing this up is I'm not trying to spend more money, but I've been over there and seen that shed and I wouldn't put \$50,000 worth of anything inside of it.

Mr. Gresens responded that it's a small concrete block building and more substantial than what you're thinking about.

Public Comment:

Cheryl McDowell: Have you been written up on this?

Ms. Madrid responded no. We've reached out to the DDW and they know what's going on and we've corrected some reports.

Committee member Lyons asked what are the penalties, if any, if the reporting is wrong? Were there any reports that were wrong?

Mr. Gresens responded that we had some reports that were corrected that were turned in in the past. They used the wrong column on the spreadsheet.

Ms. Madrid commented as far as the transmission line on the bridge, we only need \$20,000 right now because we need to do the planning and permitting.

Mr. Gresens commented that we need a permit from Fish and Game and that takes at least six months to get.

Ms. Madrid said we don't need the \$100,000 for the project right away, until we get to construction, which probably won't be until July or at least next fiscal year.

Mrs. Duffield said looking at the #1 on the spreadsheet, we learned yesterday that there was already \$50,000 for that project in the current year's budget that's been approved, so we didn't need to add that additional \$120,000 as we originally talked about. We have more than sufficient funding sitting in the current year's budget.

Mr. Gresens said I think communication-wise, the CIP list was meant to show what we estimated the cost of a project to be and when those costs would hit in particular years.

Ms. Madrid agreed. What we're proposing from the funds is \$320,000 for water, \$50,000 for SCADA at SR4, and vehicle replacement program reserves of \$25,000 and the rest of items in the water CIP are already in the budget.

Public comment:

Laura Swartz: I made it a point that \$76,000 a year is supposed to be set aside so when you have to start the SWF there's money there to pay to haul away the salts.

Mrs. Duffield responded that we will have to review the rate study to see what it says the money is supposed to be used for.

Public comment:

Crosby Swartz: It was quite clear that they eliminated the SWF operating charge and during operation it was intended to pay for the electricity and hauling costs.

Mrs. Duffield commented that we're not charging customers that fee at this time. If you look at our rate structure, we are charging you the base, but not the per unit operational cost. You only get an SWF base.

Public comment:

Crosby Swartz: It was definitely included in the rate study in lieu of charging the operating charge. As far as the Prop 218, it didn't break it down line by line. If you don't actually set aside this cash, it won't be there to pay to haul away the waste.

Mrs. Bland said the \$76,000 is only the increase over and above the regular rates we'll be getting. It's not just \$76,000 per year.

C. Discussion and Consideration Regarding \$20K Allocation to the Water Transmission Line in FY 2018/19 and \$100K to FY 2019/20

Vice Chair Dean introduced item and stated this was discussed with the work plan in Item B.

D. Discussion and Consideration Regarding Summarizing Public Comment and Possibility of Recording Meetings

Vice Chair Dean introduced the item and said this will be covered with Item G.

C. Receive an Update Regarding Installation of Influent Screen at the Wastewater Treatment Plant

Vice Chair Dean introduced the item.

Mr. Gresens said the contractor got a late start on the job, so he'll be charged some liquidated damages for a late finish, about \$200 a day. They have the main slab poured with the footings for the columns and the steel work is on-site. They are looking at February 7, 2019 for a completion date, which could change based on unforeseen change orders.

Vice Chair Dean asked about the \$200/day fine. Is that coming off the cost of the installation and does that go back in our fund?

Mr. Gresens responded that it will probably be dealt with in the progress payments he submits for payment.

Mr. Ogren stated that liquidated damages aren't fines or penalties. It's a stated amount that is reflective of costs to the District when contractors, by contract it's a dollar amount that's agreed upon in advance. Beyond liquidated damages, if a contractor creates other damages or costs that could be specifically identified, those could be recovered outside of the liquidated damages clause.

Committee member Farmer said did he give you an adequate explanation as to why that occurred?

Mr. Allchin said he had a great amount of difficulty locating valves that were spec and they weren't delivered until last week. I told him earlier in the process to find another valve manufacturer and he chose not to do that.

Ms. Madrid asked if he's on schedule so far?

Mr. Allchin said yes, but today is a set-back day with pipe fittings.

D. Receive Update on PG&E Sustainable Solutions Turnkey Program Project

Vice Chair Dean introduced the item.

Mr. Allchin said they came to us with a nice presentation. It was a little more thorough than we would like. We have responded back with a scaled down version of what they presented. We have a scheduled meeting with PG&E on Monday, January 14th. We should have a final report by January 25, 2019.

Vice Chair Dean said they were going to do more than we wanted in that initial plan?

Mr. Allchin responded they wanted to build everything all at once and we couldn't afford it.

Vice Chair Dean asked so we're pairing it down to just the necessities?

Mr. Allchin responded yes.

Committee member Lyons said he would like to ask the two members of the CCSD board who happen to be here, regarding the discussion we had on January 3 about transparency and reporting and communication, do you think the progress and completion of the influent screen and whatever you decide about this turnkey program, would you be reporting that during the Board meeting as progress?

Committee member Farmer replied it's too early for the PG&E program. We need to know more about it. We can let people know the influent is behind schedule.

Mrs. Bland said that pictures and a written summary will be in the Board of Director's packages in January.

E. Discussion Regarding Draft Proposal for Infrastructure Committee Structure

Vice Chair Dean introduced the item.

Vice Chair Dean said Committee member Lyons and I came up with draft guidelines for the Infrastructure Committee. We recommended to increase the committee to seven members to have more flexibility in forming ad hoc committees, without violating the Brown Act. The Board decided to form a committee of five, with Committee member Howell as Chairman and ex officio.

Committee member Howell would prefer to have seven committee members.

Committee member Farmer said seven would allow for sub-committees.

Vice Chair Dean thought the committee could review this and resubmit it to the Board.

Public Comment:

Crosby Swartz: I think it was five members so each director could nominate one person. If you went to seven members, you've got to figure out how that's going to be done.

Vice Chair Dean suggests that the current members of this committee stay on the committee and the Board could still pick one.

Committee member Farmer said the Board has determined there's only going to be one Board member on the committee who is the Chairman and they don't vote. I will no longer be on the committee. I'll be a member of the public.

Public comment:

Laura Swartz: If you only have five members and two members on a sub-committee, could Donn be on one of the sub-committees?

Vice Chair Dean said they need to define what the Director's role is on the committee.

Mr. Ogren said we can get clarification on the Brown Act. Board members are allowed to attend public meetings but are restricted from participating in discussions.

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: I feel the circular seating we have at this meeting is more productive than stadium seating we've used in other meetings. It allows people to contribute a little bit more.

Committee member Farmer said the way it's going to be structured potentially is with six members of the committee, with one being a Board member. If you have an Ad Hoc committee and you choose another member of the public to help out, you have seven members, even though it's not officially a seven-member committee.

Vice Chair Dean said do we want to recommend that they increase our committee to seven members, plus our director, or keep membership it at five?

Committee member Lyons would like five voting members, plus one ex-officio and we would encourage public participation on each committee.

Committee member Howell said I looked at several on-line Robert's Rules of Order and it says that the way it's presently constituted the chair doesn't vote unless there's a tie. The Board should clarify what constitutes a quorum.

Mr. Ogren said we'll follow up on that. There is going to be an agenda item next week regarding committee structures, so we'll make sure and address the question of a quorum. I like the general suggestion of going to five, with a member on an Ad Hoc committee. I think the Board is looking for feedback from the committees, but we should probably stay somewhat consistent with what the Board's general direction already is.

Committee member Lyons said he wouldn't object if there is a tie that the Chair be allowed to break the tie vote.

Vice Chair Dean stated that number two has already been decided by the Board.

Vice Chair Dean stated that number three was added because I think it would be very helpful if a Finance committee member could attend our Infrastructure committee, and vice versa, so if we have any question about what the other committee is thinking, we have someone there that can answer. We should attend each other's meetings at least quarterly or have a joint meeting between Finance and Infrastructure.

Public comment:

Cheryl McDowell: My take on today's meeting is that it's more financial than infrastructure. Somewhere along the line maybe these committees can get married.

Paul Nugent: If you look at the finance meeting for this week, we're going to be discussing vehicle policies so what I'm saying is there any way to create a work flow with these different committees so they're working together so it's not just a ping pong game.

Mr. Ogren responded that when I read number three about liaison members, it makes me reflect on January 3. The Board was looking to take the leadership role in coordination with committee and staff and overall district efforts. It seems that the Chair would have that primary liaison role with each committee. I think that was the board intent. One of the roles that clearly came out of the January 3 meeting was that Director Howell is going to be responsible for setting the agenda. I think part of setting that agenda is talking to Cindy about the Finance agenda and the work flow should get better.

Committee member Howell said the liaison role has always been for the CCSD Board member to report at the meeting on his/her attendance at the committee meetings.

Vice Chair Dean moved on to terms of service. We thought each member could stay on the committee if they wanted to.

Mr. Ogren said that puts the Board in the uncomfortable situation of having to dismiss somebody from a committee.

Vice Chair Dean asked do you feel each year the committees should be reappointed?

Mr. Ogren responded yes.

Vice Chair Dean said I don't feel like we were appointed by a Director to represent their point of view. I feel like we were appointed to work together on this.

Ms. Madrid said it was more of a selection process. Each Board member selected a member and then the Board itself approved the member.

Mr. Ogren and Ms. Madrid agreed that reappointments could occur every two years at every Board election.

Ms. Madrid said we may not need the whole committee to change every two years. It would be nice if you were on the same election schedule.

Committee member Lyons suggested during the election time, the new Board can reappoint current or add new members as they wish.

Ms. Madrid said staff assumes that the present committee members would remain and the Board would fill the existing vacancies.

Committee member Farmer said maybe after a year, a person can be given an option to resign, but we would want at least a one-year commitment.

Committee member Howell suggested that one or two alternates be appointed.

Mr. Ogren said an alternate can create a Brown Act issue.

Vice Chair Dean said okay, no alternates and number five has been decided by the Board.

Vice Chair Dean discussed number six. The public asked to have their public comment as part of the minutes. It was difficult to do. I started recording and transcribing the public comment, which Haley summarized. We started talking about it again, and I offered to do it for Annette. I talked to district counsel about it. The recording was okay, but I have to keep the recording for 30 days as a public record.

Mr. Ogren said we covered that point again today with legal counsel. I think the add on is you really need to turn it over to the district.

Vice Chair Dean said I bought a separate recorder, because I was doing it with my phone, it has a USB attachment, so Annette can download it onto a computer. Does that work?

Mr. Ogren replied, yes, for the minimum requirements for the recording. On number six, you discuss summary minutes and because of the resource demands on staff it was discussed that committees should have their own secretary rather than district staff. It will be up to the committee whether you want to do action minutes or

summary minutes, but the committee secretary can work with the committee to decide that. We don't anticipate that Haley or Annette will be here in the future because that demand on multiple different committees adds up quickly. On January 3, the discussion came up at the Board of Director's meeting and whether or not a summary of public input should be put together. The challenge from staff's standpoint is how do we accurately portray the message that the member of the public was expressing. President Pierson suggested if someone really wants their comment documented in the minutes, they need to provide it in writing. This decision was made for the Board as a whole. They're going to do action-only minutes. At the committee level, I'm anticipating if you want to do summary, it will be the obligation of the committee secretary. It will be similar to the way PROS is working.

Ms. Madrid said clerks are trained to take action-only minutes. The reason for that is they are brief and less liability. You're not taking verbatim minutes. You're just paying attention to who's talking, their name and recording the action the Board takes. I think your committee is trying to capture everything that's said so you can go back and refer to what was said. I think you'll find as you're developing your committees and processes, you won't necessarily need verbatim minutes.

Committee member Lyons said the reason this came up is because of an accusation from a member of the public who made comments at a meeting and they weren't recorded. He felt those comments were very important to our discussion.

Ms. Madrid responded that that's the beauty of submitting your comments in writing.

Committee member Farmer said one of the problems is sometimes you say something spontaneously, that's not prepared, and then going back and providing a written summary could be a challenge.

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: I watched a lot of CCSD meetings online before I moved here and having that information to refer back to is valuable.

Ms. Madrid asked are you talking about you want us to summarize public comment or all of the back and forth conversations?

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: You could make a YouTube page of the CCSD meetings that has every single video or audio file.

Ms. Madrid responded that the CCSD is responsible for records so record keeping for a public agency is a little bit different than if you're a private agency. If we're going to create public records and record meetings, we have to have it in our retention policy and we have to comply with statutory regulations.

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: You'd have to have the file somehow mirrored onto a server?

Ms. Madrid said we'd have to make sure it's on a server that's inside the United States and it can't be duplicated.

Public comment:

Paul Nugent: From the public's perception, just having it online is helpful.

Ms. Madrid responded if you're talking about the videos from AGP, which are edited, they are very costly as opposed to taking a recording and keeping it for 30 days.

Committee member Farmer asked what if this became an agenda item to consider purchasing some type of camera for these meetings, and put on the district website?

Vice Chair Dean said my intention was to help if people who can't be here. We could keep the recording for 30 days.

Committee member Lyons said we may have to do our own secretarial job, if no staff can be here. We may need to do an action form of the minutes with an audio backup.

Ms. Madrid said the point of minutes is to memorialize the business that's occurring and what actions are taken. There's value in a video, but the CCSD has limited resources.

Public comments:

Laura Swartz: If you're taking action minutes and there's no action taken, there won't be any minutes.

Ms. Madrid commented that she has a valid point. If you're going to take action minutes, the meetings have to be a little more structured and a little less informal.

Committee member Howell said recordings cost nothing to make and very little to store. It should be stored on CCSD servers and available on the web site.

Ms. Madrid said we can put a link on our website.

Mr. Ogren said with respect to committee members and the reason why you may vote yes or no on an item, the committee member can say I want the following statement reflected in the minutes regarding my yes vote or no vote. The voting individual needs to make that statement at the meeting at the time they're voting. They can't do it later.

Committee member Lyons asked couldn't a member of the public, after a meeting, submit a statement they'd like included in the minutes?

Mr. Ogren responded that the challenge with that is the subsequent submittal of a written document may not be reflective of what they actually said at the meeting, so submitting something subsequently and the District taking it in as a public record and including it in District records is allowable, but to say that it's actually part of the minutes would probably be a stretch.

Committee member Howell made a motion to have meetings recorded and to be stored on the District server and made available to the public on the website and that the official minutes be action minutes. All comments should be written and recordings should be retained for a minimum of one-year.

Committee member Lyons seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Howell, Lyons, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Vice Chair Dean moved on to the timing of the meetings and committee officers. We have to wait until the Board discusses this.

Ms. Madrid said they're going to set priorities. The Board is looking for some sort of mission statement for the committee that will help guide you.

Vice Chair Dean said when it comes to a mission statement, we need input from the Board on the resources part of the committee and what they expect from us.

Mr. Ogren said my sense is the Board wants to provide general direction and the committee then gets into the details and provides those recommendations. You did a formal action on minutes and recordings and we had other discussions like on terms of service. It seems like from the discussion, that staff understands what the direction is

that you're leaning in. Do you want to follow it up with formal actions? On terms of service, my understanding is that your recommendation is that terms of service will be for two years, coinciding with the Board's election cycles. And that in December of each year, correspondence will be made with committee members to confirm their desire to continue into the second year.

Committee member Lyons made a motion to accept these terms.

Committee member Howell seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Lyons, Howell, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Vice Chair Dean said on membership we discussed five, with being able to add an ad hoc committee of two, plus members of the public.

Committee member Howell made a motion to accept membership as stated above.

Committee member Lyons seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Howell, Lyons, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Mr. Ogren said for the next item, the committee chairs on Finance and Resources & Infrastructure will act as the liaisons to each other.

Committee member Howell moved to approve Paavo's recommendation.

Committee member Lyons seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Howell, Lyons, Dean, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Vice Chair Dean said the Board already made their decision on number two and number five is taken care of. We moved on number 6. For number eight, we're going to elect a vice chair and secretary internally at the February meeting each year.

Public Comment:

Laura Swartz: It's tough to be the secretary and participate on the committee.

Vice Chair Dean said if I'm recording it, the secretary can use the recording to do the minutes.

Ms. Madrid asked do you want to make a motion on election of officers?

Committee member Howell moved to elect a vice chair and secretary at the first February meeting each year.

Vice Chair Dean seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4-Ayes (Howell, Dean, Lyons, Farmer), 0-Nays, 1-Absent (Bahringer).

Vice Chair Dean said Mr. Ogren mentioned number nine, that we should have a mission statement. Do you want to work on that now?

Committee member Lyons said that should be an ad hoc. I'd like to see what the CCSD does with their mission statement.

Committee member Howell suggests this be a future agenda item.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Discuss mission statement
2. Election of officers
3. Scheduling 2019 meeting dates
4. Update on the influent screen
5. Update on the PG&E turnkey program
6. Review of goals and priorities of goals

Ms. Madrid commented we could develop a manager's report and ad hoc report rather than having multiple business items that are just updates by various staff. We would follow the example of the PROS committee manager's report. It would be a regular agenda item. We could create a section that's called Manager's Update or something like that.

Mr. Ogren agreed and stated what really should be on the agenda are items that are going to necessitate a motion by your committee.

5. ADJOURN

Vice Chair Dean adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.