

UTILITIES SERVICE BOARD MEETING

09/14/2020

Utilities Service Board meetings are recorded and are available during regular business hours in the office of the Director of Utilities.

Board Vice President Capler called the regular meeting of the Utilities Service Board to order at 5:00 p.m. The meeting was held via Zoom and Facebook Live.

Board members present: Jim Sherman, Jason Banach, Jean Capler, Megan Parmenter, and Amanda Burnham. Three board members were absent, Julie Roberts, Jeff Ehman, and ex-officio Jim Sims.

Staff present: Vic Kelson, Laura Pettit, Holly McLauchlin, LaTreana Harrington, Chris Wheeler, Brad Schroeder, Brandon Prince, James Hall, Kelsey Thetonia, Tom Axsom, Elise Boruvka, and Cindy Shaw.

MINUTES

Board member Sherman moved and Board member Parmenter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the August 31 meeting. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

CLAIMS

Sherman moved and Burnham seconded the motion to approve the standard claims as follows: Vendor invoices submitted included \$158,092.77 from the Water Utility, \$331,313.44 from the Wastewater Utility, and \$127,457.86 from the Stormwater Utility.

Total Claims approved: \$616,864.07. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

Sherman moved and Burnham seconded the motion to approve the standard claims as follows: Vendor invoices submitted included \$35.70 from the Water Utility, and \$87.01 from the Wastewater Utility.

Total Claims approved: \$122.71. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

Sherman moved and Parmenter seconded the motion to approve the utility claims as follows: Utility invoices submitted included \$101,070.20 from the Water Utility, and \$65,299.13 from the Wastewater Utility.

Total Claims approved: \$166,369.33. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

Sherman moved and Parmenter seconded the motion to approve the wire transfers, fees, and payroll in the amount of \$469,657.47. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

Sherman moved and Parmenter seconded the motion to approve the customer refunds as follows: Refunds submitted included \$128.81 from the Water Utility, and \$2,079.29 from the Wastewater Utility.

Total Claims approved: \$2,208.10. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

CONSENT AGENDA

CBU Director Kelson presented the following items recommended by staff for approval:

- VHW Engineering Co., LLC, \$5,000.00, 2020 Griffy Dam inspection report
- Control Freaks Consulting, LLC., \$3,685.00, Installation of Moore flow control modules at MWTP
- Potomac Electrical Services, LLC, dba Electrical Maintenance and Testing, \$9,270.00, Installation of six capacitor trip devices at Dillman

As no items were removed from the Consent Agenda by the Board, agreements approved. Total contracts approved: \$17,955.00

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH WESSLER ENGINEERING

CBU Purchasing Manager Shaw presented an amendment for the date extension to an agreement with Wessler for the validation of CBU's 2019 AWWA Water Audit. The amendment extends the date of the contract from August 31, 2020, to December 31, 2020. There are no financial changes.

Sherman moved, Burnham seconded the motion to approve the request for an amendment to the agreement with Wessler Engineering. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH WOOD ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE SOLUTIONS, INC.

CBU MS4 Coordinator Thetonia presented a contract for the creation of the City's first stormwater plan. The contractor for this project is Wood Environment Infrastructure Solutions, formerly Amec Foster Wheeler. The contract is for \$200,000.00 and the duration is 2 years.

Project Manager for Wood, Heather Williams, introduced herself to the Board and described her experience with stormwater master planning with other cities.

Thetonia gave some details of the contract, explaining the process will be split up into 3 phases. The first phase includes a program assessment across all city departments that has to do with MS4 compliance such as procedures and ordinances. Next is the planning process that will involve a city-staffed focus group with input from everyone involved with stormwater management. The first two phases will be the first year of the project and will cost just under \$70k for the creation of the plan and the assessment. In the second year of the project, the remaining funds will go to phase three and will be the implementation of the plan.

Burnham asked if there will be a plan for an inventory of the current city-wide systems and their age. Will we have a map of those systems or a layover of that map if there already is one? Thetonia answered that that plan could fall under the implementation phase if we choose to include that with this contract. Williams explained part of the process, saying in the initial planning phase, Wood will look at the data and see where there could be an aging infrastructure and how much it will cost to upgrade. Part of the project is to do a GIS evaluation, but the implementation phase will go into greater detail.

Board member Banach asked, how did CBU select this contractor, and what is the immediate need for us to do this?

Kelson said the contractor was selected through an interviewing process where we sent out a request for proposals. The candidates interviewed were those we thought best met our needs, and Wood was our first choice. The project manager managing this project is based in Bloomington. Kelson also said that the city has never had a stormwater master plan. This has been on our agenda for several years and is one of the things we included as an objective when we did the stormwater rate increase. Most importantly, the city wants to move in the direction of developing greener stormwater infrastructure. To do that is going to take several capital projects. Stormwater efforts will dovetail with other departments in the city, especially Public Works and Planning and Transportation. The idea of the stormwater master plan is what we as a city are intending to do in terms of managing and improving the quality of stormwater run-off leaving the city. Assistant Director (Environmental) Hall said the state is getting ready to change the MS4 requirements before the end of the year. Some of our requirements may change, so getting Wood's input, incorporating it now, and how we can help do that moving forward is also a part of this plan.

Banach mentioned other municipalities do not have a stormwater utility, and they presumably still have to comply with a lot of the same requirements without giving hundreds of thousands of dollars to consultants to help them. He asked if the \$200,000.00 is a fixed price or if there will be change orders for more information. Hall said that one of the reasons we liked the Wood proposal is that the implementation is a large part of the money. For a lot of the other contractors the majority of it was planning, and they were all around or a little more than \$200,000.00. The phase of implementation can be changed if finances change.

Banach also asked if there will be other expenses in addition to the contract, such as travel.

Hall said if there is something that is part of the implementation plan, it will come out of that budget. Travel will not be included in any of those costs because the project manager lives in Bloomington.

Banach asked if we pay \$70,000.00 for the plan document, why can't we implement with our plan?

Williams answered that a concrete problem is the maintenance of green infrastructure practices. Wood will identify a need and help the city find a solution. A lot of cities do not have all of the BMPs mapped in GIS, so they will put together a database. If a private BMP is not in compliance with the MS4 permit, they help the city come up with a process to get in compliance. Another example is a lot of cities do not have green infrastructure typical details, so they do not know how contractors are going to construct BMPs. In the plan, Wood will identify the need for the city's green infrastructure typical details, and implementation will create those typical details in the construction document. The planning process takes about a year and they work with all city departments to find what those needs are. Wood has a library of engineering standards and details to help with the process.

Hall said the green infrastructure standard design is something that our engineering department has struggled with. We want to implement green infrastructure but we do not know how we want it to look or the maintenance requirements, so this is something we need help doing.

Thetonia mentioned that we have been working with other city departments and want something consistent so that other people submitting plans to us know what we expect. That will also make plan reviews easier. In terms of cost, the stormwater master plans can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars based how much engineering is included. We have spent some money in the past year or two on drainage studies. That is why we are

not spending \$300,000.00 on master plans like other cities because we will not be doing all the engineering modeling for all our stormwater systems. We are focusing on the baseline program assessment to modernize our stormwater program and align it with other city goals, like sustainability and climate action goals. In talking with other city departments, there are items in these other plans that a stormwater plan could address. There are a lot of other stormwater master plans around the State of Indiana for similarly sized utilities. It will help us with long-range capital improvement planning while having a focus on green infrastructure implementation. It will also help us have a plan for how to spend the funding from our rate increase for city-owned projects, as well as plans for new development and redevelopment.

Kelson said the stormwater master plan communicates to the regulating community of developers and others in the city exactly what it is we are trying to do, why we are doing it, and how it all ties together. That gives us a much better vehicle for communicating our goals and objectives for the city more transparently and understandably.

Sherman said that until you have a plan, you do not know what the implementation will be. How do you set a dollar amount on implementation without having the plans?

Thetonia said that she used to manage grants for IDEM for watershed management and implementation. She said plans were sitting on the shelves that were written and never implemented and that she did not want that to happen here. We can start working on the implementation projects while we are still in the planning phase. Some of the deliverables will be helping us with ordinance updates and policies for the MS4 program. We can also help facilitate workshops for elected officials and our private sector stakeholders. It is often useful to have a professional consultant help with those things and discussing it from their outside perspective. We can also have them complete design bid packages so that we know certain capital projects will come and have those planned and ready. We can choose whatever we would like with the rest of the funding in the contract.

Sherman asked if the plan takes more than the \$130,000.00, would we have to increase the amount?

Hall answered that we will watch the cost of the plan, but we may cut back on implementation.

Sherman moved, Burnham seconded the motion to approve the request for an agreement with Wood Environment and Infrastructure Solutions. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH GRW, INC.

CBU Assistant Director (Engineering) Schroeder presented an amendment to a contract with GRW for the design of sewer capacity improvements from Dunn St. to Cascade Park. Through the work process, there has been a couple of items that were not in their scope-of-work that we need them to do. One of them is to coordinate geotechnical services that do borings, and in support of that, some brush clearing. Also, this sewer terminates in a storm pipe so we would like them to include improvements on this culvert. We also asking for additional money that can be used if other out-of-scope work comes up which would only allocate based on our approval. The total of this amendment is for \$37,745.00, and the new not-to-exceed on the contract is 233,745.00. Burnham asked if the responsibility to pay falls on CBU or the developer, who in this case, is IU. Kelson answered the developer is IU. CBU will pay the portion they do not pay. We are discussing ways that we can do long-term development of sewer

infrastructure coherently. Historically, we have had situations where the entity that builds the new structure has put us over the limit and we have had to do an expansion. We realize that is not realistic. This is a sewer that will serve a lot of area that will be redeveloped or newly developed in the coming decade. Since IU set the schedule for this by the need that they are establishing, they are going to pay their portion of it and we will pay the rest. Over time we will work on ways to allocate the additional costs to future connections so that we can find a more coherent way of handling these major infrastructure expansions in the future. Schroeder mentioned CBU is managing the design, it will go to bid, and it will be done through reimbursement.

Sherman moved, Burnham seconded the motion to approve the request for an amendment to the agreement with GRW. Motion carried, 5 ayes.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Burnham reported the Rules & Regulations subcommittee, which also includes board members Banach and Ehman, who had two meetings before the regular meeting to discuss two separate items. The first meeting regarding the recommendation to start a deposit program. It came to the rules and regulations committee that there has been a change to state legislation in which the utility, CBU, can no longer go to a landlord to recoup funds that are in arrears from a tenant. By the state changing the legislation, it leaves CBU in a bind when tenants leave and do not pay their utility bills. We have the ok from the IURC to put a deposit program in place. The subcommittee is working with staff to establish guidelines and an ordinance so that we can start requiring a deposit program.

The second meeting was for single metering with multiple uses in the property. The subcommittee is working on this and looking at rules and ordinances in terms of how we are going to move forward.

STAFF REPORTS:

Kelson introduced to the board Elise Boruvka as the new CBU Purchasing employee.

Also reported to the board was an interest for CBU to join INWARN, the Indiana Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network. INWARN is an organization of water and wastewater utilities around Indiana that is a mutual support network for utilities when crises arise.

There is a press release that CBU has its 6th COVID case, and the first one in the city in six weeks. The case is in the engineering department, and there is no evidence of any additional exposure owing to that case.

CBU is nearing completion of the installation of the advanced metering project. The next phase is the deployment of the customer portal. Over the coming weeks, there will be information about getting connected to the customer portal and learning how to use it to manage water use.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS: None

ADJOURNMENT: Capler moved to adjourn; the meeting was adjourned at 5:43 pm.

Julie Roberts, President

DATE