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

CALL TO ORDER

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

Board members present: Amanda Burnham, Seth Debro, Jeff Ehman, Megan Parmenter, Jim Sherman, Kirk White, Jim Sims (ex officio)
Board members absent: Jean Capler, Scott Robinson (ex officio)
Staff present: Tom Axsom, Jane Fleig, James Hall, Nolan Hendon, Dan Hudson, Vic Kelson, Phil Peden, Laura Pettit, Brandon Prince, Brad Schroeder, Cindy Shaw, LaTreana Teague, Chris Wheeler

MINUTES

Board member Parmenter moved, and Board Member Sherman seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 4th meeting. The motion received a roll-call vote: Sherman-yes, White-yes, Ehman-yes, Parmenter-yes, Burnham-yes, Capler-yes, Debro-yes. The motion passed.

CLAIMS

Parmenter moved, and Board member Sherman seconded the motion to approve the Payables Invoices: Vendor invoices submitted included $133,774.43 from the Water Utility, $146,703.69 from the Wastewater Utility, $850.00 from the Wastewater Sinking Fund, $672,047.00 from the Wastewater Construction Fund, and $31,181.36 from the Stormwater Utility.

Referring to a claim on page two for reimbursement for an asbestos course, Ehman asked why the refund has to come out of the water fund and whether it has to do with our buildings.

Director Kelson said there are some water pipes with asbestos, and we could do some repairs there. It could be relevant to any facility. We put it all in water in the past because the Assistant Director of Environmental Programs Hall worked on former water facilities. He already had the license, so we extended it. This reimbursement should be split 60/40.


Parmenter moved, and Board member Sherman seconded the motion to approve the Standard Invoices: Vendor invoices submitted included $610.48 from the Water Utility, $1,907.13 from the Wastewater Utility, $350.00 from the Wastewater Sinking Fund, and $266.65 from the Stormwater Utility.

Parmenter moved, and Sherman seconded the motion to approve the Utility Bills:
Utility invoices submitted included $63,954.13 from the Water Utility and $22,548.89 from the Wastewater Utility.
The motion received a roll-call vote: Capler-yes, Parmenter-yes, Ehman-yes, Debro-yes, Burnham-yes, Sherman-yes. Total claims approved: $86,503.02.

Parmenter moved, and Sherman seconded the motion to approve the Wire Transfers, Fees, and Payroll in the amount of $570,097.29. The motion received a roll-call vote: Parmenter-yes, Ehman-yes, Debro-yes, White-yes, Burnham-yes, Sherman-yes. The motion passed.

Parmenter moved, and Sherman seconded the motion to approve the Customer Refunds:
Customer refunds submitted included $120.34 from the Water Fund, $660.51 from the Wastewater Fund, and $34.83 from the Sanitation Fund. There were two typos on the Customer Refunds, both for Pepper Construction. The errors showed refunds to the vendor from the wastewater fund and not the water fund. Staff correctly entered the refunds into the system.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- Harrell-Fish, Inc., $4,304.30, Replace squirrel cage fan at Dillman WWTP
- Heflin Industries, Inc., $2,591.93, Replace low service chemical nipple at Monroe WTP
- Donohue & Associates, Inc., $15,000.00, Chemical line reroute at Monroe WTP

As no items were removed from the Consent Agenda by the Board, the agreements were approved. Total contracts approved: $21,896.23.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN MOU WITH CITY ENGINEERING

CBU Engineer Peden requested approval for an MOU with the City of Bloomington's Engineering Department to inspect bridges and culverts under the roadways throughout Bloomington. The MOU is not to exceed $18 thousand.

Ex Officio Sims asked what these inspections consist of.
Peden answered the staff manually walks through them and checks the structure for degradation and concrete or exposed rebar. They look for any deficiencies that might lead to failure and mark them on the inlet and outlet sides and the portion under the pavement.

Has this been an ongoing process? What shape are we in?:

It is an ongoing process. We had several trips, and there were no significant issues. Some vegetation was removed, or patches we needed to grout. Even if they do not find anything, we get a baseline to know what kind of degradation is happening.

Ehman asked if the span is a certain distance, then the county is responsible? How do we locate the inspections between what the city pays and what we pay. Or are we paying for all of the inspections because they all fall within stormwater.
Peden said that the county manages anything over a 20’ span. The other agencies within the city have their own MOU. So we are just covering CBU structures.

Parmenter asked how many culverts and bridges were there? Are they all being inspected right now?
Peden answered there are about one hundred on the list. We are doing 9, and they are doing about 25 total.

Parmenter moved, and Sherman seconded to approve the MOU with City
Engineering, Inc. The motion received a roll-call vote: Burnham-yes, Sherman-yes, Debro-yes, Ehman-yes, Capler-yes, Parmenter-yes. The motion passed.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT WITH GRW, INC.
Peden requested approval of an agreement with GRW development of a bid package, bid assistance, and construction engineering for a project. We are focusing on rehabilitation for the Fritz Terrace neighborhood on the north side of town. The original sewer was put in in the 1960s. It is a vitrified clay sewer with a brick manhole. This project is the design and bid package to rehabilitate the infrastructure. It will include over 15 thousand feet of pipe and 65 manholes. There will be a 90-day period for GRW to complete the bid packages, and within 180 days, they will have a notice to proceed with construction. The amount of the agreement is $52 thousand.

Board member White asked whether we have a good indication of how well they are holding up? How long does this last?
Peden answered that he does not know of any location where the liner has failed. It has a 50-100 year lifespan. Several sewer segments have been replaced in this neighborhood in the last ten years. Those sewers were in rear yards and not the street. It is $2 thousand to line it and $10 thousand to replace it.
Parmenter moved, and Sherman seconded to approve the agreement with GRW, Inc. The motion received a roll-call vote: Parmenter-yes, Burnham-yes, Sherman-yes, Ehman-yes, Debro-yes, White-yes. The motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS: None

STAFF REPORTS:
Kelson welcomed new employee Troy Kilgore, Marketing Specialist, to CBU.
Kelson asked the Board to consider which member will serve on the Residential Stormwater Grants Committee.
Burnham asked about the process for turning in grant applications and their review.
Hall answered the applications are due on February 1st. There will be an internal review amongst CBU staff, and they give the applications a ranking on how well they will suit our system. Staff then passes the applications on to the review board. The process usually takes four to six weeks.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS: None

ADJOURNMENT: Parmenter moved to adjourn; the meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

______________________________    __________________________
Jeff Ehman, President               Date