

December Director Questions – Siegfried

- p. 97: Line cleaning: reasonable to assume less progress in winter, or are there other reasons line cleaning is falling behind?

Lauer - Yes, winter is one of the reasons for lower cleaning numbers, proximity of cleaning to the treatment plant which is where we get water means more driving and less cleaning. We have also had training weeks along with new staffing, vacations and frequent truck problems that have all contributed to the lower numbers. We are now staffed up and a new cleaning truck has arrived and should be back on schedule.

- p. 99: Eliminating a GFI is concerning. Was the manufacturer consulted? Is the original amperage also 20 amps?

Foley - GFCI is for personnel protection from shock. Foley-This outlet is for equipment. There is still required overload and short circuit protection. This is an application issue not a defect so the manufacturer was not consulted. Yes, original was 20 amps.

- p. 103: I salute drilling on “winch mode.” Don’t drill on “grinch mode” for the holiday season.

- p. 105: CAWD total power consumption appears to have been on a consistent decline from June. Is this good luck, or is there some other reason(s)?

Treanor - The Microturbines were turned back on in July after being down for a while. The Tertiary Sand Filter system was offline for maintenance in October which would result in less power usage, but that was not normal operations.

- p. 135: Why three managers? Ditto pp. 136, 137. Poor practice.

We are deliberately working collaboratively. We think collaborative is the appropriate way to address some of the bigger or more complex issues facing the district. We agree that it is not appropriate for all situations, but when it works, we think it can result in better solutions.

- p. 147: Pump failure: Is there no method of condition monitoring of the dampener that can replace time-based replacement? Vibration monitoring, for instance?

Foley - No method other than time since soft parts such as diaphragms and seals are consumable items with chemical pumps.

p. 148: Testing of transfer switch and load: Late December seems sub-optimal for seasonal testing of generators. Given time lags for parts acquisition and the need for functioning generators in winter, the tail end of the water year makes more sense.

Foley - Agreed. Request to vendor was made in October and they have significant backlog. Any future requests will be made earlier to account for vendor backlog.

Clarifier: Do we check prices with shops in Salinas, El Camino Welding, Gonzales Machine? They sit on cheaper land, and might be expected to work more cheaply.

Foley - Yes, we use Valley Fabrication and El Camino. The pricing is similar since they service the same region. Since pricing is similar smaller jobs can be dropped off in Sand City which saves staff time.

Pipe bracing: Is it understood where the force will go that presently is dissipated in piping?

Foley - The pipe bracing is for vibration not water hammer. The brace will reduce the vibration by stabilizing the pipe so it will not move back and forth. The brace will be connected to concrete structure.

p. 154: EXAMPLES . . . (continued): Are these also illustrative? If so, why repeat the heading?

Foley - I think this may have originally been a new page heading. Will Correct.

p. 155: Are we seriously expecting the CPO to perform laboratory tests?

Foley – No, but generally Grade I Operators have this capability. Operator may want to calibrate field process instrument against lab instrument for pH (for example). Can delete laboratory test and leave process test.

“Wastewater Math”: Is this a recognized term?

Foley – yes, it is recognized in the industry and the EPA

p. 157: Are out of state certifications recognized on a temporary basis?

Per the State Water Resources Control Board

Examination Waiver (Formally Known As Reciprocity)

Wastewater operators with valid, unexpired wastewater certifications from another state, U.S. Territory, or land under the jurisdiction of Indian tribe may apply for an examination waiver (according to the California Code of Regulations, title 23, division 3, chapter 26, section 3689). Please note that the Wastewater Operator Certification Program (WWOCP) does not have formal reciprocity agreements with any other states. An approved examination waiver application exempts the applicant from taking the WWOCP exam or submitting the applicable fee; however, they must submit a certification application and fee and an exam waiver application and fee.

No person may operate a wastewater treatment plant in California unless that person has been certified by the Wastewater Operator Certification Program (WWOCP) as a wastewater treatment plant operator.

Requirements for Examination Waiver

An applicant who holds a valid, unexpired certificate may receive an examination waiver if:

1. The experience, education, examination requirements and enforcement capability of the *certifying body are comparable to the WWOCP's requirements;
2. The applicant meets the minimum education and qualifying experience requirements for the applicable grade level;
3. The applicant has passed a written examination, administered by the certifying body, that is comparable to the examination given by the WWOCP for the applicable grade of operator certification; and
4. The applicant completes both a certification application and an examination waiver and pays the certification and examination waiver fees.

*A certifying body can be a state or a tribal government that certifies or registers any person performing wastewater duties at a wastewater facility. The Indian tribe must provide a signed resolution from the governing body signifying that the responsibility of certification of their operators has been relinquished to the certifying body.

p. 162: There is duplication with p. 163.

Foley – Wrists are covered under Twisting/Rotating and Bending

P. 162 details “Pushing/Pulling” and “Twisting/Rotating”

P. 163 details “Bending”

p. 165: A “two-person lift” becomes a one-person lift when a worker loses grip or footing. Note on page 166 that “any lifts above this (120+) threshold will be

accomplished via lifting equipment”. The logic seems to be that there is no rationale for two-person lifts then. Explanation required.

Foley - CAWD provides training on lifting and part of the training covers grip and footing to reduce the risk of losing grip. An example would be to use lifting equipment to move a valve and then while the valve is still secured it is lifted the final 1” to its location. If an employee slipped the valve would be secured by lifting equipment but a two person lift is still required.

“Above a threshold of 120+ lbs.” does not make sense. Do you mean “above [or greater than] 120 lbs.?”

Foley - Greater than or equal to 120 lbs. but lifting equipment in general used when items are over 50lbs since even less weight can cause injury in awkward positions. Example is a motor under a pulley. It may only weigh 50lbs but could place a lot of stress on the back when moving at odd angle.

p. 172: Why is the CPO not grouped with the Collection System Superintendent?

Are you referring to placement on the page? If so, I think p. 200 does it better

How was the CPO salary arrived at?

A search of other CPO jobs through CASA, job posting, State Controller listing

p. 189: Ability to “make appropriate recommendations for plant operations”: Would not this be a duty of the CPO? I see the lab manager more as a provider of trustworthy data.

The Lab Manager provides data but also has the ability to suggest changes to the CPO for greater plant efficiency. We’re attempting to encourage greater ownership of the data and greater collaboration. If they simply provide the data then we should keep the position as a Lab Supervisor.

p. 223: I prefer not to vote on a general resolution that already is District policy. I would rather vote on this specific problem narrowly stated.

Treanor - The board can direct staff to bring the issue back at a later meeting.

I also prefer that the General Manager not characterize ratepayers' arguments as "obfuscating" for fear of eliciting accusations of prejudice on the directors' part. There is no need to characterize arguments.

Understood

Given that Mr. Keig and Mr. Wilson wish to have their complaint heard before the full board, I suggest we reschedule this for the January meeting.

Mr. Wilson already appeared before the Board in November. They will be here at the December meeting. The Board certainly has the discretion of rescheduling any item.

p. 230: The subject of the staff report on page 230 is "Legal Counsel Request for Proposals (RFP)", but the discussion reads that the ad hoc committee is submitting a single firm for the Board's consideration. If true, this exceeds the committee's authority and renders the subject of the staff report meaningless. Nothing in the minutes of previous meetings indicates that the Board bestowed upon the committee authority to choose a new firm.

This staff report is a placeholder. The interviews were not completed until the 16th which is after the board packet submission. A final report will be handed out on Thursday.

The committee interpreted their mandate as filtering the submissions to the RFP and submitting a final recommendation to the full board at December meeting.

If the committee decided among themselves to choose a firm, this is a problem of process. Choosing a successor counsel is an important duty of the Board, possibly as consequential as choosing a general manager. Selection of a new firm from among qualified candidates must be performed by the full board. To bring a single recommendation to the board is to present the board with a *fait accompli*, the result of a decision made by two directors in committee. This would usurp the Board's duty to consider, discuss and decide one of the most important of its decisions. We owe our ratepayers the thinking of the entire board.

The committee is making a recommendation only. The intent is that full board will make the final decision.