

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

MINUTES OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY WATER BOARD

Tuesday, January 10, 2012
6:30 a.m.
110 S Main Street
Springville, Utah 84663

ATTENDANCE

Councilmember
Richard Child

Secretary
Marcie Clark

Board Members
Alton Beck
Lynn Panter
Nile Hatch
Calvin Crandall
Rick Child
Rollin Hotchkiss – chairman

City Staff
Brad Stapley – Public Works Director
Shawn Barker – Water Superintendent
Juan Garrido – WWTP Superintendent/SWPP

Review of Minutes – the December 13th meeting minutes were reviewed. Mr. Beck made a motion to approve, Mr. Panter seconded. All members approved.

Mr. Hotchkiss talked with Mr. Stapley about various topics to be discussed in this meeting. Mr. Stapley thought we would be overstepping our bounds of authority as a water board to discuss storm drains. Our enabling language in our charter does not include storm drain. Mr. Beck reminded the group that the City asked the Water Board a few months ago to be over storm drains. Mr. Stapley said we will need to change the wording of our board policy so we can include storm drain issues. We'll include it on next month's agenda.

Mr. Juan Garrido was invited to come and introduce himself and explain what he does for the City, specifically with Storm Water. He gave a brief background on himself, including past work experience. He was hired by the City in 2007 as a Public Works SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) Inspector. SWPPP is a mandate from EPA, part of the clean water act. He was recently promoted to Superintendent of Storm Water and Sewer. He will be doing this along with SWPPP. He distributed a handout, explaining MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System). Mr. Beck asked if Mr. Garrido has any interaction with the Planning Commission. He does not. Mr. Beck thinks it would be a good idea to make them aware of what the State is mandating the City to do. Mr. Garrido does have involvement with the City Planners in the Design Review Committee (DRC).

Mr. Hotchkiss asked each board member to introduce themselves to Mr. Garrido.

Mr. Panter asked Mr. Garrido if Nestle needs to have some kind of permit for MS4. Mr. Garrido explained the requirements and why they are exempt (non-permit). Mr. Child asked about the changes in storm water, where it is now all to be piped, instead of open ditches. How do all the changes interface with each other? Mr. Hotchkiss suggested this as a summer field trip.

We have a recommendation on the Canyon Water Users that needs to be voted on. Ms. Clark read the recommendation to the board. ~~Another issue has come up since this was written, which is item #3 on the agenda.~~ Mr. Stapley distributed Policy #WTOC-02051991 OUTSIDE CITY CONNECTIONS. He explained that #8 goes against what we are recommending. In order to make this recommendation to the council, we will need to change this policy. Mr. Hotchkiss asked Mr. Stapley if city staff could provide some draft language to the water board. Mr. Stapley said he would do that. Mr. Hotchkiss asked each member to say whether he supports the recommendation. Mr. Panter thinks the recommendation seems fair the way it is written. Mr. Hatch thinks it's a slippery slope for the city to single out anyone inside or outside the city and charge them individually for pooled services. Some of their arguments are weak, and actually wrong. They're not making the most important arguments. But in spirit, it's probably right. But now they're asking to change city code and that's a bigger thing. Mr. Beck doesn't think those

1 canyon users knew about the policy. Mr. Hotchkiss verified that it never came up. Mr. Beck thinks the city council
2 needs to enforce their policy, and this shouldn't be a water board issue. Mr. Beck doesn't think we should change
3 this policy. This is an isolated incident and there may be others come up in the future. Mr. Hatch asked how the
4 Grindstone water system was paid for a few years ago. Mr. Stapley explained the cost was shared between the City
5 and Grindstone residents, with the City paying for the majority. Mr. Crandall asked if the City costs have come
6 down now that they are chlorinating at Bartholomew Tank. Mr. Barker explained that it has in some ways, but not in
7 others.

8
9 Mr. Hotchkiss wants to defer this decision to next month, and each board member needs to look at the policy more
10 and propose any changes. Mr. Hotchkiss asked Mr. Stapley to come next month and be prepared to talk to the board
11 about future possibilities and question the wisdom of having individuals chlorinate their own water as opposed to a
12 general change. Mr. Stapley explained that #1 allows the City Council to make whatever requirements they want on
13 a case-by-case basis for "new connection" to the City's penstock. The issue right now is the canyon users are already
14 on our system. So we can change this policy and it still won't affect future issues.

15
16 Agenda item #3 is urgent. Mr. Stapley explained that a few weeks ago, the City was notified about a pressure
17 problem for a Left Fork water user. The City had to fix their PRV station. Mr. Stapley distributed a diagram of the
18 Lower Bartholomew Penstock PRV stations. Most likely, years ago, the resident's 4" probably failed and they
19 rerouted the water through the 1" bypass piping. The fittings in the bypass are not rated for the pressure that they're
20 breaking. So eventually the PRV blew out. Mr. Stapley discovered that the City installed it, but then turned it over
21 to the resident. The new resident doesn't want it. The City went against #7 on the policy by installing it for them.
22 Mr. Stapley wants the board to consider the issues – if the City maintains the PRV stations, we take the risk of
23 blowing out their water system if the PRV station fails. Mr. Stapley indicated he doesn't want the public messing
24 with a 400 psi penstock. He wants the City to be responsible for it. There is technology though to protect the
25 residents downstream of a PRV station if the pressure reducing valves fail. A PRV station failure can happen on a
26 rare basis. So, we have two different issues here. Either we take the station and take on the risk that goes with that.
27 Or we dump it back on them, based on the policy. That will be difficult, because we've never enforced this and we
28 have a bunch of stations up there that are ready to fall apart. Mr. Barker explained his feelings on this issue. The
29 Water Dept has had a tough time in the past to implement the residents maintaining the PRV stations. The PRV
30 stations have not been maintained as they should. We've waffled back and forth over the years because of this. In
31 another related issue, Mr. Stapley drew a diagram on the white board, showing the penstock and the PRV station,
32 noting that it appears that there is no way to turn off any of the PRV stations since there is not a shut-off valve
33 between the penstock and the PRV station. There may be a corp-stop at the connection to the penstock, but this
34 would require digging up the connection at the penstock to shut off the supply to the PRV station. So, besides trying
35 to decide who is going to take care of this, we need to decide how to take care of the missing valve issue.

36
37 Mr. Beck brought up #9 on the policy. Mr. Hatch recommended looking at the policy and figuring out what is right
38 in principle, because right now we have a written policy and a de facto policy. Mr. Stapley explained that Mr. Barker
39 has been instructed to immediately fix any emergency problems related to individual PRV station connected to the
40 penstock.

41
42 Mr. Hotchkiss would like Mr. Stapley to email the notes from this meeting to board members and decide if the board
43 needs to meet again before next month.

44
45 Mr. Beck moved to adjourn. Mr. Hatch seconded. All were in favor.

46
47 *Adjourn* – This meeting adjourned at 7:30 a.m.
48
49
50