

COOS BAY-NORTH BEND WATER BOARD  
P O BOX 539 – 2305 Ocean Boulevard  
Coos Bay, Oregon 97420

Minutes  
Regular Board Meeting

September 8, 2022  
7:00 a.m.

Coos Bay-North Bend Water Board met in open session in the Board Room at the above address, date, and time with Chair Bob Dillard presiding. Other Board members present: Dr. Charles Sharps, Greg Solarz and Carmen Matthews. Board Members absent: None. Water Board staff present: Ivan D. Thomas, General Manager; Matt Whitty, Engineering Manager; Bryan Tichota, Customer Relations Supervisor; Rick Abbott, Distribution Supervisor and Karen Parker, Administrative Assistant. Board Legal Counsel Melissa Cribbins was present (virtually). Media present: None.

Chair Dillard opened the meeting at 7:00 a.m. and led the Board and assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Dillard asked if there were any corrections or additions to the August 18, 2022, Regular Board meeting minutes. Dr. Sharps moved the minutes be approved as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Solarz and passed unanimously.

Chair Dillard asked if there were any public comments, and there were none.

Regarding the proposed changes to Meter Reader and Field Customer Service Representative job descriptions, Mr. Thomas stated the Water Board is currently funding five positions to conduct meter reading, meter maintenance, and field customer service duties. The current dissemination of the five positions includes three Meter Readers and two Field Customer Service Representatives (FCSR). There are key primary differences in the positions. The Meter Reader position is more labor intensive in a repetitive sense and the FCSR position is more maintenance and customer service driven. The positions are also meant to complement each other when the need arises.

With the Water Board's implementation of Automatic Meter Reading (AMR), the job of Meter Reading is becoming less labor intensive and more maintenance driven. This will continue to be amplified as more AMR units are installed. As meter reading becomes less labor intensive, more maintenance work will be demanded from the FCSR.

Mr. Thomas stated after meeting with staff and the Union Steward, we are suggesting use of a career ladder to make our positions sustainable through the implementation of AMR. This consists of changing the Meter Reader job description to a FCSR I, and the current FCSR to a level II position.

The use of the career ladder does not change the current job duties or wages of current staff. However, once the FCSR I meet certain criteria, they can be promoted to FCSR II. The criteria to be considered for the career ladder promotion are: be employed 24 months in the FCSR I position, complete the AWWA Customer Service training course or pre-approved comparable customer service training course, have a written recommendation from the Customer Relations Supervisor stating the employee is trained to effectively perform the job duties listed in the FCSR II job description, and have no disciplinary actions for 6 months prior to the suggested date of promotion. Dependent upon the pay range step the FCSR I occupies, advancement to FCSR II would include a pay increase of 4-5%. In the case of any career ladder advancement in FY23, funds were adequately planned and budgeted.

POSITION TITLE	1	2	3	4	5	6
Field Customer Service Representative I	19.89	20.88	21.92	23.02	24.17	25.38
Field Customer Service Representative II	20.75	21.79	22.88	24.02	25.22	26.48

Dr. Sharps asked if the FCSR I is a position that is difficult to fill. Mr. Thomas agreed. Dr. Sharps commented he was trying to figure out in the long term how much it would cost because once the FCSR I is certified they would move to a higher step, but it doesn't appear that many employees would be moving from FCSR I to FCSR II. Mr. Thomas stated the utility currently has two meter readers, one of which is eligible now to take the necessary class. Dr. Sharps asked if this will help maintain this position. Mr. Thomas stated he feels this would give someone an option that is looking at this as a career, not just as a meter reading perspective.

Mr. Dillard inquired what percentage of new meters have been installed. Mr. Thomas stated there are currently 900 new meters installed, which is a little less than 10 percent of the total meters. An additional 1,200 meters are in the current fiscal year's budget and will be installed this year. The plan is to budget multiple meters every year until the project is complete (approximately 6 years). Mr. Solarz commented the meters have an expected life of 15 years and staff could replace 1/15<sup>th</sup> every year in a designated area. Mr. Thomas stated the meters would be replaced in a designated area.

Dr. Sharps asked if the Union had any problems with the changes in the job descriptions. Mr. Thomas stated there were not many questions and overall it gives the employees another step to move forward within the organization. Motion was made by Dr. Sharps to accept the job description updates and inclusion of the career ladder for the Field Customer Service Representative positions.

Regarding the Pavement Patching Request for Quotes, Engineering Manager Matt Whitty stated over the past year the Water Board has fallen behind on pavement patching. Staff has a long list which includes patches from repairs to water mains and services and new service installations. Most of the backlog accumulated in the last 6 months, but several are from late 2021 and early 2022. The list includes over 30 items.

Recent staff turnover and a lack of paving experience on the distribution crew are primary factors contributing to the patching backlog, as well as the uptick in the housing market. Staff experienced a smaller backlog in 2021 which was resolved by issuing an RFQ in September 2021 and having a contractor install 1,300 square feet of patching at a cost of \$11,750. The distribution crew installed the remaining patches from the 2021 backlog.

Mr. Dillard asked if the Water Board distribution crew is still installing patches to some extent. Mr. Whitty stated our inhouse capabilities are really limited at this time due to the lack of experience in paving and training is needed, as well as the general workload is such that patching has not been accomplished.

In response to a current patching list twice as long as the 2021 list, staff is proposing a solution designed to reduce the time required for replacement of pavement. Staff prepared an RFQ for up to \$75,000 in pavement repairs. The patching will be phased with an initial scope estimated at \$30,000 in repairs including a final full width overlay of McDaniel Street estimated at \$8,500. The repairs included in the RFQ are representative of the various types of repairs we encounter.

The goal of this RFQ process is to retain a contractor for an extended period of time and get pricing from this contractor upon completion of our work so they can complete the pavement patching in a timely manner. After the first bundle of patches is complete we intend to use the initial quoted prices as a baseline of comparison for future pricing of patching work by the same contractor. When the \$75,000 limit is approached staff will issue another RFQ with a similar limit to allow the paving contractors another opportunity to win the work.

On August 25<sup>th</sup> staff issued the RFQ to three local contractors. The quotes are due on September 13<sup>th</sup>. Staff proposes funding the repairs from a combination of the Distribution budget and the active capital fund.

Dr. Sharps inquired if staff is asking for permission to go out for request for quotes for pavement patching now and if not, when was this brought to the Board for approval to do. Mr. Whitty stated this was not brought before the Board. Dr. Sharps commented he thought it was normal procedure to ask the Board for approval to issue a Request for Quotes as he noted the RFQ has already been issued to spend up to \$75,000. Mr. Whitty stated under normal circumstances staff would go out for the amount of work that is in the original RFQ, so if the Board chooses not to approve the \$75,000 then the award could be made for the work that is within the RFQ, \$20,000 to \$25,000 (work for this amount is not normally taken to the Board). Dr. Sharps questioned if the rule is anything over \$50,000 is taken to the Board. Mr. Thomas confirmed this is correct and the reason the RFQ is being brought before the Board is because staff is asking for a limitation of up to \$75,000.00.

Dr. Sharps inquired if this is for just one time and Mr. Thomas confirmed, one time for one year.

Mr. Whitty stated the Board does have a decision to make as there is no guarantee of additional work in the RFQ. As stated prior, the work is going to be about 20,000 to \$25,000, an amount that does not need Board approval. Dr. Sharps said he understands that but does staff understand his concern.

Mr. Whitty stated his concern is definitely understood and explained staff can't retain a contractor for 3 years for patching as it is not fair to other contractors and challenging within the Board's rules. However, \$75,000 or less than \$150,000, we can do that. This streamlines the process with the idea that we would already have someone on retainer when we are cutting the pavement and as soon as we're done, we go to them and obtain a quote. Staff has the baseline from last year's numbers and the baseline from this to compare it to. Mr. Dillard questioned if there is a percentage staff goes by if it is 25% higher than the prior year. Mr. Whitty commented by looking back at prior scopes on projects will give comparisons needed to make sure we are given consistent numbers.

Mr. Thomas commented his main concern is to get to these patches quickly. As far as this work being done in-house, the crew needs to gear up for paving-get all the equipment ready; schedule a day or two or however long the paving job is; make sure the asphalt plant is ready for multiple locations to haul. If the crew is unable to get to the paving right away, having a contractor on retainer would allow staff to see if they could get to it sooner. Also, this would alleviate complaints and having to revisit sites to cold patch.

Mr. Matthews commented does it make sense to just have them do these patches as opposed to getting them on retainer to potentially do it.

Mr. Thomas stated it has to be a mix of work and asked Distribution Supervisor Rick Abbott if he could elaborate on their workload. Mr. Abbott stated the utility does not have a roller so staff has to arrange to borrow one, and getting asphalt this time of year is sometimes difficult, and many times they only run at night as Knife River has been doing a lot of highway jobs. Staff prefers to get patches done within 30 days. Mr. Abbott commented that the new main they put in on Madrona Street in North Bend has been there for six months now. Since the crew has been unable to do, the City of North Bend has been really good about maintaining it in spots, and paving other areas as they have their crew there. But other than that the crew spends a lot of time putting down cold mix. The workload and the experience of the crew makes it hard to do. We have a good crew but they need training before being able to do the paving. The crew needs to finish the main on McDaniel Street; there are four new services that need to be done, as well as 8 hydrants from the cities that they want repaired. Mr. Abbott stated they are just treading water and are shorthanded.

Mr. Dillard asked Mr. Abbott if he would train on the small patches. Mr. Abbott stated the Crew Leader, Miranda, has done several and a couple crew members have done a few small patches. There is one Crew Leader and one Utility Worker with a CDL. There are two other crew members who are ready to get their CDL but the State has new rules that they need to meet. It is all work in progress.

Dr. Sharps asked if any responses have been received on the Request for Quotes. Mr. Whitty said no responses have been received to date. Mr. Thomas added he suspects quotes will come in right before the deadline.

Dr. Sharps inquired if this work is included in the budget. Mr. Thomas stated there is \$50,000 budgeted for patching, and any funds above that amount would come out of active capital reserves. Mr. Matthews moved to authorize the General Manager to award up to \$75,000 in patching work to the contractor with the lowest price in response to the August 25<sup>th</sup> Request for Quotes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Solarz and passed unanimously.

Regarding the proposed Change Order for the Parking Lot Paving Project, Mr. Whitty stated during removal of the existing AC pavement the contractor found additional 4-inch thick pavement in front of the truck bays in the upper parking lot. After discussing options for replacement of the thicker pavement staff decided to place a uniform thickness of 3 inches over the entire lot. The project also required additional aggregate in excess of the 65 tons included in the original contract. We anticipated a large change order due to the increased volume of materials.

The contractor offered a discount on the aggregate if we used their recycled aggregate product. Staff have seen this product utilized in the past and it has good construction qualities including compaction and durability, so we agreed to its use on this project.

The change order increased project costs as follows:

<u>Description</u>	<u>Design Quantity</u>	<u>Final Quantity</u>	<u>Price/Ton</u>	<u>Increase</u>
AC Pavement	650 Tons	886.96 Tons	\$154	\$36,491.84
Subgrade Aggregate	65 Tons	299.32 Tons	\$66	\$15,465.12
Aggregate Discount		299.32 Tons	(\$10)	<u>(\$2,993.20)</u>
<b>Total Change Order</b>				<b>\$48,963.76</b>

The contract price with Knife River was \$153,385.50 bringing the total cost to \$202,349.26. The budgeted amount for this project was \$205,000.

After a brief discussion, motion was made by Dr. Sharps approving the change order for the Parking Lot Paving Project in the amount of \$48,963.76. The motion was seconded by Mr. Matthews and passed unanimously.

The General Manager's performance evaluation was discussed at the Board of Director's August 18, 2022 Board meeting. Dr. Sharps moved to increase the General Manager's vacation accrual to the 10 years of service rate of 150 hours retroactive to July 1, 2022 and to increase the General Manager's auto allowance to \$400 per month retroactive to July 1, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Matthews and passed unanimously.

The Board's next regular meeting was set for Thursday, October 6, 2022, at 7:00 a.m.

Updates were given as follows:

- 2019 Timber Sale – The LIDAR was unable to differentiate species. Mason, Bruce and Girard's cruise data has been transferred to Northwest Management so they can integrate that information into their report. This will give species specific volumes. A draft of their report is expected to be received by mid-October 2022. This report will also help make a 20-year harvest plan that will be sustainable.
- Master Planning – Murraysmith should have a completed plan by mid-winter.
- Polymer Chemical Feed System – The new system has been installed and is working well. Staff has seen very encouraging signs, including getting more run time out of the filters and less back washes.

At 7:30 a.m. Chair Dillard directed they go into executive session for the purposes of discussing potential litigation pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(h) and personnel issues pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(a). They returned to open session at 7:54 a.m. There being no other business to come before the Board, Chair Dillard adjourned the meeting at 7:54 a.m.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2022

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Dillard, Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_