

August Board Questions - Siegfried

p. 052: Is sorting universal waste an optimal use of S/C Admin Mark's time?

Perhaps, however Mr. Dias has been extremely successful. In May he took in a load of scrap metal (copper, alum, insulated wire) and returned with \$5,066.20. We were not expecting anywhere near that amount.

Items such as batteries and paint are sorted as they are collected. Mr. Dias ensures that wire, electronic waste, fluorescent lamps, etc. are disposed of in a timely manner and sent to the correct facility. Staff also assist Mr. Dias in the sorting and he provides oversight since he administers the program. Mr. Dias is taking a proactive approach so that the amount of waste stored onsite is minimal and items are disposed of properly.

Could someone else do it? Perhaps, but we also subscribe to the philosophy that everybody pitches in no matter the task. If Mr. Dias is training staff on how to sort, it is helpful if staff sees him practicing what he preaches.

p. 082: Are plans to purchase only the controller or to engage Hach for "Plus" services if the controller proves out?

The Hach SC4500 controller is a demo unit and will be returned when the pilot is complete. CAWD will be trading in the two SC4200 models for SC4500 and any future SC200 upgrades will be to the SC4500 model.

Background: The previous Hach SC200 controllers with local display, but not network connected, were upgraded to Hach SC4200 units which allow staff to calibrate and manage instruments via tablet or PC. The SC4200 are networked connected but does not include a local display. Hach listened to the voice of the customer and released the SC4500 which has a local display and is networked connected.

p. 083: I was under the impression the Iorex system would not be installed without a letter of approval from a reputable university. Please agendaize this issue for consideration next month by the board.

We are not moving forward with purchasing any further Iorex units until we fully review data from the pilot Iorex unit that was installed in late 2019. Back in 2019 CAWD Staff (including the Plant Engineer) agreed to Pilot Test a small ¾ -inch Iorex System on the Chlorination/Dechlorination (CDC) freshwater (Potable) system within the Treatment Plant to prove or disprove effectiveness for ourselves.

The Pilot testing thus far has collected only anecdotal evidence of improvements to red water occurrence; however, this could be due to increased flushing of the piping in this part of the WWTP. The lab has just recently started collecting pre and post water samples (upstream and downstream of the Iorex unit) and initial results are pending. The constituents being tested are based on Title 22 water samples guidelines for drinking water.

Once the water quality data is compiled, we will have quantitative information to base further decisions on. We are fully aware that the unit may not be doing anything, however completion of the scientific experiment via lab testing seems worthwhile. It has progressed slowly because it hasn't been a high priority.

p. 093: 2021-47 awards a contract, but the contract is not presented to the board. This seems irregular.

Not at all, this is the standard way we do it. The contract documents were part of the bid packet. Once the Board approves the bid, we will proceed with obtaining signatures.

p. 098: Have MNS a markup on GPRS' services?

MNS marks up 15% on all subs

p. 117: "Any staff member who does not vaccinate and does not provide a certified exemption will essentially position themselves as a voluntary separation from employment."
"or"?

There is no "or". We are offering a choice of vaccination or separation from service. I am recommending that we draw a red line on this issue.

This is exactly what the County of Monterey is doing. In consultation with our counsel, I was told that we should not have a legal problem doing so. Finally, although unconfirmed with the Employment Development Department, I've been led to believe that those who refuse to vaccinate will not be eligible for unemployment benefits (source: USA Today, a "worker who does not comply with a company's policy to get vaccinated is generally ineligible for unemployment benefits").

p. 120: Policy is not clear about acceptable types of tests (e.g. antigen or pcr). Policy also is not clear about who pays for the testing.

Test will be PCR – considered to be the more accurate of the two.

The District will have to pay for testing. The only people eligible for testing are those that can provide a certified exemption (medical or religious). Under law, if an employee provides a valid exemption, we are required to accommodate. In this case the accommodation is weekly testing that will be District provided (staff will direct the exempted employee to a provider).