

Water Pollution Control Authority
July 25, 2012
Regular Meeting
Town Hall – Council Chambers

Members Present: Mr. Matt Bowman
Mr. Steve Carroll
Mr. Walter Gancarz
Mr. Mark Kaszinkas
Mr. Tim Pelton (Chairman)
Mr. Thomas Scannell

Members Absent: Mr. John Perrotti

Others Present: Mr. Joseph Michelangelo, Director of Public Works
Mr. Donald Chelton, AECOM

Chairman Pelton called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum determined. The assembled group recited the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Pelton explained to the audience how to exit the chamber in the event of an emergency, in compliance with the Fire Marshal's order.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Pelton informed the Authority that he sent a letter to the Oxford Court, Riverside Drive, Applewood Drive, Bridget's Lane and Country Club Road residents regarding questions raised at the public hearing regarding the sewer assessment held last month.

Mr. Pelton notified the residents of the assessment of \$5,720 which must be paid in one single payment or in 17 payments with an interest charge of 3.89 per cent per annum on the unpaid balance, which is due on October 1, 2012.

Mr. Pelton advised the residents that if and when they hook up to the sewer system they will need to learn from the Building Department staff the steps necessary to install their sewer connection. He further advised that they need to check with Chesprocott Health District staff for how to decommission their existing septic tank.

APPLICATIONS

There were no applications to come before the Authority.

PROJECTS

WPCD Plant Upgrade Design-Project Update

Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that he has been in discussion with representatives of the DEEP regarding approval of the Facilities Plan which was submitted three to four years ago. AECOM is in the process of preparing comments in response to questions from the DEEP. It has been determined that it will not be necessary to call a public hearing regarding the plan, as there was adequate public input as the Facilities Plan was being developed. Mr. Michelangelo will keep the necessary copies of the Facilities Plan in the proper office locations.

Mr. Gancarz moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve Invoice #37254946 of AECOM in the amount of \$14,328.39 for work relating to the WPCD Plant Upgrade Design Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carroll and carried unanimously.

Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that three proposals were received in response to the RFP for the disk filters for the plant upgrade. The three firms were: Aqua Aerobic Systems, Inc., Kruger, Inc. and Wes Tech Engineering.

Mr. Chelton stated that review of the proposals revealed that Wes Tech's proposal did not contain data for design of operating facilities achieving similar phosphorus levels to the Cheshire proposed limits. The firm does not have three similar facilities as required by the RFP. Thus, AECOM is recommending that Wes Tech's submittal be rejected.

Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that construction and operating cost estimates were developed based on the information provided in the proposals. The items used to develop a comparative total life cycle proposal cost included the proposal lump sum cost, comparative construction cost estimates and comparative present worth estimates for a 20 year operating period. Mr. Chelton noted that the estimates are not intended to be used as a complete construction cost estimate for the disc filters. A complete cost estimate includes such things as electrical work, HVAC, Plumbing, chemical and storage facilities, site work and building architecture which are not in the scope of the RFP.

Analysis revealed that the lump sum proposal costs for Aqua Aerobic Systems, Inc. was \$1,117,006 and for Kruger, Inc. it was \$1,139,000.

In addition to the lump sum costs, a comparative construction cost for each proposal was developed. These construction costs were developed to account for the items that would be required to accommodate the two different filter systems at the WPCP. Mr. Chelton noted that the Kruger disc filter backwash flows out of the filters by gravity, versus the backwash being pumped out of the filters by Aqua Aerobics. The Kruger system recommends that an automatic chemical cleaning system be provided for maintenance cleaning of the filter media. Kruger's proposal cost included the cost of a portable chemical cleaning unit.

Analysis revealed that the comparative construction cost of Aqua Aerobic Systems, Inc. is \$738,000 and Kruger, Inc. comparative construction cost is \$609,000.

A comparative present worth cost evaluation was performed on information presented by both firms to estimate a 20-year present worth cost for operation and maintenance of the disk filters. The costs included electrical use, maintenance labor, chemical usage and media replacement costs. The costs were calculated using a 4.0 percent discount rate. Mr. Chelton noted that these comparative worth costs are not intended to be used as a complete present worth because that would include other factors as described previously in the comparative construction costs estimate.

Analysis revealed that the comparative present worth costs for Aqua Aerobics is \$1,984,000 and for Kruger, \$1,991,000.

Finally, Mr. Chelton presented comparative total life cycle costs for the proposals which include the lump sum costs, comparative construction cost estimates and the comparative present worth operation and maintenance costs. The total for Aqua Aerobics is \$3,839,000 and for Kruger, \$3,739,000. Mr. Chelton noted that the total estimated costs of both firms are essentially equal.

Mr. Chelton informed the Authority that his firm looked at all the information presented by both firms and found that the Kruger proposal offers lower comparative life cycle costs, which are not intended to represent the absolute value but comparative costs. Mr. Chelton stated that there is only a 2.7 percent difference in overall costs proposed by both firms, so he recommended that selection not be based on cost alone.

Mr. Chelton stated that after an overall comparison of both proposals, including completeness and exceptions to the proposals, it is the opinion of AECOM that Kruger, Inc. offers more overall value to the town and should be tentatively selected for the disk filters.

In response to a query from Mr. Pelton, Mr. Chelton stated that the RFP does include the ability to expand the disk filter system with disk modules and both firms offer that possibility. There is room in the footprint of the facility to expand the disk filters, but Mr. Chelton stated that it is not in the design to do so.

Mr. Gancarz inquired about whether design includes the ability to use a finer mesh for phosphorous removal. Mr. Chelton stated that the technology is not there yet to do that, but he assumes that the system could be retrofitted to include finer mesh. Firms are working towards a five micron system. In response to a query from Mr. Gancarz, it was noted that there is room in the facility to expand for that, but it may be necessary to move to a ballast system at that time.

Mr. Gancarz inquired as to how close to 90% design completion does this report bring the project. Mr. Chelton responded that these are still estimates, and it is still necessary to select a filter system and to pilot the system at the plant. Mr. Chelton commented that what is being presented is only 25% of the project.

In response to a query from Mr. Carroll, Mr. Chelton stated that he is as confident in this estimate as he would be at the 30% design stage, perhaps a bit more with this project. Mr. Bowman stated that he feels that AECOM has enough information to be close to a final cost

estimate for the project. In response to a query from Mr. Bowman, Mr. Chelton stated that his firm has designed plant upgrades similar to this one, but each project is different and has its own unique design configurations and challenges.

Mr. Chelton stated that he is fairly confident in the cost estimates at this point, most likely to the 80% phase. Mr. Bowman stated that money is available for AECOM to continue with design of the project. Mr. Chelton commented that AECOM is continuing with design.

In response to a query from Mr. Carroll, Mr. Chelton stated that he has worked with both firms and both are very capable. He feels that Kruger offers more products so AECOM uses them more. Aqua Aerobics is a more specialized firm. Mr. Pelton offered that the Authority has lost time on this project, and he would like to move forward with the selection of a preliminary vendor to pilot test their system.

Mr. Pelton moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority tentatively approve the selection of Kruger, Inc. for the disk filter system for the plant upgrade, subject to the successful completion of the pilot program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell.

Discussion of Motion:

Mr. Bowman offered that it would be helpful if staff prepared draft motions for Authority members to consider prior to the meeting. It would be a time saving task.

The motion carried 6-0-1. Mr. Kaszinskas abstained.

West Johnson Pump Station Design Project

Mr. Chelton reported that he met with Mr. Dievert and his staff to discuss this project and AECOM is proceeding with preliminary design of the facility. He will present a schedule of the project progress at the next meeting.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Plant Equipment Status

There was nothing to report regarding plant equipment at this time.

Status of Plant Upset

Mr. Michelangelo informed the Authority that a chemical came into the plant and caused some problems. The chemicals upset the bugs in the aeration basins. Mr. Michelangelo stated that the plant was over the permit limit for two days, but operations are back to normal at this time.

CCI Flow

Mr. Michelangelo reported that he and Mr. Dievert are going back into CCI flow records to back

bill the prison for the excess flow into the plant. Mr. Michelangelo stated that his office has 12 months of accurate data on which to base a comparison of previous years and to show that prison flow has been under-reported.

In response to a query from Mr. Pelton, Mr. Michelangelo commented that the prison population has not significantly changed over the years, or the number of employees.

NEW BUSINESS

Capital Budget Hearing 7/31/12

Mr. Pelton created a presentation which will be presented to the Capital Budget Committee on July 31 regarding the plant upgrade project. The presentation detailed a historical review of the manner in which the Authority developed the project cost estimate of \$32,145,025, which will be the figure presented at the November referendum.

The presentation contains a breakdown of all costs related to the project, including electrical, engineering and contingency figures. Although there was discussion regarding the possibility of the project coming in under budget due to a favorable bidding climate, it was recommended that no adjustment be made to the proposed referendum figure.

Mr. Pelton expressed how important it is for the Authority to present a figure which is as accurate as possible in order to avoid the possibility of having to go out for another referendum if the figure voted upon is not correct.

In response to a query from Mr. Bowman, it was stated that making the estimated cost public will not affect bidder's response, as they are essentially bidding against each other and will try to present the lowest possible cost in order to be awarded the project.

Mr. Gancarz noted the importance of getting the message out that the Town will be receiving approximately 7 Million in Clean Water Act funding for this project. Mr. Bowman noted that this information in addition to information on the possible funds that may be received from the prisons are important facts to include in the education effort.

It was noted that the Town must pay all of the interest due on loans for the project as soon as construction is complete. The Town has a Debt Service Fund which may be utilized to make that payment, which will be approximately 4.7 million. Mr. Pelton added that certainly this can be discussed as a possibility, but there is no certainty as to how much money will be available from this fund in 2017 when the project is anticipated to be completed.

Joint Town Council/WPCA Public Hearing

Mr. Pelton informed the Authority that there will be a joint meeting of the WPCA and the Town Council on August 21 and he encouraged members to attend. This will be in addition to the regular monthly meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

WPCA Education Effort

Mr. Pelton informed the Authority that he has prepared a truncated version of his previous Power Point presentation regarding the Plant Upgrade Project which was presented to the Town Council. He listed several organizations which may be interested in this presentation. Mr. Pelton, Mr. Gancarz and Mr. Perrotti will spearhead this education effort. Other members will assist as needed.

Authority members noted the importance of emphasizing that the average cost to taxpayers will be \$136.00 per year. Mr. Bowman offered that the Authority should also be prepared to tell businesses what their average annual cost will be as well. Mr. Chelton reminded members that the figure of \$136.00 is just an average cost over 20 years, and that costs will be higher and lower in different years, as payments decrease over years.

Mr. Bowman offered the possibility of taping a couple of meetings so the public can see how the Authority has a detailed process which is followed in determining all aspects of projects. It was suggested that there could be a presentation on Access TV to educate the public on the importance of this project.

Mr. Carroll suggested that a question and answer presentation be prepared which could also run on Access TV or be used in other presentations. He further suggested that information be made available as to why the capacity of the plant isn't being increased. It was also suggested that information be made available on the Town's Web Site.

Mr. Kaszinskas offered that the education effort should focus on what is the problem at the treatment plant and what the WPCA is proposing to do about it. He suggested that the information presented on the last slide, which talks about what the bottom line is relating to this project, be moved to the front, or in some way duplicated at the beginning of the presentation.

Mr. Scannell suggested that the public be invited to tour the treatment plant, perhaps on a Saturday. Mr. Chelton noted that a tour was very successful in the town of Portsmouth, New Hampshire which produced a very good turnout.

Authority members noted the importance of beginning the education effort immediately so the public is aware of the importance of this project when the referendum takes place.

RWA Basis for Sewer Use Fee

Mr. Michelangelo stated that his office is still working with RWA to gather data regarding changing the basis for the sewer use fee.

Assessments on Public Records

Mr. Michelangelo stated that once the sewer assessment is levied, it does go on the public

records. It is the preliminary information regarding the assessment which does not. Mr. Bowman stated that information regarding the future assessment should be listed on the disclosure list which must be prepared by every property owner who is selling their home. It was also suggested that with future sewer projects that affected property owners be sent a letter informing them that there will be a future assessment relating to the installation of the sewer line in front of their property.

Chesprocott

Authority members received copies of the monthly report from Chesprocott, detailing septic system failures and repairs for the month of June.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to come before the Authority.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Carroll moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve the minutes of the public hearing dated June 27, 2012, as published, subject to correction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried 6-0-2. Mr. Gancarz and Mr. Kaszinskas abstained.

Mr. Carroll moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority approve the minutes of the regular monthly meeting dated June 27, 2012, as published, subject to correction. The motion carried 4-0-2. Mr. Gancarz and Mr. Kaszinskas abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gancarz moved that the Water Pollution Control Authority adjourn at 9:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Scannell and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Pelton, Chairman
Water Pollution Control Authority

Attest:

Susan F. Zwick