Winnipesaukee River Basin Program

CIP Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

September 14, 2011 Gilford Town Hall 9:00 am

Attendees: Chairman Brian Sullivan (Franklin) called the meeting to order at 9:20am. Those in attendance were Sharon McMillin (DES), Steve Dolloff (DES), Ray Korber (Bay District) (arrived 10:10am), Sheldon Morgan (Gilford), and Tracey Russo (clerk).

Agenda Topics

1.) Flow Metering Project Update.

S. McMillin explained that no new deliverables have yet been received from CDM. S. Dolloff had done a field visit to look at an alternate meter location which Belmont would like moved to avoid potential vandalism. To move the meter to the next manhole would mean a big difference in elevation so the radio telemetry should be acceptable. He would like to see access in the form of an easement from the campground located adjacent to the proposed location. Overall, it's a good location since, whether the meter location is moved or not, it will still need power brought to the location. B. Sullivan asked does that mean we have consensus on all the meter locations. S. McMillin said that she was still waiting for a response from CDM on whether the changed location presents any technical installation issues and for formal agreement to proceed with final design from the full Board. There is still the concern about low flow scenarios and data use (e.g. when the data is used). CDM has also been given a copy of the studies from Janet Levy in Franklin and Underwood for Belmont. CDM is to provide responses to the questions and concerns raised by these consultants. S. Morgan said he has been unable to obtain an answer on whether or not Gilford is willing to spend money on an engineering firm to determine if the locations for Gilford are sufficient or not.

2.) Review and recommended revisions of the draft MOU dates.

General discussion regarding some of the dates and potential alternate language that could be incorporated now that a fact-finding subcommittee has been formed resulted in S. McMillin being asked to send the latest draft in e-mail format asking for Board member's ideas and suggestions. A red-line version will be prepared for review at the full Advisory Board meeting on October 18th.

3.) CIP projects: Populate forms and develop proposed prioritization/schedule.

S. McMillin handed out worksheets on the following: Ranking criteria, Projects under consideration, and two draft Project Worksheets to be used as guides. The two projects were the Flow metering and Rate Study and the River Street Roadway Restoration

Flow Metering & Rate Study Project Worksheet

This form was used as the guide and so was reviewed thoroughly with the following changes and amendments. Project Title is to be more descriptive. Project Description to include information about the cost allocation effort, as well as the telemetry and SCAD upgrades included in the project scope. Priority of Project will now read Importance of Project. A definition was made as far as a project being Mandatory which members felt needed to be set aside for projects that were regulated and that are being required to be completed by outside forces. For this project, the status was changed from Mandatory to High. Project or Equipment Description: this will be a more generalized but specific enough to justify. The members wanted to make sure someone unfamiliar with the WRBP that might be reading these forms would understand the description and that the

specifics of the project were sufficient to warrant the status. Multi-phased project: For this project, the phasing will be bundled as one commitment of money so it is not considered multi-phased. Expected useful life: either there will be a N/A for this line or a narrative as to why this is a vital function of the operation. Since some of the project included equipment, a statement will be included to describe equipment useful life that reflects the priority ranking criteria. Annual estimated operating costs: this will be left blank for now since information can always be updated and changed as necessary; there will be only incremental changes (such as for calibration recommended by the chosen equipment manufacturer) that will be integrated into the O & M costs. Project Cost Summary: bidding for this project should be a separate line, construction admin/Resident engineering will be blank since amount is not currently known, and the 5% contingency will change to "contingency" and will remain blank until bids are received. Funding sources: this Total should be the same amount as the Cost Summary Total Project with a footnote explaining that the total cannot exceed the 2 million SRF loan budget for this project. Projected Funding Needs: projected loan assessment per year will go here along with the % total to communities. These will be reassessed yearly. The block for pictures will either be left blank or possibly a generalized picture of a meter as an example. Project Score: the following table will show the total project score for the Flow Metering Program Implementation and Cost Allocation Study.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	1	12
Health & Safety (12)	12	0	0
Environmental (12)	12	1	12
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	3	21
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	2	20
Efficiency (5)	5	1	5
Project Delivery	2	0	0
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	1	5
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	1	5
Total Comparative Project Score			80

The total project score wording was changed to total comparative project score. The 80 points will help the CIP Subcommittee to prioritize the project and a narrative will be needed to explain that these are relative values used to compare and prioritize projects under consideration, not 80% of 100%.

River St. Roadway Rehabilitation Worksheet

The location will be changed to read Franklin WWTP Access Road, the priority of project has been changed to medium due in large part to the fact that the road is in acceptable condition; however, if it is not maintained it will deteriorate and eventually revert to a gravel road. However, active intervention might eventually be necessary to actually cause the road to go to gravel while maintaining access – such as grading to remove loose paving material or to facilitate drainage off the road – and routine maintenance would still be necessary. There was discussion about letting the road revert to a gravel surface and the discussion concluded that there would be nothing particularly wrong with a gravel access road but that probably with relatively small capital outlay the paved road could be restored for service for a few more years. If the paved surfaced is to be maintained then the project would need to be a priority since it is the only current access road to the treatment plant. Project or Equipment Description: the length of road to be reconstructed should change from 3,700 linear feet to approximately 1000 +/- linear feet. Impact of Cancelled or Delayed Project: the word "and" will be removed in

the sentence if this project is delayed or cancelled there will be continued deterioration of the access roadway **and** leading to poor driving conditions, drainage structure failure, and potential safety issues and higher future cost for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. Failure or delay in paving the road or letting the road revert to gravel will simply necessitate that drivers adjust the speed of the vehicle they are operating to match the driving conditions that exist. Part of the project is ditching and repair of drainage structures which, if they continue to fail, could lead to sink holes or other road hazards that could lead to vehicle damage or unsafe driving conditions. This is a state facility which has visitors so the roadway needs to accommodate staff, septage and biosolids haulers, deliveries and the general public. Given this, there is additional liability if the roadway is not adequately maintained. Just paving will not alleviate this deterioration and potentially neither will reversion to gravel. Drainage structures need to be evaluated and restored, as needed

Discussion continued as to how to phase this roadway project. DES staff is to get estimates for crack sealing, chip sealing, shoulder/drainage work, and grading/drag/shim work. After estimates are received a further review will determine whether the project with include one or two years for rehabilitation. Reconstruction work would be a separate phase of work but is estimated as being needed for only 1000+/- linear feet of the 2.5+/- roadway.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	0	0
Health & Safety (12)	12	0	0
Environmental (12)	12	0	0
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	3	21
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	1	10
Efficiency (5)	5	2	10
Project Delivery	2	0	0
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	2	10
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	0	0
Total Comparative Project Score			51

R. Korber made a motion to simply score the remaining "Priority 1" Projects under Consideration in order to save time, S. McMillin will input descriptions and budget data at a later time. S. Morgan seconded; all were in favor; motion passed. Completed worksheets will be emailed to the CIP Subcommittee members and reviewed/approved at the next meeting. The Taylor Brook project was removed from evaluation since final total of $31,400 is below the CIP $50K threshold and the project is scheduled to be completed this month.

WWTP Tank Maintenance: Annual routine tank maintenance (painting, cleaning, etc.)

This work involves a rotation of tank surface restoration, painting and metalwork inspection and repair. Each tank is usually addressed every 4 to 5 years. The Chief Operator had previously provided a 10-year schedule of tanks (both steel and concrete) included in the routine maintenance program.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	0	0
Health & Safety (12)	12	0	0

Environmental (12)	12	0	0
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	2	14
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	0	0
Efficiency (5)	5	2	10
Project Delivery	2	2	4
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	1	5
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	0	0
Total Comparative Project Score			33

Collection System - Pipe, Appurtenances: Phased evaluations (CMOM)-camera, testing, other

Project is to be phased and the communities and the results from the flow metering project will help to determine which areas will be prioritized. The NPDES permit requires "an inspection program to identify potential and actual unauthorized discharges" into the collection system.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	2	24
Health & Safety (12)	12	2	24
Environmental (12)	12	2	24
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	2	14
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	1	10
Efficiency (5)	5	2	10
Project Delivery	2	2	4
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	2	10
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	0	0
Total Comparative Project Score			120

Weirs Gabion Wall - RR and WRBP ROW at Culvert: Culvert deterioration, wall sagging jeopardizing force main

Discussion to do a single worksheet including both design and construction estimates but designate the project as a phased approach unless a design build type contract can be developed. S. Dolloff explained that the City of Laconia is looking to expedite this project since they are doing drainage and roadwork in the area and would like this project completed before final paving is completed. The full extent of the project won't be known until an Engineer is hired to provide design assistance for rehabilitation in order for the construction work to be put out to bid. He suggested sending out a small letter RFP to procure engineering services for the project. S. McMillin suggested seeing if the City of Laconia has an engineer on retainer they can use and WRBP will see about getting a construction crew or having Laconia do the work and back charge the work to the WRBP. She indicated that the DES and State would have to approve any contract or payment, regardless of whether with the City or with another consulting or construction firm. She suggested the project could be paid out of the communal sinking fund, with approval and prioritization from the Advisory Board. It was suggested to have the Advisory Board

provide a recommendation to the State to allow DES to contract with an engineering firm (e.g. on retainer as-needed) for projects such as these.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	1	12
Health & Safety (12)	12	0	0
Environmental (12)	12	2	24
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	3	21
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	1	10
Efficiency (5)	5	2	10
Project Delivery	2	2	4
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	3	15
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	0	0
Total Comparative Project Score			96

Digester Boiler & Heat exchanger upgrade or repair or replacement - w/ or w/o CHP evaluation

S. McMillin explained to the members that the WRBP is waiting for a report from the manufacturer's representatives based upon a meeting with staff on September 13th regarding the inability of the digester heat exchangers to adequately maintain digester temperature particularly in the cooler months of the year. Federal regulations specify minimum temperatures for sludge digestion processes which must be complied with in order for the WRBP to continue with its current means of biosolids management. Therefore, this is both a potential biosolids compliance issue and operating cost escalation issue. The estimated cost on the worksheet WRBP CIP Projects under Consideration for the initial part of the project was for $2,500.000 for evaluation and $150K for replacement. Discussion decided on doing a single worksheet including both evaluation and potential repair/replacement with a place holder amount of $50K since the actual cost has yet to be determined. The $50K amount is used since it is the trigger for inclusion on the CIP list.

Criteria	Weighting	Priority (3-0)	Score
Mandatory			
NPDES Compliance (12)	12	2	24
Health & Safety (12)	12	0	0
Environmental (12)	12	0	0
Maintenance			
Maintain, Repair, Replace (7)	7	3	21
O & M Cost & Efficiency			
O & M Cost (10)	10	2	20
Efficiency (5)	5	2	10
Project Delivery	2	2	4
Expected Useful Life			
Expected useful Life (5)	5	2	10
Availability of Funding			
Availability of Funding (5)	5	0	0
Total Comparative Project Score			89

4.) CIP projects: develop a timeline and schedule of meetings to complete the vetting and prioritization process.

After a brief discussion the members decided to hold a meeting immediately after the Advisory Board meeting on October 18th and work through the afternoon.

5.) Other Business:

Reminder: UV/Plant Water/SCADA Project Progress meetings (first Wednesday of each month at 10am at the WWTP)

S. McMillin explained to the members that there had been another leak in Meredith. Although there had been a prior sewer overflow in almost the same location, the first effort at locating the leak had not been successful. The leak was finally located on September 13th by the crews working on the repairs associated with the recurrence of the sewer overflow. The force main has corroded and a rather large leak/hole in the pipe was discovered at the location of the excavation and additional corrosion is evident along the section of pipe that was replaced. Further work is necessary to determine the extent of the corrosion on this line. Unfortunately, there is no simple way to know how much more pipe may be affected since it is corroding from the outside. She wanted to make everyone aware this could be an ongoing problem. S. Morgan asked if there is any equipment that will measure the thickness of the pipes. S. Dolloff said there is such equipment but his recollection from the last repair in Gilford was that the testing equipment was effective for oil and gas transmission lines but the information available at the time was that the test equipment and methods were not effective in measuring sewer pipes. S. McMillin suggested evaluating the possibility of slip-lining the 12" pipe force mains. Meredith will likely be asking the WRBP to cover the cost of repairs since this is an area where ownership is not well documented. The Board will need to address this issue. R. Korber said if Meredith is reimbursed, there is a similar issue stemming from the Bay District force main repair that should also be addressed.

S. McMillin will electronically send out the minutes of the August 10th meeting for review, and revisions should be sent to her no later than September 23, 2011. The minutes will then be approved at the next CIP meeting on October 18, 2011. S.

S. McMillin handed out monthly summary reports for June, July and August. The reports detail how money is being spent on significant projects regardless of whether they are on the CIP project list. The UV/Plant Water/SCADA Project bid was awarded to Penta Corp. This got G & C approval on 7/13/2011 and was on the July project list. Re-Coating one primary and one secondary clarifier at the WWTP, bid was awarded to Limerick, with G & C approval on 7/13/2011. Grease removal at Pump stations, scum pits at WWTP; there were no bids for a four year term received. It was re-bid for a two year term in July and two bids were received with the low bid from Lamprey. It was a first time bid for Lamprey. A contract is pending contractor paperwork before submission to G & C for approval.

6.) Adjournment –the motion was made by R. Korber and seconded by S. Morgan to adjourn at 12:40.pm.

The next CIP Subcommittee meeting is to be held on October 18th immediately after the Advisory Board meeting at the WRBP Laconia Maintenance Shop on Water Street.