

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
Executive Oversight Committee
Minutes
October 13, 2016
Meeting held at the Glenbard Wastewater Plant
21 W 551 Bemis Rd, Glen Ellyn, IL

Members Present:

Keith Giagnorio	President, Village of Lombard
Alex Demos	President, Village of Glen Ellyn
Mike Fugiel	Trustee, Village of Lombard
Dean Clark	Trustee, Village of Glen Ellyn
Scott Niehaus	Village Manager, Village of Lombard
Mark Franz	Village Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
Carl Goldsmith	Public Works Director, Village of Lombard
Julius Hansen	Public Works Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

Others Present:

Erik Lanphier	Executive Director, GWA
Matthew Streicher	Engineer/Assistant Director, GWA
Rick Freeman	Electrical Superintendent, GWA
Jay Dahlberg	Maintenance Superintendent, GWA
David Goodalis	Operations Superintendent, GWA
Laurie Frieders	Environmental Resources Coordinator, GWA
Christina Coyle	Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn
Gayle Lendabarker	Administrative Secretary, GWA

1. Call to Order at 7:30 a.m.
2. Roll Call: President Giagnorio, President Demos, Trustee Fugiel, Trustee Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Hansen answered "Present".
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. Public Comment
5. Consent Agenda - The following items are considered to be routine by the Executive Oversight Committee and will be approved with a single vote in the form listed below:

Motion the EOC to approve the following items including Payroll and Vouchers for the months of September totaling \$839,524.26. (Trustee Clark)

Mr. Fugiel motioned and Mr. Franz seconded the MOTION that the following items on the Consent Agenda be approved. President Giagnorio, President Demos, Mr. Fugiel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Hansen responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

- 5.1 Executive Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes:
 - September 8, 2016 EOC Meeting
- 5.2 Vouchers previously reviewed by Trustee Clark
 - September 2016
- 6. UV Disinfection System Rebuild Request for Authorization – (Erik Lanphier)

The Ultraviolet Light Disinfection System (UV Disinfection) has provided the Authority seasonal disinfection since the early 1990's. The system replaced chlorine gas due to safety concerns and impending EPA regulations pertaining to use and storage of chlorine gas. The Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) and engineers of the Fisher and Porter UV Systems is Ironbrook UV Corp. The design concept for this system was based on the Arlat design which utilizes low pressure lamp technology.

Since 2012 the Authority has recognized that the UV system was beginning to show its age. The almost twenty years of service life started to show when ballasts started to intermittently go bad. At this time Iron Brook UV Corp. were still supporting parts of the existing systems, but as the years past the parts have become expensive and more difficult to acquire.

The two options the Authority has with regard to updating the UV process system is reengineering the system and buying new, or rehabilitating the existing system through the OEM. The system *cannot* be serviced or rehabilitated by any other company other than the OEM Ironbrook UV. During the Facility Planning completed in 2013 Strand evaluated horizontal, vertical, and inclined-style UV systems for replacement of the existing system. These new systems require significantly fewer lamps compared to the existing system, which has 2,304 lamps. The TrojanUV 3000Plus equipment can be installed in three of the existing channels with new concrete baffle walls at the equipment. The Xylem Wedeco Duron equipment could be installed either in a four-channel or two-channel arrangement. The two-channel arrangement for the Xylem Wedeco Duron equipment requires two of the existing channels to be widened to accommodate the equipment. The four-channel arrangement for the Xylem Wedeco Duron equipment can be installed in the four existing channels with baffle walls at the equipment. The TrojanUV Signa and Ozonia Aquaray 3X equipment require channel modifications to provide a deeper and wider channel.

Per the 2013 Facility Plan these capital improvements cost range from \$2,500,000 to \$3,300,000. The Wedeco Duron 4 channel was recommended by the plan as the best improvement with a total opinion of probable construction cost of \$2,400,000

	Ironbrook UV Base Price	Supply of PLC Hardware & Communication MicroLogix	Update CAD Drawings to As-built status	Panel Factory Acceptance Testing	Replace Ex. Panelview with new iFix Thin Client	Total UV Upgrade Cost
Base Price	\$646,500	\$123,000	\$7,900	\$2,500	\$4,400	\$784,300

Comparably speaking the OEM rebuild will provide us with the same results without the expense of engineering, bidding and construction. The Authority will continue to receive the same high quality service we have received from Ironbrook UV as we have for more than 20 years. The savings of \$1,538,700 over a 20-year period equates \$76,935/year of savings. This savings pays for the lamp replacements every 4 years or 10,000 hours. Based on the \$50,000 for replacement of lamps every 4 years we would utilize \$200,000 of the savings during that twenty years. This leaves the Authority a residual savings of \$1,300,000.

The UV system is currently due for the 10,000-hour lamp replacement. This line item is normally found in our capital budget in the amount of \$50,000. For CY2017 this budgetary item has been removed due to the lamps being supplied under this contract for a reduced purchase price.

The Authority's staff is requesting the authorization to proceed with this work immediately following the GWA Full Board approval of the CY2017 budget. The reasoning for this request is due to the mandatory need for the work to be completed during the offseason for plant effluent disinfection which is November 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017. Lead times for purchased equipment and shipping of the equipment to and from Canada take a significant amount of time. Maximizing the months during CY2016 for breakdown and shipping with the agreement with Ironbrook UV to withhold invoicing until January 2017, will provide us with the best opportunity to meet the startup deadline of March 31.

Motion to waive competitive bidding for a single source purchase which is an authorized exception in the purchasing policy for an OEM manufacturers rebuild awarded to Ironbrook UV of Ontario, Canada for the not to exceed amount of \$785,000. Award shall be pending the GWA Full Board CY2017 budget approval on November 3, 2016.

Mr. Niehaus motioned and Mr. Fugiel seconded the MOTION to waive competitive bidding for a single source purchase which is an authorized exception in the purchasing policy for an OEM manufacturers rebuild awarded to Ironbrook UV of Ontario, Canada for the not to exceed amount of \$785,000. Award shall be pending the GWA Full Board CY2017 budget approval at the November 3, 2016 and subject to investigation of Ironbrook's solvency and confirmation of language or insurance or conditions of GWA coverage if the company were to cease to exist. President

Giagnorio, Mr. Fugiel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Hansen responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

Mr. Lanphier provided a background on the need for the work to be completed and the evaluation done by staff in an effort to determine if an entirely new system was needed or if an extensive rebuild was the most cost effective measure to accomplish the needed upgrade. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the to replace the entire system would be, at the minimum a \$2.3 million project as it would most likely require having the entire UV building/system gone through, whereas the rebuild project is simply a replacement of existing hardware with newer technology and would not require any modifications to the building or existing flow channels. Mr. Lanphier advised that Ironbrook has been providing parts and service for the existing system for more than twenty-five years after they purchased Fischer Scientific who was the original supplier of the system and highlighted the fact that the company has been servicing and upgrading over 300 existing systems, some of which are much larger than GWA’s system; additionally, Mr. Lanphier had asked Carollo Engineering to do a volunteer evaluation on the maintenance costs for the system and their evaluation determined by upgrading the existing instead of buying new, GWA would realize approximately \$375,000 over a twenty (20) year period in O&M costs due to the costs of bulbs. Mr. Lanphier advised that the reason this is being brought to the EOC now instead of waiting till the November EOC meeting, is due to the fact that the existing mechanicals need to be removed and shipped to Ironbrook in Canada for upgrading as soon after November 1st as possible, to insure, that all work is completed and equipment is reinstalled and operational by April 30th so GWA can begin UV disinfection on May 1st as per our NPDES requirements. Mr. Lanphier indicated that while GWA must use the disinfection process seven (7) days a week and perform IPEA testing two (2) days per week compared to the previous five (5) days a week testing, the system has reached it life expectancy and needs upgrading as replacement parts are becoming more and more scarce due to the age of the system.

Mr. Demos asked both Village Managers if they were comfortable with this being the best way to address the matter especially considering the timing and asked if it would be better to make this upgrade in either 2017 or 2018; what is the current systems functionality and what parts are currently on hand in the event of a breakdown. Mr. Demos indicated that he did not see any documentation indicating that what impact a deferment by one (1), two (2) or three (3) years would nor indications on whether the costs of the technology would decrease if deferred. Mr. Lanphier advised that the cost difference between the facility in Lansing, Michigan is approximately \$20,000 more than what has been quoted to GWA only two (2) years ago, so it is a trend for the costs to increase. Mr. Lanphier indicated that when GWA staff looked into this upgrade in 2013 those costs were approximately \$20,000 less than what the current pricing reflects. Mr. Lanphier explained that as far as operating and maintaining the existing system, parts are harder and harder locate as the entire system is twenty-five years old and the components are not necessarily items that be readily found on the shelves of local electrical supply houses or are no longer available even through the manufacturer which can result in higher costs when parts are located; additionally, GWA does have some

parts available in possession, however but not enough to guarantee that the system could remain operational if something were to fail. Mr. Lanphier added that GWA scheduled to replace light bulbs at a cost of \$50,000, which would be included in the system upgrade.

Mr. Demos asked Mr. Lanphier if he was confident that another US based vendor was not available to perform the work. Mr. Lanphier indicated that as the equipment was vendor specific, there were no other companies authorized to perform the work.

Mr. Demos asked Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Hansen if they were in agreement with the scope of the work and proceeding now rather than waiting. Mr. Hansen indicated he was in agreement with Mr. Lanphier's recommendation since the system must be operational by the end of April 2017 so the plant can avoid the potential of violations.

Mr. Goldsmith asked when the next round of bulbs replacements would occur with the new system. Mr. Lanphier indicated that in four (4) years as the manufacturer recommends replacement every 10,000 hours and GWA tries to replace bulbs just under that maximum.

Mr. Niehaus asked what would happen if the upgrade was not done and the system failed in July. Mr. Lanphier indicated that if the system went down due to negligence and failing in maintaining the system properly, GWA would experience fecal violations which must be reported to the IPEA whereupon, the IEPA can come in and demand that the system be repaired immediately at all costs. Mr. Niehaus indicated that this would be considered an emergency repair, which would substantially increase costs since GWA would have to cover the travel expenses of the technicians and shipping costs for the materials on top of the costs for the actual materials. Mr. Lanphier added that even if the system were to be repaired and back in operation quickly, the IEPA could also mandate that GWA go back to testing five (5) days a week instead of the two (2) currently mandated by the NPDES permit, which affords GWA additional energy savings.

Mr. Giagnorio asked if it is typical for there to be only one company that can perform the repairs and/or replacements. Mr. Lanphier explained that unfortunately, in the wastewater industry most equipment is proprietary to an individual company and therefore, all work must be completed by them to maintain warranties.

Mr. Demos asked where Ironbrook's financial future stood. Mr. Lanphier indicated that they have been around in some form for over twenty years and based on all of the work they have performed in the last few years, does not foresee any situation wherein they would not be around to support the equipment. Mr. Demos indicated that he wants to see some form of written indication of the Ironbrook's solvency if they are going to be the sole source of parts and support for the next twenty (20) years. Mr. Franz noted that Ironbrook has over 300 systems currently in operation, it seems unlikely the company would experience any sudden financial downturn that would jeopardize their ability to supply GWA with the needed resources to keep the system operating.

Mr. Franz asked what the life expectancy of the equipment was being projected. Mr. Lanphier indicated that most engineers will conservatively say fifteen (15) years; however, GWA works diligently to properly maintained equipment and feels that twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) is not unrealistic.

7. Airgas Liquid Oxygen Contract Amendment and Vaporizer Lease Agreement
(Matt Streicher/Erik Lanphier)

The Authority's staff would like to propose to the EOC a transitional process that if approved would take place in January of 2017. Prior to eventually converting to a biological nutrient removal facility in the future, an evaluation has been performed on whether or not to continue maintaining the cryogenic plant and producing pure oxygen on site, or to haul it in from an outside provider. The transition to hauling it from an outside provider would allow us to start using less energy, while still operating the high purity oxygen system, and give us the ability to fine tune our operations prior to converting to a biological nutrient removal processes. Performing the transition could avoid shocks to the biological components of the overall treatment process. The transition to liquid hauling would also consume less staff time since the cryogenic plant would no longer be in operation, and would reduce operational costs overall.

An analysis has been completed comparing shutting down the cryogenic plant that produces pure oxygen for the High Purity Oxygen (HPO) Activated Sludge process versus continuing to operate with it in service. The plant separates pure oxygen out of the atmospheric air, which is then sent to our aeration tanks as part of the activated sludge process. The equipment is nearing 40 years old, out of date, and expensive to operate.

Another component involved with switching over to liquid hauling would be the replacement of our existing hot water bath vaporizer. When the oxygen is held in the storage tanks it is held in liquid form, therefore when it is transferred to the aeration tanks, it needs to be vaporized into a gaseous form first. The liquid oxygen is vaporized as it passes through the hot water bath, which is also nearing 40 years old, is not reliable, and is not energy efficient. Three quotes were requested for the purchase and installation of new atmospheric vaporizers. Based on the future regulatory requirements the Authority will be presented with options necessary to convert to biological nutrient removal, and the vaporizers would no longer be needed, quotes for leasing atmospheric vaporizers were also requested. Only one provider was able to quote a direct lease option, which also happened to be the provider that our existing liquid hauling contract is with; Airgas. Under the lease option Airgas will perform the installation as part of the lease agreement; therefore, there would be no upfront capital costs. Another provider was able to provide us with a lease option, but only under the condition that they also operate it, which was not economical to us since there are very few operating costs associated with the units. Not included in the lease cost of the vaporizers is the installation of concrete pads that the vaporizers will be installed on. Price proposals for the concrete will come at a later date prior to installation; however, they're anticipated to

be \$20,000-\$30,000. Both proposals for the purchasing of liquid oxygen and the proposed installation/lease of the vaporizers were reviewed by our Cryogenic consultant, Mohawk, LLC, and both proposals were deemed to be acceptable.

After detailed evaluation and analysis, and based on qualifications and price, the Authority is seeking approval to award Airgas for the leasing of atmospheric vaporizers for the amount of **\$1,500** per month for the 5 year proposed liquid oxygen hauling schedule.

For added safety to the existing system, Airgas recommends replacing the tank pressure relief device with a dual pressure relief valve system, at a total additional cost of \$7,158.00. This is a one-time cost to be performed with the installation of the vaporizers. It is recommended to authorize Airgas to install the dual safety system for a cost of **\$7,158.00**.

Motion the EOC to approve an amendment to the liquid oxygen hauling contract and the dual safety system installation to Airgas USA LLC of West Chicago, IL to be invoiced to O&M account #270-530443. Award of this agreement amendment and dual safety valve installation shall be pending the GWA Full Board CY2017 budget approval on November 3, 2016.

Motion the EOC to approve the 5-year lease agreement for the atmospheric vaporizers in the amount of \$1,500 per month to be invoiced to Capital Fund 40. Award of this agreement shall be pending the GWA Full Board CY2017 budget approval on November 3, 2016.

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Goldsmith seconded the MOTION to approve an amendment to the liquid oxygen hauling contract and the dual safety system installation to Airgas USA LLC of West Chicago, IL to be invoiced to O&M Account #270-530443. As well as approve the five (5) year lease agreement for the atmospheric vaporizers in the amount of \$1,500 per month to be invoiced to Capital Fund 40 and explore installation of concrete pads as part of the lease agreement. Award of this agreement amendment and dual safety valve installation and approval of the lease of the atmospheric vaporizers shall be pending the GWA Full Board CY2017 budget approval on November 3, 2016 President Giagnorio, Mr. Fugiel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Hansen responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried

Matt Streicher, GWA's Assistance Director/Engineer explained that the onsite production liquid oxygen is reaching the point where it too expensive to continue; and that while GWA is not looking to cease using of liquid oxygen in the overall treatment process at this time, there are means by which costs can be reduced and a transitional step taken in preparation for the future when GWA will have to begin biological phosphorus removal. Mr. Streicher indicated that the electrical costs associated with the production plant are a large contributor to the GWA's high monthly electric bills and by shutting down the

production facilities and resorting to scheduled deliveries, cost savings will be realized in the future in addition to the annual maintenance costs that had been budgeted in CY2016. Mr. Streicher indicated that while the costs associated with manufacturing liquid oxygen onsite is less expensive the flexibility to control the amount being used daily. Mr. Streicher explained how this is a temporary process in that GWA will have to introduce a biological phosphorus process in the future and being able to control daily usage is an important step to help avoid any type of system “shock” that could create problems.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that GWA is trying to take a step-wise approach in reducing the amount of liquid oxygen being used in the coming years, so that when biological phosphorus removal limits are issued by the IEPA, our system will not be shocked at the reduction of oxygen it needs to run on; additionally, GWA will be able to benefit from the reduction of electrical, water, maintenance and staff over-time costs associated with manufacturing onsite. Mr. Lanphier highlighted that the plan is presented in worse-case scenario in that staff will work to increase plant efficiencies. Mr. Lanphier indicated that annual maintenance work scheduled for 2016 had been deferred and would need to be done if the decision to not proceed with this process is made.

Mr. Streicher indicated that a concrete pad would need to be installed to support the proposed atmospheric vaporizers the system requires, but other than this there would be no additional capital costs to GWA.

Mr. Demos asked when the concrete pad would need to be installed. Mr. Lanphier advised it would be installed if approval is granted at the Full Board Meeting on November 3rd as this project is pending approval of the CY2017 budget since there is a three (3) month lead time on the vaporizing equipment.

Mr. Demos asked what type of storage is currently onsite. Mr. Lanphier indicated that 6,000, 9,000 and 13,000 ton tanks on premises which is five (5) to seven (7) days of storage as back up in the event a truck cannot make a delivery or there is an issue that requires the use of additional liquid from the towers. Mr. Lanphier indicated that Airgas will be installing sensors on our existing tanks so they will know automatically when a delivery is needed.

Mr. Demos asked if any other vendors were investigated besides Airgas because his experience in installing pads of this nature have been paid for by the purveyor and asked if the staff had attempted to negotiate the cost of the pad(s) in the contract. Mr. Streicher indicated that he was not aware that there was a potential to request and would follow-up with Airgas on this. Mr. Lanphier indicated that they reached out Ranch Cryogenics who would only provide the vaporizers and Praxair would only supply both if GWA allowed them to have a full-time staff member on premises basically they wanted to own the system, while Airgas was open to a lease of equipment and reduced cost on the supply. Mr. Lanphier and Mr. Streicher both indicated that they would go back to Airgas for additional discussions, as contract negotiations are not yet complete.

Mr. Goldsmith asked Mr. Lanphier to confirm that no overtime will be attributed to the operation. Mr. Lanphier confirmed there would not be. Mr. Niehaus noted that overtime should see a reduction in overtime.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if the current system could be throttled down and if cannot why? Mr. Lanphier explained that the system is approximately 40 years old and would cause the process to become unstable due to facility not being manned twenty-four seven (24/7) the system has been programmed to operate at its "sweet spot", which is just running. Mr. Goldsmith asked if there was any way to modified the process at all. Mr. Lanphier indicated that due to the age of the system, the costs associated with trying to upgrade to new technology would be significantly more costly, and GWA is making every effort to keep capital costs down as the facility plans to transition away from the process under the anticipated future biological phosphorus removal requirements. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the budget repairs had included \$20,000-\$50,000 for the air compressor alone.

Mr. Goldsmith asked what would happen in Year 6 of the plan. Mr. Lanphier indicated that trying to have a conversation at this point time about the biological phosphorus removal that GWA will be required to do is not something that can be done since the uncertainty of what the IEPA will require is still a question.

Mr. Franz asked the harm would be in postponing this work another year. Mr. Lanphier indicated electric and water cost savings and process and staffing flexibility. Mr. Lanphier added that an estimated of \$30,000 per year in water costs alone could be realized if this change was made since potable water is used in the production of the liquid oxygen. Mr. Lanphier added that staff would not have the flexibility to begin dialing back the operation of the process thus losing out on utility cost savings. Mr. Streicher indicated that the maintenance work that was delayed would have to be done, especially the air compressor work since this item is starting to experience more and more failures.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if there was any time sensitivity to this project. Mr. Lanphier indicated that there is a 3-month lag time for the atmospheric vaporizers equipment so the goal, if approved, is to allow Airgas plenty of time to get the equipment ordered, the pad installed and have everything prepped and waiting the equipment in the first part of 2017.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if there was a market for any of the equipment that will be decommissioned or will it all be scrapped. Mr. Lanphier indicated that there has been some interested in the compressor and some of the existing vaporizers by a facility in Towanda for their spare stock, but at this time, he does not have any indication on any value any of the items may have.

8. CY2017 Budget Recommendation for GWA Board Approval – *Erik Lanphier- 20 minutes*

The CY2017 final draft budget is proposed for your review per the managers meeting held October 3, 2016.

Motion the EOC recommends to the GWA Board for approval the proposed CY2017 Annual Budget for the Operation, Maintenance and Capital Improvements for the Glenbard Wastewater Authority in the amount of \$18,899,550.

Mr. Niehaus motioned and Mr. Franz seconded the MOTION to recommend to the GWA Board to approve the proposed CY2017 Annual Budget for Operation, Maintenance and Capital Improvements for the Glenbard Wastewater Authority in the amount of \$18,899,550. President Giagnorio, Mr. Fugiel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Hansen responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

Mr. Lanphier highlighted that the O&M portion of the budget saw a less than one percent (1%) increase for CY 2017 and reviewed the largest impacts. Mr. Lanphier noted that changes to personnel costs reflects a three percent (3%) increase as per the Village of Glen Ellyn’s budget planning; Cost Center 270-520975 increased by \$95,500 due to the inclusion of maintenance costs associated with maintaining the CHP engines and other associated equipment; the decrease in water and electrical due to the change in Cryo as previously discussed and the CHP engines coming on line; and the addition of the expense of purchasing liquid oxygen with the decommissioning of the existing liquid oxygen manufacturing facility onsite. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the flow metering will increase slightly as the sixteen (16) flow meters are due for replacement and ADS has offered a rental option for the upgrade instead of purchasing new meters which will have wireless/cellular technology so while the telecommunications budget (270-521195) could see a decrease this will be offset by the increase in the Electrical Support (270-520981). Mr. Lanphier advised that quotes are being sought from other vendors for comparison.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if GWA conducts monthly tests and maintenance on the flow meters. Mr. Lanphier advised that as part of the agreement with ADS, they currently handle all of the testing, data collection and validation and maintenance on the existing meters.

Mr. Franz asked why electrical costs have increased by 20% per year for the past few years. Mr. Lanphier advised that the ComEd delivery/infrastructure improvement charges are the driving force behind the increases as the base Kwh rate is less than \$.04/Kwh.

Mr. Fugiel asked if the landscaping and janitorial services are bid in conjunction with either of the Villages bidding processes. Mr. Lanphier indicated that in the past this has been tried, with the quotes received being substantially higher than the rates being

charged at the time of bid; however, GWA will make every effort to try and consolidate bids whenever it proves beneficial just as we do with asphalt and concrete work.

Mr. Lanphier reviewed the Capital plan for the CY2017 year and how most of the projections of costs and revenues for the years 2016 and 2017 are conservative numbers as he feels more comfortable if GWA has to explain exceeding expectations rather than having to explain any shortfalls; additionally, Mr. Lanphier highlighted the various small capital, infrastructure, large capital, roofing and vehicle purchases expected to take place in CY2017.

Mr. Franz asked what the projected contributions by the Villages was going forward. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the number is evaluated each year, however for the sake of planning, the calculations were based on two percent (2%).

Mr. Lanphier indicated that a gas holder of some sort is being evaluated that will help improve the production/retention of methane gas for fueling the CHP engines. Mr. Demos asked if this item was originally omitted from the CHP project due to costs concerns and we are now going back and trying to piece together things to make the system work. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the concern about the level of gas production was brought to light after the CHP project had been awarded and brought to the EOC Committee's attention as soon as it came to light. Mr. Lanphier indicated that GWA is taking a step-wise approach in that the first step was approving the CHP project and engines, the second step was approving the FOG receiving station and how the waste brought in would impact the digesters and gas production which has shown that there is not enough methane gas production to sustain both CHP engines to the full capacity.

Mr. Niehaus requested that any references to Design Build be removed from the CIP plan so as to not confuse anyone about the steps for building future projects and let it be a policy decision by the current/future EOC Committees.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that he has created a summary of CIP projects that have been moved or deleted from the plan just as a way document the results of various changes.

Mr. Niehaus commented on the effort that Mr. Lanphier took to keep the O&M impact below a one point two percent (1.2%) percent which is the same as what the Village of Lombard experienced with their budget.

9. Discussion

9.1 Facility Improvement Project Update (Matt Streicher)

Mr. Streicher indicated that much work has not taken place on the project to this point, although they did some boring and determine the soil conditions were better than they expected. The Electrical contractor has been onsite and working to set-up temporary power.

Mr. Streicher asked for feedback on the graphs he created to show how the project is progressing.

Mr. Franz asked if the project deadline is already in jeopardy. Mr. Streicher indicated that there is still plenty of work that can be done even with the winter months closing in.

9.2 Combined Heat & Power Update (Matt Streicher) Pending Agenda Items

Mr. Streicher indicated that the first loads of sweet water have come in and the impact is finally showing up with the boost in gas production.

Mr. Niehaus provided feedback on what he would like to see the Mr. Streicher's summary report that reflects the costs savings and compared to the ROI schedule that was used to make the decision to proceed with the CHP project.

9.3 Pending Agenda Items

10. Other Business

10.1 NACWA Gold Peak Performance Award Recognition (Erik Lanphier)

Mr. Lanphier and Staff presented the EOC Committee members with their NACWA Gold Award shirts.

11. **Annual GWA Full Board Meeting** – The annual board meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2016 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Tentative Schedule is as follows:

5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. - Meet & Greet

6:00 p.m. – Meeting Call to Order

6:30 p.m. – 6:45p.m. – Meeting Dismissal

12. **Next EOC Meeting** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting is set for **Thursday, November 10, 2016 at 7:30 a.m. at the Glenbard Facility.**

Mr. Franz asked if the Full Board meeting packet is hard copy or electronic distribution. Mr. Lanphier indicated that GWA will be providing hard copies of the packet which includes the budget.

Mr. Demos requested a copy of the revised Capital Improvement Plan that Mr. Lanphier had presented during the budget discussion. Mr. Lanphier advised he would send it electronically to everyone.

EOC Meeting/October 2016
Minutes

Mr. Demos moved to adjourn the October 13, 2016 EOC Meeting and Mr. Niehaus seconded the MOTION. *President Giagnorio, President Demos, Trustee Fugiel, Mr. Clark, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Hansen responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.*

Submitted by:

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Administrative Secretary