

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
Executive Oversight Committee
MINUTES
June 10, 2021
Meeting held at the Glenbard Wastewater Plant
945 Bemis Road, Glen Ellyn, IL

Members Present:

Mark Senak	President, Village of Glen Ellyn
Kelli Christiansen	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

Others Present:

Matthew Streicher	Executive Director, GWA
Thomas Romza	Assistant Director, GWA
Jon Braga	Maintenance Superintendent, GWA
Richard Freeman	Electrical Superintendent, GWA
Ashley Staat	Environmental Resources Coordinator, GWA
Gayle Lendabarker	Administrative Secretary, GWA
Robert Schmieder	Engineering Intern, GWA
Christina Coyle	Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn
Jamie Wilkey	Auditor, Lauterbach and Amen

1. Call to Order at 8:05 a.m.
2. Roll Call: President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, and Mr. Goldsmith answered "Present". President Giagnorio, Trustee Bachner and Mr. Buckley, Acting Interim Public Works Director, were excused. Mr. Franz noted the Mr. Buckley will be officially be sworn in Public Works Director at an upcoming Village Board meeting.
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 part of the months of March 2021 \$1,451,623.91, April 2021 \$409,165.56, and May 2021 \$1,167,597.36 (Trustee Christiansen).

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Niehaus seconded the MOTION that the following items, on the Consent Agenda be approved. President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

- 5.1 Executive Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes
 - o March 11, 2021

EOC Meeting/June 2021
Minutes

- 5.2 Vouchers previously reviewed by Trustee Christiansen
- March 2021
 - April 2021
 - May 2021

5.3 Declaration of Surplus Equipment and Authorization for Sale

At the March 11, 2021 Executive Oversight Committee meeting, the EOC approved the purchase of a new forklift, therefore, the Authority no longer had a use for its oldest forklift and with the same request for the new purchase, a request to declare it's oldest forklift as surplus for the purposes of public auction. EOC members raised concern that the method of requesting approval to declare obsolete equipment as surplus for the purposes of public auction did not fulfill the Authorities legal requirements under municipal law.

Following the March EOC meeting, the Authority inquired further with its legal representation. Since all Authority equipment is titled to the Authority itself, and not the Village of Glen Ellyn, a different method was needed rather than what is used for Village owned equipment. The Authorities legal representation recommended passing an ordinance or resolution to officially declare the equipment as surplus for the purposes of public auction. Since the Authority cannot legally pass ordinances, the Authority's attorney drafted a resolution for the EOC to approve.

Enclosed with this memo is the formal resolution for approval. The Authority respectfully requests that the EOC motion to approve Resolution No. 2021-001, a resolution authorizing the sale of equipment – Forklift Unit 612.

5.4 Approval to purchase CHP Media

Prior to digester gas being used in the CHP's, the gas needs to be "scrubbed" in order to remove siloxanes and hydrogen sulfide, in order to help preserve the life of the engines. Although the life of the media is tracked, due to varying usage and gas conditions, it is difficult to exactly predict when the media will be reaching its useful life. Since there is little expiration notice, and the media has a long shelf life, we prefer to have the media onsite and available to keep the down time of the engines to a minimum. Therefore, staff obtained pricing ahead of schedule so that the purchase can be made, and available for use when needed.

In the 2021 GWA budget, staff allocated \$50,000 for the purchase of this media in budget category Plant Equipment Rehabilitation account 40-580150. Therefore, *we motion the EOC to authorize approval to purchase CHP media from Unison Solutions in the amount of \$22,266.00*

6. Authorize GWA to Enter into 3-year Agreement with USP for Odor Control Solutions

In 2020 GWA began piloting a hydrogen peroxide dosing system to use towards effectively addressing odors. After seeing several years of increased odor complaints from neighbors, while using the system, a record low number of complaints since 2016 came in. Therefore, staff desires to continue using the system, hoping to achieve continued success.

EOC Meeting/June 2021
Minutes

Therefore, due to the professional nature of the services and the lack of other vendors, GWA, with the approval from the TAC, is respectfully requesting to waive the competitive bidding process per the purchasing policy C.1.a *Professional Services* and C.1.e. *Single Source Purchases* and is requesting EOC approval of the USP Technologies proposal of 3-year contract, not-to-exceed amount of \$136,920, at \$4.66 per gallon of peroxide used. This will come out of the budget 270-530440 Chemicals Fund and will be budgeted appropriately for in future years.

Mr. Romza explained that in 2020, GWA did a pilot test where hydrogen peroxide was dosed into to the flow as it entered the plant to see if odors could be noticeably reduced before they are released into the air. Mr. Romza advised that GWA staff feels the process was very successful as indicated by the low number of odor complaints, 17 with 13 being from the same person, and actually received a few compliments from the more vocal neighbors about the lack of odors. Mr. Romza stated that GWA would like to continue using USP for their services; adding that GWA staff did reach out to the short list of engineering firms and other industry professionals and not many of them could refer another vendor that could provide this type of turn-key service like USP is offering.

Mr. Goldsmith indicated that when this was discussed at the TAC, he had expressed concern over the ability for GWA to opt-out at any point during the 3-year contract period; however, after seeing that a cancellation clause is included in the agreement, he has no reservations in approving the contract.

Trustee Christiansen asked if a full refund would be received if the contract was cancelled or if this would be a pay as you go type contract. Mr. Romza advised it is a pay as you go contract.

President Senak asked if the cancellation was without penalty. Mr. Romza advised that no penalties would be accessed as long as proper cancellation notice was given by GWA.

Mr. Streicher highlighted that the contract amount is a “not to exceed” amount over the course of the three years and the turn-key services are included in the per gallon cost of \$4.66 per gallon.

Mr. Niehaus added that with the addition of an opt-out clause he is more comfortable going this route and stated the he feels it is a necessary service especially in the eyes of the public.

Mr. Niehaus made the motion and Mr. Franz seconded the approval of the proposed 3-year contract, not-to-exceed amount a contract, with waiver of bid, with USP Technologies in the amount of \$136,920, at \$4.66 per gallon of peroxide used. This will come out of the budget 270-53044 Chemicals Fund. President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, and responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

7. Authorize GWA to Approve Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) Upgrade

In August of 2002, the EOC approved the purchase of *Maximo*, a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS). This software identified, categorized and named all the Authority’s assets. While not only organizing assets, *Maximo* provided a platform for work to be conducted and recorded. Work orders would now drive day to day maintenance. Preventative maintenance (PM) increased equipment reliability and performance while corrective maintenance (CM) is used as a tracking method and a tool in budget planning for future maintenance work.

EOC Meeting/June 2021
Minutes

Fast forward to 2021, GWA has gone through multiple Maximo software updates, changing the look, but not the core capabilities. Over the 19-year span use of the software, these capabilities have become outdated, and now can be seen as limiting staff productivity and efficiency compared to what could be with newer platforms. Through collaboration between departments and investigation, GWA staff identified an upgrade to be necessary to better utilize resources, and formed a selection committee to pursue the selection of a new CMMS based on a professional services approach.

After conducting a survey of CMMS systems used by other wastewater treatment facilities and receiving over 20 responses, staff narrowed the list down to the two systems that fit the Authority's needs the best. Proposals were then requested, with the results below.

CMMS Software	Annual Subscription	Data Migration Fee	Total for 2021
Maximo	7-concurrent users \$47,900	\$73,000	\$120,900
MVP Plant	3-concurrent/10-mobile \$18,000	\$11,165	\$47,065*

*includes training and travel costs

The GWA selection committee recommends the EOC authorize the Authority to approve the purchase of **MVP Plant** and associated professional services from CMMS Data Group of Chicago, IL in the amount of \$47,065.00 as part of Phase III of the Computerized Maintenance Management System Upgrade Project with the amount expensed to Capital budget account number 40-580120. The TAC is an agreement with this recommendation based on a professional services approach.

Mr. Streicher advised that GWA's Maintenance Superintendent, Jon Braga did most of the leg work on this project. Mr. Streicher stated that GWA uses a maintenance management software to assist in maintaining equipment and other items throughout the plant; and while GWA is currently using an old IBM platform called MAXIMO, this program is 20 years old; while it has worked well, there are some deficiencies in the program that are starting to hinder staff's productivity and ability to work efficiently. Mr. Streicher indicated that Mr. Braga has been working on this project for well over a year during which time he did a survey with other wastewater facilities through the IAWA, Illinois Association of Wastewater Agencies, and received 20 responses, then formed a selection committee that included the Electrical Superintendent, Rick Freeman and other GWA staff, to evaluate the various programs and narrow the selection to two (2) options. Mr. Streicher explained that as this is a purchase of a system for professional services, staff did want to simply get quotes and go with the cheapest price and potentially end up with a program that did meet the needs of GWA. Mr. Streicher explained that the decision to go with CMMS's MVP Plant is not solely based on cost, but also on long-term usability, as well as the fact that the company is based in Chicago.

Mr. Franz asked who GWA's uses for IT support and how will this program integrate with GWA current IT system. Mr. Streicher advised that Rick Freeman handles a large majority of GWA's IT work with Concentric, formerly Baxter & Woodman CSI, providing back-up for specialized work that is beyond Rick's abilities, as well as CMMS Group serving as integrator for this particular project.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if the price included costs associated with migrating current data to the new software. Mr. Streicher advised that the costs included migration costs and training; and that going forward, there will be an annual licensing/maintenance contract expense of \$18,000.

President Senak asked why there is such a substantial cost difference between CMMS and Maximo programs. Mr. Streicher explained that the Maximo program offers many features that GWA would not utilize and asked Mr. Braga to add any additional information he had regarding the cost difference. Mr. Braga stated that Maximo had just released their latest version in April and as most of their clients are large manufacturing corporations, who can afford the larger price point up front with the upgrade; and begin decreasing the price over time to make it affordable for smaller entities. Mr. Streicher stated that the Wheaton Sanitary District used MVP Plant when he was employed there and re-enforced that it is tailored more to smaller facilities such as ourselves.

Trustee Christiansen made the motion and Mr. Franz seconded approval of the purchase of MVP Plant and associated professional services from CMMS Data Group of Chicago, IL in the amount of \$47,065.00, as part of Phase III of the Computerized Maintenance Management System Upgrade Project with the amount expensed to Capital Budget account number 440-580120. President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, and Mr. Goldsmith responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

8. Discussion

8.1 Capital Improvement Projects Update

Facility Improvement Project:

Mr. Romza provided the following updates on the project:

- Project is almost complete as there are two bigger things remaining to achieve final completion status: 1) submission of final O&M manuals; and 2) a weeping issue in the basement of the new wet-well that was built, which Boller has been battling on a weekly basis. Mr. Romza did state that over the course of the past few weeks, the amount of weeping seems to be lessening.

Trustee Christiansen asked why weeping is still an issue considering the lack of rain. Mr. Romza stated that due to the fact that this hole is 45 feet deep and the water table is only 6 feet.

Mr. Romza added that Boller did submit a final payment application; however, there are somethings in the pay app that needs further review before GWA will authorize payment, which due to the weeping issue we are not in a hurry to complete.

Mr. Streicher indicated that once the final pay app is paid, the final loan documents with the IEPA can be completed. Trustee Christiansen asked if there was a deadline for closing out the loan app with the IEPA. Mr. Streicher advised that while the IEPA would like it done to calculate our final repayment amount, there is no hard-set deadline; however, GWA has already begun making the loan payments.

Medium Voltage Electric Grid Update:

Mr. Romza provided the following status:

- This is the major project that has the plant torn up throughout the plant. Mr. Romza shared a video via a drone that shows how the work is progressing and added that the drone is enabling GWA to have accurate records for future projects.

- The project is behind schedule by approximately 8 weeks instead of 6 as indicated in presentation, as updated information was just received the previous day. Mr. Romza stated that the contractor has had to dig at a slower pace due to a lack of information on the location of some existing/pre-existing underground structures; additionally, equipment and material lead times are causing delays in the schedule as well. Mr. Romza explained that something as simple as wiring, which normally takes 5 days to arrive, has a 6-8 weeks delay, and as of the previous day, the contractor advised they were told up to 12 weeks before the product arrives.

Mr. Franz asked what the original completion date is. Mr. Romza advised September 24th; and at a meeting on the previous day, Mr. Streicher had recommended to the contractor that they need to make every effort to close out the contract before end of the calendar year. Mr. Romza stated that the new date for substantial completed provided by Broadway is December 14th. Mr. Streicher advised that some of the work cannot be completed when it gets cold out, so there is a push to get as much as the outside work done now versus waiting.

Trustee Christiansen asked if, as a result of the supply and demand issues the project is encountering, are materials costs also going up. Mr. Romza stated that a few subcontractors are submitting change orders for everything little thing they encountered that has caused them inconvenience; and while GWA feels some of the items are justified, some items have been declined, such as a \$63,000 change order for increased PVC pricing. Mr. Streicher stated that as a result of GWA denying the change order, the contractor has now submitted a claim and while the contract language does allow for claims, and both parties can go to mediation to resolve the issue, there is no verbiage allowing for material price escalations and that they are trying to claim it as an "Act of God" because of COVID. Mr. Niehaus stated that a claim based on a COVID claim can lead to never ending claims by other contractors. Mr. Streicher advised that he has referred the matter to GWA's legal counsel just to verify there are no loopholes in the contract that would allow for a claim on grounds of this type and since Broadway's attorney drafted the claim, it was best to have GWA's attorney issue the formal response rejecting the claim. Mr. Streicher advised that once the claim is settled, whether it be accepted, rejected or arbitrated, the matter will be closed and cannot be re-opened.

Mr. Romza highlighted that the \$63,000 increase is for a \$100,000 line item, or a 63% increase. Trustee Christiansen asked if the claim is contributing to the slowing of the work. Mr. Romza stated he hopes that there is no connection between the claim and work slowdown. Mr. Goldsmith highlighted that a \$63,000 claim on a \$4 million project, is not something that is worth slowing down the project over. Mr. Streicher added that the contractor has more to lose by delaying the work.

President Senak as if there were any consequences to the delay, are there any performance clauses in the contract. Mr. Streicher stated that the contractor has not officially submitted an extension of the September 24th completion date yet, but there are provisions for liquidated damages to be accessed in the contract; however, based on experience with Boller on the FIP project, they are extremely difficult to enforce/collect on, so GWA usually negotiates resolutions. Mr. Streicher stated that due the problems encountered in locating the underground utilities which is the fault of neither party and the extreme lead times for materials, he would be in favor of extending the completion date when the formal request is received.

Mr. Streicher advised that on the previous day, there was a meeting with the contractor wherein he advised that GWA is willing to be reasonable and work with them on extending the completion dates, with substantial completion being December 14th and final completion on January 14, 2022 and that he was going to stick with the contract where he must and yet offer some leeway where he can.

Trustee Christiansen asked for clarification on the schedule with regards to the 6-week versus 12-week behind schedule. Mr. Romza stated that when he completed his presentation the 6-week time frame was based on a schedule that was a month old and that the updated schedule was received at a meeting the previous day reflecting a 12-week extension.

President Senak asked there would be any interruption of services to residents. Mr. Romza advised there should be zero impact to the residents.

Biosolids Dewatering Improvement Project (BDIP):

Mr. Romza provided the following status:

- The contractor has been busy with project submittals*

- A delay was encountered with the Village of Glen Ellyn's Planning Department in issuing the building permit so the project can proceed which as of this morning has been resolved. Mr. Streicher advised that the contractor is picking up the building permit, but believes there is an issue that needs Mr. Franz's to address. Mr. Franz asked if this was in regards to the Village's sprinkler requirements and asked Mr. Streicher to update the EOC Committee on the debate that has been taking place as he was interested in getting feedback from the Village of Lombard representatives. Mr. Streicher explained that as the Village of Glen Ellyn does not have a*

lot of industrial businesses, the permit is being issued as a commercial construction/commercial building remodel; however, the project is not a “remodel” but a rehabilitation/replacement of existing equipment, but because of the “remodel code”, the Planning Department wanted to see a hard cost related to various components of the project; and as that amount exceeded a trigger limit, that per local ordinances, requires fire suppression and not just the fire monitoring which GWA already has. Mr. Streicher explained that a fire sprinkler system was not part of the original design and not part of how the project was bid; therefore, it would increase costs on our end and as this is an unoccupied building, with all of the electrical equipment, quite frankly that if it did catch fire and a sprinkler system went off, would cause even more damage than the fire. Mr. Streicher indicated that he had spoken with the building official, who advised that he understood the reason to request waiving of the requirement, but felt the approval power did not lie with him and that it needed to go through the proper channels for Mr. Franz’s review and the issuance of a final decision. Mr. Franz stated that he wanted confirmation that there are no offices in this particular building and is not occupied regularly by staff before making his decision; and will be getting back to Mr. Streicher shortly.

Mr. Niehaus asked if the Village of Glen Ellyn charges other public entities permit fees. Mr. Franz responded that the Village charges itself permit fees for project just for the sake of transparency. Mr. Niehaus stated that the Village of Lombard does the same.

PLC Replacement Project:

Mr. Romza provided the following status:

- This project is replacing 11 PLC panels, program logic controllers, which are vital to the SCADA automation of the plant, located throughout the facility.

- Mr. Freeman has been working with Concentric on the project, with 10 of the 11 controllers having been replaced. Mr. Romza highlighted that the one remaining controller is the largest and most complicated one to replace as it involves shutdowns of various pieces of equipment; and anticipates the project being completed within the next few weeks.

RE Hours:

Mr. Streicher highlighted the RE hours tracking and stated that Mr. Romza’s time is highly valued as he does much more than just providing engineering support and handles a substantial amount of administrative work, making his time invaluable.

Mr. Romza highlighted the amount of RE hours spent on the Electrical project and hopes that his time on this project will begin to decrease.

Mr. Streicher and Mr. Romza added that the amount of RE hours includes time spent by GWA's Superintendents who also provide engineering oversight on the various projects.

8.2 Electricity Procurement Update

After being approved to seek procurement of a new electric supply contract at the March 11, 2021 EOC meeting, on April 15, 2021 the Authority locked in a new fixed rate of \$0.03958/kWh for four years beginning in February 2022 with Direct Energy. The new rate will yield a savings over the existing \$0.04436/kWh rate that has been in place since February 2018, which is also with Direct Energy.

Mr. Streicher provided an update highlighting that since the March EOC Committee meeting, he was able to secure an all-inclusive per kWh pricing for four (4) years that would result in cost savings starting in April 2022. Mr. Streicher added that while the three (3) year rates were slightly lower, GWA felt that locking in a four (4) rate was a better option as the industry forecasting was projecting costs to begin to rise after three years as a result of "green" initiatives that would drive cost increases over the 3 year span..

8.3 Flow Split Memo

The enclosed memo describes revelations and research done on the existing flow split equation and monitoring. The Authority and TAC plan to relocate the Hill Avenue meter, begin including CSO flow into flow split equation, and not provide any retroactive adjustments moving forward. This has been discussed with the Finance Directors and all agree on moving forward providing the EOC has no opposition.

Mr. Romza summarized that he and Mr. Streicher had begun to notice a shift in the flow splits between the Villages and as they dug deeper into the cause, they found a few things of note with the consultants that handle the flow monitoring and had to correct some of the data issues, such as data gaps that were not being filled in with historical information. Mr. Romza stated that the review also revealed that one of the flow meters is not measuring the flow that staff thought it was as the meter is in the wrong location; and has been for as far back as there is data that they could find; and the flow split equation was not including the any flow that goes through the CSO facility in the equation.

Mr. Romza explained that after the equations were adjusted and re-calculations computed, there was very little difference between the original number and the new calculations; however, as a result of the findings, there are a few recommendations that Mr. Streicher and Mr. Romza feel should be implemented.

Mr. Niehaus advised that when he first heard about the matter, he was more than a little concerned that there would be a need for a substantial true-up, but was relieved when it was revealed that the numbers were not as far off anticipated. Mr. Franz asked if part of the reason for the almost neutral impact, was that that the CSO plant did not run often enough to have a substantial impact on the flow. Mr.

EOC Meeting/June 2021
Minutes

Romza agreed and advised that he was able to back-calculate the flow for the meter that was in the wrong place and that calculation cancelled out the impact of the CSO flow. Mr. Romza advised that after discussions with the Finance Directors from both Villages, the decisions were made to begin including the CSO flow in the monthly flow calculations going forward, move the incorrectly positioned meter to the correct location, not back charge any differences and when the flow metering contract comes up for renewal, do an evaluation and determine if any changes to meters locations and/or the number of meters needs to be adjusted as there could be a potential to eliminate some redundant meters.

Mr. Niehaus asked Mr. Goldsmith when any noticeable reduction in Lombard flow might be seen based on their efforts to fix manholes. Mr. Goldsmith advised most likely in another 2 years as they are in the third (3rd) year of a five (5) year project.

Mr. Streicher stated that while working on the 2022 budget, the Village of Glen Ellyn's share of the flow split has increased by a few fractions of a percent.

Mr. Niehaus advised the Village of Lombard is working on reducing the amount of inflow and infiltration in an effort to lower their percentage of the flow but knows it will take a few more years for anything substantial to be reflected, which will impact the flow splits for calculating capital contributions, and such.

Mr. Romza added that the Hydraulic modeling study that was done will hopefully provide some additional insight on flow recommendations. Mr. Romza advised that a draft of the report was reviewed and RJN is working on making corrections so it can be shared with the both Villages.

Mr. Niehaus commended GWA staff for the time and effort they put into investigating the impact these issues had on both the historical and future flow billing.

Trustee Christiansen asked how costly it was going to be to relocate the Hill Avenue flow meter. Mr. Romza advised the costs were approximately \$5,700 as some of the work was completed by GWA staff, while the actual moving of the meter is RJN's responsibility since they own the flow meters, which will require an amendment to their contract.

Mr. Franz indicated that this is the second time in ten (10) years that there has been an issue with meters and asked what can be done going forward to prevent another situation. Mr. Streicher indicated that at the end of RJN's current contract, GWA staff will be doing an audit to evaluate the placement of the meters and determine if there are other meters currently in use that are providing some of the same data.

President Senak asked if any action was needed from the EOC Committee so GWA can proceed. Mr. Streicher advised that the TAC Committee had already approved the actions to be taken, but had recommended the information be shared with the EOC Committee. Mr. Romza added that Mr. Franz's approval on the contract amendment for RJN will be necessary, but otherwise no other action is needed.

8.4 Property Acquisition Discussion

The property owner of 21W534 Bemis Road in Glen Ellyn approached the Authority to gauge its interest in purchasing the property. This subject was discussed at the most recent TAC meeting, with the recommendation being given to seek guidance from the EOC prior to moving forward with any further steps.

Mr. Streicher advised that the property owner approached GWA inquiring if we would be interested in purchasing his property, which is adjacent to the vacant corner lot across from GWA's Admin building, which GWA purchased in 2016. Mr. Streicher added that the 2016 purchase, as well as the purchase of the Sunnybrook property purchased in 2019, were purchased in an effort to provide GWA with space for the future when the IEPA mandates all facilities start to require nutrient removal, which could require moving the plant away from a purity oxygen system currently in use, and while GWA is pushing to use the current system as long as we can, at some point it is going to need replacement regardless of whether or not we are required to begin removing nutrients.. Mr. Streicher outlined that the goal was developed to acquire key parcels of property around/near the plant that would allow for the building of a new parallel process while leaving the existing system 100% operational. Mr. Streicher mentioned that by having vacant property land for building any new construction in this manner, would result in cost savings on a future project versus trying to build new on an existing footprint and keep the plant operating; additionally, this provides green field for construction, which is considerably cheaper due to the lack of underground conflicts. Mr. Streicher reminded that Committee that GWA has existed in this location in some manner since the 1920's, so any digging can become costly since most older facilities are abandoned underground in place.

Mr. Streicher stated that in the past, Mr. Franz has brought up the fact that GWA is building closer to its neighbors and it is a concern, which is why he has reserved one prospective parcel to be used as a buffer between any future construction; and added that the suggestion that the current Admin Building could be built on one of the acquired parcels, which would be less intrusive than building part of the plant operations near a residence. Mr. Streicher said that while building closer to the residents is not ideal; however, anyone purchasing a house near the plant should be cognizant of the fact that they are living next to a wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Niehaus asked Mr. Streicher to clarify that the neighbor approached GWA about purchasing his property. Mr. Streicher confirmed that the neighbor had approached him, which why he then brought the matter to the TAC Committee who recommended feedback from the EOC Committee before taking any steps on the matter. Mr. Streicher outlined three (3) options: 1) obtain an appraisal and begin negotiations with the property owner; 2) table until a later date and see if his interest in selling wanes, especially since property values are high right now; or 3) abandon property acquisitions altogether and deal with it in 2030 or 2035 whenever the IEPA mandates GWA to perform nutrient removal.

President Senak recommended proceeding with getting a property appraisal done so everyone has an idea of the potential cost. Mr. Goldsmith asked if the property owner was actively marketing the home for sale. Mr. Streicher advised that he is not. President Senak asked what is the seller's motivation in approaching GWA. Mr. Streicher explained that he had mentioned losing his job and wanted to sell then rent back for twelve months. Mr. Streicher stated that he has no interest in being a landlord, not to mention that the property loses its tax exemption status if he is paying a monthly rent. Mr. Streicher suggested that maybe he will lose interest in selling if the lease option does not exist. Mr. Goldsmith suggested determining the property's value and reducing the purchase price by an amount equal to twelve (12) months of rent. Mr. Niehaus stated he would prefer this approach rather than having someone buy the property, begin building equity in it and then lose it when/if the property has to be taken by eminent domain so the plant can build on the property.

Mr. Niehaus gave Mr. Streicher permission to proceed with getting an appraisal on the property before any further decisions are made. Mr. Streicher stated that was the direction he was seeking.

Mr. Franz advised that at some point in the future the Village of Glen Ellyn plans to re-construct Bemis Road, put some sidewalks in, do some stormwater management and "fix" the corner but he is not sure exactly what the plan might entail and/or how the plans will impact plans for GWA's use.

Mr. Goldsmith asked Mr. Streicher if the piece of property, which is marked as "buffer" can be subdivided by the Village of Glen Ellyn. Mr. Streicher stated that while it is an 3-1/2-acre piece of property, it is very narrow, making sub-dividing a challenge for access. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that he feels acquiring this piece of property is a priority to prevent a contractor from trying to buy so GWA can control the buffer. Mr. Streicher indicated that at one point in time, the owner did approach GWA about acquiring the property, but GWA declined. Mr. Franz asked if the house was in bad shape. Mr. Streicher advised that the people currently living on the property have recently improved upon it. Mr. Goldsmith mentioned that the owners of the million-dollar homes to the north of the lot, will not be happy if GWA uses the property to for plant expansion.

Trustee Christiansen asked if getting an appraisal at this point in time, when the market values are high, is going to create an issue if we holdoff on the purchase, as a second appraisal would most likely be needed at that time, especially if the market cools off. Mr. Franz suggested the appraiser be asked to factor in a range rather than an exact number. Mr. Streicher indicated that in the past the appraiser has supplied a range for the value. Trustee Christiansen stated she did not want GWA to get locked in to a price that was too high. President Senak stated that this would be a confidential information that would not be shared with the public, but feels a range is good idea.

9. Other Business
- 9.1 Technical Advisory Committee Updates

EOC Meeting/June 2021
Minutes

Mr. Niehaus stated that the TAC Committee is only a few years old but feels it has proven beneficial in evaluating and recommending action on various items.

10. ***Next EOC Meeting*** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting is set for ***Thursday, July 8, 2021 at 8:00 a.m. location TBD.***

Mr. Franz stated that he will not be available for the July 8th meeting.

Mr. Niehaus made the motion to adjourn the June 10, 2021 EOC Committee and Trustee Christiansen seconded the MOTION. President Senak, Trustee Christiansen, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, and Mr. Goldsmith responded “Aye” during a roll call. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:44 a.m.

Submitted by:

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Administrative Secretary