

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY
Executive Oversight Committee
MINUTES
October 14, 2021
Meeting held at the Glenbard Wastewater Plant
945 Bemis Road, Glen Ellyn, IL

Members Present:

Mark Senak	President, Village of Glen Ellyn
Keith Giagnorio	President, Village of Lombard
Bob Bachner	Trustee, Village of Lombard
Mark Franz	Village Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
Scott Niehaus	Village Manager, Village of Lombard
Dave Buckley	Public Works Director, 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
Gayle Lendabarker	Administrative Secretary, GWA
Christina Coyle	Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn
Tim Sexton	Finance Director, Village of Lombard

1. Call to Order at 8:01 a.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Bachner, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Franz, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Buckley answered "Present". Mr. Franz arrived at 8:04 a.m. after Roll Call and after approval of Consent Agenda items. Trustee Christiansen was excused.
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 July 2021 and August 2021, totaling \$3,468,902.62 and September 2021 for an \$1,653,531.39 (Trustee Christiansen).

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

- 5.1 Executive Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes
 - July 15, 2021
- 5.2 Vouchers previously reviewed by Trustee Christiansen
 - July 2021, August 2021 and September 2021
- 5.3 Approval of Additional Maintenance Parts for Combined Heat and Power Engine's 20,000 Service Interval

During the performance of the 20,000-service interval for the Authority's Combined Heat & Power engines additional parts that are needed that were left off of the initial quote were identified. The additional parts add up a total of \$25,865.90. As part of the original EOC approval for this work in July, 2021, \$151,600 of the budgeted \$248,000 was approved. Therefore, this additional \$25,865.90 still falls within the budgeted amount in Fund 270-520975.

Due to the proprietary nature of the CHP system, GWA seeks waiving the competitive bidding process. The approved 2016 purchasing policy item *C.I.f.* defines *Standardization purchases*, as "technical in nature of certain items or services may result in the standardization of a particular supplier's specifications being necessary or desirable to Village operations. Competitive bidding may be waived if the Village requires compatibility with existing software, machinery or other existing equipment." Therefore, it is being requested the EOC authorize the Authority to approve Nissen Energy's proposal and provide notice to proceed for the amount of \$25,865.90.

- 5.4 Ratification of August 26, 2021 Phone Poll Item
 - 5.4.1 Final Header Sludge Header Replacement

Parts of GWA's infrastructure are quickly approaching 50 years of age. The final sludge return header is one of those pieces. In the past two years, GWA staff has had to repair rotted pipe sections multiple times. Most recently, staff spent an entire day removing a butterfly valve and operator then repairing the rotted pipe and then placing back in service. These repairs were only a temporary fix.

The Authority recommends the EOC authorize the Authority to award Dhame Inc. with a notice to proceed in the amount of \$78,888.88 to complete this work. Sourced from 2021 GWA Capital budget 40-580120. Previously, \$180,000 was dedicated for these improvements, \$61,063.93 of which were spent on the associated magnetic meters and valve actuators for the final sludge return station, leaving \$118,936.07 in the budget for this work to be completed.

6. Discussion

6.1 CY2022 Draft Budget

Proposed 0.1% decrease (\$4,688) in overall operations, maintenance, and capital budget for CY2022 as broken down in the enclosed memo.

Mr. Streicher highlighted key points planned in the CY2022 starting with the Capital Improvement Fund and a planned 1% increase in the capital contributions for each Village. Mr. Streicher indicated that there have been discussions with both Finance Directors regarding the possibility of bumping this increase amount to 1.25% for the next twenty (20) years to account for some major capital projects coming up in 2035 as well as the following twenty (20) years of capital projects since the fund is forecasted to go into a deficient level in 2038 but as that is so far out there, the idea is to keep track as time gets nearer; and another idea proposed by the Finance Directors to help reduce the deficit is to budget for an operating surplus to be transferred into the Capital Fund every year. Mr. Streicher explained that traditionally, each year the EOC approves the transfer of any O&M surplus to the Capital fund versus transferring the surplus back to the Villages, so it was decided to budget \$50,000 for the foreseeable future. Mr. Streicher highlighted that for CY2020 \$363,678 in surplus.

Mr. Streicher indicated that Electrical Grid project will be concluded early next year bringing a major expense to a close. Mr. Streicher indicated that there will be some projects starting that were deferred in CY2020 due to COVID, with the biggest project scheduled for CY2022 being the primary clarifier rehabilitation at a cost of approximately \$2-\$2.5 million.

Mr. Streicher highlighted key budget points in the O&M fund, including an increase in personnel costs and the elimination \$250,000 that had been allocated for a major service interval on the CHP engines. Mr. Streicher indicated that a large majority of the other O&M items remained static and adjusted where price escalations have occurred or the rebidding of services which need to be put out to bid this past year or will be bid in CY2022 in an effort to be as accurate as possible.

Mr. Streicher indicated that without salaries included in the O&M calculations, there was an 5% decrease in O&M expenses for CY2022; and the overall budget, including the Capital Fund is .1% or \$4,688 less than the CY2021 budget. Mr. Streicher stated that the end result is an approximate \$20,000 decrease in the Village of Lombard's contribution and an increase in the Village of Glen Ellyn's contribution by the same amount.

President Senak stated that he had a question regarding the salary increase in the CY2022 budget and asked Mr. Streicher to explain his statement "incorporating higher merit increases than in past years due to new strategical goals in moving personnel through pay ranges in an appropriate amount of time". Mr. Streicher explained that he has had conversations with Mr. Franz, Mr. Buckley and Ms. Coyle,

before the Village Board met to discuss salaries and was advised to make the adjustment.

Mr. Franz explained that the Village has been having discussions with regards to developing a compensation plan to move employees who start at the low end of the pay range and move them to the mid-point and beyond in a reasonable amount fashion and are trying to make a shift in order to play catch up. Mr. Franz added that the Village Board has provided some, conceptual support to fund that for CY2022.

President Senak asked if GWA's salary range is consistent with the Village's. Mr. Franz confirmed that it is as the Village is the Lead Agency for GWA; and therefore, handles the financial services, human resources management, etc. for GWA and wants GWA to be consist with the Village's Public Works department.

Mr. Niehaus stated that Mr. Franz will reach out to him to discuss internal salary raises that Glen Ellyn is considering and Lombard will, in turn, use Glen Ellyn as a comparable. Mr. Niehaus added that what Lombard has found is that the Merit is not an entitlement, it's not a "right" the employee has to perform; and typically, Lombard has a regular cost of living adjustment and then a 2% merit and the good performers can climb up the ladder and like to see them at the top of the range after 10-12 years. Mr. Niehaus added that in 2020 the Village had a zero (0) merit, due to COVID, but Lombard's budget for CY2022 is anticipating a 3% merit pool to give a little room to catch up after COVID.

President Senak asked what is the cost-of-living component in the increases. Mr. Franz indicated that the Village of Glen Ellyn is all merit, but the Village is currently discussing an increase to the salary ranges of 1.4% and a merit 2.25% and then a merit pool of to address the previously stated issue of those employees who have been with the village five (5), six (6) or seven (7) years and are not at the midpoint of their range in an effort to retain employees as it takes money to recruit and start over, so the Village wants reward employees.

President Senak asked what it takes to accomplish the goal of getting employees to the mid-point could be done by raising the base salary or accomplished through something like a bonus. Mr. Franz stated that the problem with bonuses, which has been used in the pat especially with people at the top of their range, is that you are not moving up the range, which is where the problem lies. President Senak asked if the 1.4% adjustment addresses the issue. Mr. Franz stated that it does not as all of the ranges will be adjusted by the 1.4%. as this a cost-of-living adjustment as this has been they adjustment to the ranges for the past ten (10) years, which is way employees are so slow to move up the rangers. President Senak asked if this change will address the problem or simply perpetuate the problem. Mr. Franz stated that it will if the Village is allowed to continue to use a kind of bonus merit process, which again the Village Board has conceptually approved this being for inclusion in the general fund budget. President Senak asked Mr. Franz if he was comfortable that this

structure will accomplish the idea of getting people to the top of range in a ten (10) year period. Mr. Franz stated that the Village's philosophy is going from previously the Village has wanted to get everyone to the mid-point within seven (7) to ten (10) years and what has been laid out to the Village Board is to try to get everyone to the mid-point in five (5) years and to the 75th percentile between seven (7) and ten (10) years. Mr. Franz added that the plan is not to get them to the top, but if one gets the 75th percentile within ten (10) years, one has a good chance of getting to the top. Mr. Niehaus summarized that nothing is guaranteed.

Mr. Niehaus added that the only other thought is, while it has not been discussed with the Village of Lombard's Board, with the federal infrastructure bill and the amount of money that is being thrown at projects and such right now, he thinks that for public works employees and employees in the trades, the lure of the private sector is going to be out there because of the money flowing to jobs, so it will be a competitive market. Mr. Niehaus stated that when he first started with the Village in 2014, they had just washed out twenty-two (22) public works employees through an early retirement program; but, the market for that was pretty dried up, and the entry level salary at that time was \$40-\$42,000 and now, no one qualified would even think about applying for that position today. President Senak stated that is what he is interested in so the Village can continue to retain employees and attract quality candidates, and asked if the plan outlined, in Mr. Franz's estimation, will accomplish the goal. Mr. Franz stated that over time, as there was a year six (6) or seven (7) years ago when the ranges were not updated and that really set the Village back, so going forward the Village has to stay consistent and realize the bigger goal is to retain our employees.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if Mr. Streicher's job grade is consistent with the Village Glen Ellyn's Supervisor within the Public Works Department. Mr. Buckley stated that he is on the level as the Assistant Public Works Director. Mr. Goldsmith asked if they are banded with the Village. Mr. Franz stated there is internal equity across the board and some time has been spent evaluating salaries, including a compensation study that was completed 12 years ago and the Village may be doing something like that again. Mr. Goldsmith asked if like positions are compared between GWA, Glen Ellyn and the external market to make sure things are comparable. Mr. Franz advised they are.

President Senak as the Village of Lombard representatives if they are experiencing higher turnover than usual or people leaving disproportionately and, in the instances when an employee leaves, are you having difficulty attracting applicants to fill those positions. Mr. Goldsmith stated the Village is having extremely hard time finding quality candidates. Mr. Goldsmith added that the Village is currently looking for a mechanic, no one is applying; as Mr. Niehaus said, the market is in such a demand right now for a good mechanics and our salaries just do not line up with the private sector.

Mr. Niehaus added that he believes there will be pressure on Public Works for the next five (5) years because of the lure of the private sector. President Senak stated that he believes that will be the case across the municipal landscape. Mr. Franz stated the great resignation exodus, 40% of the municipal work force is leaving for the private sector, which represents a huge change.

Mr. Niehaus asked Mr. Streicher what type of direction on the budget was he looking for. Mr. Streicher stated that as this was the first draft presentation, usually the first draft that would have been presented in September; then request the EOC Committee approve recommending the budget to the GWA Full Board for approval would have been sought at another meeting. Mr. Streicher added that he did not have any formal language requesting approval of the budget, as the thought was that if there were any comments or feedback that needed to be addressed it would be revised and presented at another EOC Committee meeting for recommendation to the Full Board. Mr. Niehaus advised that Mr. Goldsmith, Mr. Sexton, Trustee Bachner, President Giagnorio and himself sat down earlier in the week and reviewed the budget and had no other questions or concerns. Mr. Franz asked when is the Board meeting scheduled for. Mr. Streicher advised that the scheduling of the Full Board meeting is topic to be discussed a little later on the agenda; however, the GWA's Annual Full Board meeting is typically scheduled for November. Mr. Streicher explained that since there is no formal request for approval on the agenda for this meeting, if need be, a brief EOC Committee meeting can be held immediately prior to the Full Board meeting so the Committee can formally approve recommending the CY2022 Budget to the Full Board. Mr. Streicher stated he was not clear on whether or not approval can be done without a formal approval language or not; and that in 2020 there was no language in the agenda and President Giagnorio sought approval.

Mr. Franz indicated that she has had a conversation with Trustee Christiansen and feels that she is comfortable with the budget and so was he and feels the budget has been vetted effectively. Mr. Niehaus stated that he and the Village of Lombard were also comfortable with the budget as it stands. Mr. Streicher asked he could verbally request approval of the CY2022 budget.

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Goldsmith seconded the motion to authorize approval of the CY2022 Budget to the Full Boards of Glen Ellyn and Lombard. President Giagnorio, President Senak, Trustee Bachner, Mr. Franz, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Goldsmith, and Mr. Buckley responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

6.2 Capital Improvement Projects Update

Medium Voltage Electric Grid Update:

Mr. Romza provided the following status:

-Most Underground is pretty much work, with the final part being connecting the underground lines to the new ComEd power feed.

EOC Meeting/October 2021
Minutes

-In conjunction with the ComEd connection and issue arose in that GWA was not made aware that the pole had been condemned by ComEd until we submitted the service request for them to come out and perform the power connection. ComEd advised that they would be moving the placement of the new pole to be about 6-10 feet away from the current pole. As a result, all of the concrete encased cables that had been run to the old pole had to be removed and re-routed to the new pole. Naturally, this additional work will result in a change order of approximately \$20,000 if not more. Mr. Romza stated that a claim was filed with ComEd in an effort to reclaim the additional costs from ComEd.

Mr. Streicher added that ComEd has acknowledged receipt of the claim, but he has not had any further communication with them. Mr. Streicher expressed his frustration with ComEd's lack of communication despite multiple attempts from the contractor and GWA staff's attempts to contact them for almost a year and received no indication from them there would be an issue.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if ComEd had a set of plans indicating the work to be done. Mr. Streicher indicated that the contractor had been working with them and there had been no indication of any issues by ComEd until the last minute.

Trustee Bachner asked how the reimbursement process with ComEd typically goes. Mr. Streicher indicated he is not sure as the form they sent him to fill out was more for a business that lost revenue or inventory because of a power outage. Mr. Streicher added that he asked GWA's account manager to work with the Claims Department to explain the situation in an effort to explain GWA's position that GWA should not be held liable for the change order as the additional costs were related to ComEd's lack of communication. Mr. Streicher stated that he is not terribly optimistic as when you speak with a person at ComEd and ask to speak with a supervisor, they refuse to provide contact information.

Mr. Buckley asked if Colandra Davis, was copied on the information as she is the External Affairs representative for the Village of Glen Ellyn and is the person who manages anything that is not following the normal path. Mr. Streicher said she was not as he was not aware of being a contact person and requested that Mr. Buckley forward her contact information to him. Mr. Streicher added that GWA's account representative, Josh Leinhart, since Mr. Streicher has started here, has never been terribly responsive regardless of the need. Mr. Buckley asked if there a claim or ticket number. Mr. Streicher indicated the letter did not provide any type of claim number. Mr. Buckley suggested he forward a copy of the acknowledgement letter to Ms. Davis as well as any other communications on the issue as she will be the one works the internal side of ComEd.

President Senak as if there was any opportunity to have the service underground to reduce the chances of service interruptions due to weather

to construction related issues. Mr. Romza stated that all of GWA's electric cables are underground; however, the feed from ComEd will not be placed underground. Mr. Romza advised that GWA does have backup generators available in the event there are any issues with the ComEd feed to the plant.

Biosolids Dewatering Improvement Project (BDIP):

Mr. Romza provided the following status:

- The old gravity thickener that was installed in the 1900's and only used a few times and remained as an eyesore has been removed and*
- A lot of the necessary demo has been completed.*
- An improvement to the FOG receiving station has been added to the project which will catch overspill at the station and direct it to the head of the plant. When the contractor was digging for this line, they did encounter a few old structures from 1969, so there will a few change orders relating to that additional work but these were within the contract allowance at the time the EOC Packet was generated, but may not be the case anymore.*

RAS Pump Replacement Project:

Mr. Romza advised that this is a project that is being done in house by Jon Braga and the Maintenance team and an update will be coming in the future as the contract with Dahme was approved on the consent agenda.

RE Hours:

Mr. Romza highlighted that the chart not only reflects Mr. Romza's RE hours, but the hours of all Superintendents who have assisted with contractor oversight on the various projects.

Mr. Streicher highlighted the CHP 20,000-hour service interval that GWA had been budgeting substantial amounts of funds for has been underway and over the weekend, when an attempt was made to start up the engine, it suffered a catastrophic failure which has rendered the engine permanently unusable. Mr. Streicher added that fortunately the cost to repair will not be on GWA, but Nissen who intends to cover it under their insurance; but this means GWA will be without the engine for months. Mr. Streicher explained that Nissen has provided several options for GWA to evaluate and staff is awaiting additional information on the options. Mr. Streicher stated that the other overhauled engine is operating without any problems.

Mr. Franz asked what the life expectancy on the engines. Mr. Streicher stated 40,000 hours. Mr. Franz asked if, at a future meeting, providing an update on the ROI for the CHP program. Mr. Streicher stated he would, and highlighted that the information is also provided in the Director's Report in the packet each month. Mr. Franz asked if a quick five-minute review could be done at the next meeting.

Mr. Romza advised that he is looking into the feasibility of solar energy at the plant again and will be following up with several vendors and evaluate whether or not the lagoon area can be converted for solar panels. President Senak indicated he had forwarded information on a vendor. Mr. Streicher advised that he and Mr. Romza were trying to get a date finalized and meet with them in a week or two.

Mr. Streicher stated that GWA had recently re-negotiated its electric rate, which will take effect in February 2022, to such a low rate that the ROI on solar is almost not worth the expense. Mr. Streicher added that as incentives for solar continue to increase it is an option that is worth revisiting. President Senak mentioned that investigating the potential for federal grant money might also be evaluated.

6.3 Leachate Permit Revisions

Glenbard Wastewater Authority accepts leachate from four, closed municipal landfills. The leachate from these landfills is essentially rain water and the analytical data supports that these sources contain low levels of pollutants. In an effort to streamline permitting and create efficiencies in the pretreatment program the Environmental Resource Coordinator has reviewed the 40 CFR requirements and Sewer Use Ordinance(s) (SUO) and determined that all four landfills can be permitted under individual wastewater discharge permits instead of Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) under the Pretreatment Program.

Ms. Staat stated that she had recently reviewed several of GWA's leachate permits, rain water that has percolated through a landfill, which picks up various pollutants that are within the landfill and is then siphoned off to a storage tank, which is then transferred to GWA for disposal. Ms. Staat continued by stating that currently there are four (4) Waste Management landfills that have leachate being brought to GWA, two (2) were permitted under the Pretreatment program, and classified them as significant industrial users; which, placed them in certain statutory requirements with federal regulations, as far as reporting and monitoring; all the while they do not quite fit the definition of a significant industrial user such as if they discharge more than 25,000 gallons per day on average, if they make up more than five percent (5%) of the organic loading capacity at a plant, or they have the potential to cause an adverse event, etc. Ms. Staat advised that she reviewed GWA's local limits evaluation from the previous permit cycle that Laurie Frieders had done, evaluated how much they had been bringing to the plant for the past 6 months, and determined that they do not fit the definition and she reclassified them as a general user permits; which still protects the plants since they are required to follow the general and specific prohibitions within the sewer use ordinance within the pretreatment federal regulations, they no longer required to be on our annual report or perform self-monitoring. Ms. Staat explained that she requested that they still submit their

lab data every six (6) months since they are required through solid waste regulations to perform the testing as well as randomized sampling during off-loads.

Mr. Niehaus asked there was any action that the EOC Committee needed to take. Mr. Stricker advised that no action is necessary, but wanted to make the EOC Committee aware of this policy change in what is reported to the IEPA warranted bring the EOC Committee up to speed on the change.

Mr. Franz asked if the deliveries are spread out as to avoid overloading the system and causing issues. Mr. Streicher indicated that the quantity is such that it has very little impact on flow rates through the plant; although the number of deliveries will likely go up slightly in the coming days due to the amount of rainfall. Ms. Staat advised that the leachate deliveries are equal to either .03% or .003% of the average daily flow through the plant. Ms. Staat added that if they exceed local limits, they are still subject to being fined accordingly.

Mr. Streicher added that GWA sees approximately \$150-\$170,000 in revenue per year from leachate. Mr. Niehaus asked if the fee structure was still competitive. Mr. Streicher advised that they are.

Mr. Streicher added that news that he has just started to hear is that the largest Waste Management facility which is located at Green Valley in Naperville is supposedly installing or is going to be installing a pipeline from their facility to the DuPage County Green Valley Treatment Facility located close by which would eliminate deliveries from this plant to GWA. Mr. Streicher explained that as Waste Management hires a third-party contractor to make the deliveries, it will save them a substantial amount in trucking fees, and while it will be a substantial loss of revenue, GWA will continue to receive leachate from their three (3) other facilities.

Mr. Niehaus stated that he does see fee structures going up in the future as more facilities take on the capabilities and if, anything, fees will go down due to competition.

Mr. Streicher stated that leachate is charged at a rate of 2.5¢ a gallon as it is fairly inert and most plants are equipped to handle it; whereas, FOG is at 5¢ a gallon, which is what may go down due to competition. Mr. Streicher added that the truck traffic from leachate trucks has always been a little bit of an issue with the neighbors; but otherwise, it doesn't generate any odors or have any impact on the plant process.

Mr. Niehaus reminded Mr. Streicher to make a note regarding the potential of a 50% or more decline in leachate revenue if the pipeline does go in.

Mr. Franz asked how GWA can go about marketing itself for leachate and/or FOG. Mr. Streicher stated that both are pretty much based on location and that Ms. Staat does a good job while performing inspections of grease trap clean-outs of alerting the pumping company of GWA's ability to take in their grease loads. Mr. Streicher advised that lately, GWA has been having to turn away grease haulers as the plant has been reaching its 25,000 gallons a day maximum on a regular basis and the tipping fees so far this year have exceeded previous' years.

Mr. Streicher took a moment to recognize Ashley Staat on completing her Masters Degree in Environmental Policy.

7.0 Other Business

7.1 Technical Advisory Committee Updates

7.2 Full Board Meeting Dates

Mr. Streicher asked which dates in November would work best for scheduling the GWA's Annual Full Board meeting.

Mr. Franz suggested either November 8th or November 15th which are dates prior to the Village of Glen Ellyn's board meetings.

Mr. Bachner suggested November 15th and it was tentatively agreed to.

Mr. Niehaus explained to Trustee Bachner that it is not uncommon for some of the Village of Lombard's Board members to miss the meeting. Mr. Niehaus stated he would work with Carol Bauer in his office to get the information out to all of the Lombard's Board members.

Mr. Streicher asked Mr. Franz, what time Glen Ellyn's meeting starts. Mr. Franz replied 7:00 a.m. and suggested 6:00 p.m. at the start time for the Full Board meeting.

8.0 **Next EOC Meeting** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting is to be determined due to the regularly scheduled date falling on the Veterans Day holiday.

Mr. Streicher advised that in there are items that would require the EOC Committee's approval, he would most likely schedule the meeting prior to the GWA Full Board Meeting which is tentatively scheduled for November 15, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

President Senak made the motion to adjourn the October 14, 2021 EOC Committee and Mr. Franz seconded the MOTION. President Senak, President Giagnorio, Trustee Bachner, Mr. Franz, Mr. Niehaus, Mr. Buckley and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Aye" during a roll call. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:36 a.m.

Submitted by:

EOC Meeting/October 2021
Minutes

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Administrative Secretary