

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY

Executive Oversight Committee

Minutes

Thursday, March 10, 2011

8:00 A.M.

**Meeting will be held at the Glenbard Wastewater Plant
21 W 551 Bemis Rd, Glen Ellyn, IL**

Members Present:

William Mueller	President, Village of Lombard
Michelle Thorsell	Trustee, Village of Glen Ellyn
Greg Gron	Trustee, Village of Lombard
Phil Hartweg	Trustee, Village of Glen Ellyn
Tim Sexton	Finance Director, Village of Lombard (for Manager Hulseberg)
Terry Burghard	Interim Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
Carl Goldsmith	Public Works Director, Village of Lombard
Bob Minix	Village Engineer, Village of Glen Ellyn

Others Present:

Erik Lanphier	Wastewater Manager, GWA
Gary Scott	Sr. Maintenance Mechanic
David Goodalis	Sr. Plant Operator, GWA
Rick Freeman	St. Plant Electrician/Electronics Technician, GWA
Gayle Lendabarker	Administrative Secretary, GWA
Larry Noller	Acting Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

1. Call to Order at 8:00 a.m.
2. Roll Call: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Minix answered "Present". Mr. Hulseberg was excused.
3. Public Comment
4. Consent Agenda

Ms. Thorsell motioned and Mr. Gron seconded the *MOTION that the following items on the Consent Agenda be approved. Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Goldsmith, Mr. Sexton and Mr. Minix individually responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.*

- 4.1 Minutes from the February 7, 2011 EOC Meeting.
- 4.2 Vouchers previously reviewed by Trustee Hartweg.
- 4.3 Contract Award – Sodium Thiosulfate

The NPDES permit issued to the Lombard CSO facility in 1994 instituted a chlorine residual limit of 4.0 mg/l and a new permit issued in 2001 went even further with a limit of .75 mg/l. The Lombard CSO Facility Improvements Project, began in 2002 and completed in early 2004, included the addition of new chlorination and dechlorination equipment. Prior to the NPDES regulations, Liquid Sodium Hypochlorite was used to chlorinate with no chlorine residual limit in place. In order to meet the new permit requirement and allow for adequate disinfection time,

Liquid Sodium Thiosulfate was introduced to the treatment process to dechlorinate prior to discharge. GWA distributed five (5) bid packets and received two (2) back.

Motion EOC to award a three-year (April 1, 2011 through April 30, 2014) contract to PVS Minibulk, Inc. for the purchase and delivery of Liquid Sodium Thiosulfate at \$1.67 per gallon/delivered with the amount expensed to FY2012 O&M Budget 271 530440.

4.4 St. Charles Lift Station Change Order #3 - Update

Change Order number three (3) includes three (3) modifications to the construction contract with the most expensive addition being excavation site cleaning resulting from flooding of the wet well and the manhole in the amount of \$15,507. The total Change Order value is an additional \$19,903. Previously, Change Order number one (1) adjusted the project cost by \$599, and Change Order number two (2) adjusted the project cost by \$2,035. As it stands today, the total Change Order values on the \$2,477,000 construction project are \$22,537, thus modifying the current contract price to \$2,499,537.

Mr. Lanphier advised that change order #3 is anticipated as the final change order for the St. Charles Road Lift Station project. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the remaining items for completion consists of installation of permanent fencing, landscaping, replacement of the Glen Ellyn Park Districts driveway and signage, site grading and final pavement of the entire site.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that due to the rain event and snow melting, the station has been performing as designed and there have been no reports of surcharging of the Chidester manhole as had occurred in the past. Mr. Lanphier indicated that overall the total for all of the change orders to date amount to less than one percent (1%) of the project cost.

Mr. Mueller asked if everything was going to be restored prior to the start of the park district's busy season. Mr. Lanphier advised that as soon as the weather permitted things would be taken care of. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the reason for the last change order was due to site flooding which was a result of a J.J. Henderson's transformer failure, then their back up pump failed and the amount of rain that fell, resulted in a situation where the station was pumping in by-pass mode, but it just could not pump fast enough to prevent the flooding!

5. Biosolids Operations and Maintenance Manual (O&M) Project

This item was tabled during the February 2011 EOC meeting pending the following EOC motion was completed:

- Amended motion to defer approval of this item until such time as Mr. Goldsmith and Trustee Thorsell could review example materials presented by Strand Associates.

On February 25, 2011, Trustee Thorsell, Carl Goldsmith, Bob Minix and myself attended a presentation of the O&M manuals hosted by Brent Schuster and Troy Larson from Strand Associates Engineering. The meeting was presented with an overhead projector for electronic version display. Strand also provided an example of a paper set for the EOC members to review. The meeting lasted for more than an hour with good interaction between all attendees. The motion for award below shall not be read until the reviewers give their feedback to the EOC.

Motion the EOC approve the Task Order 11-01 for the preparation of an O&M manual for Biosolids processes in the Not To Exceed amount of \$94,200 to Strand Associates Inc. of Madison Wisconsin, invoiced to Capital Account 40-580475.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that he held a meeting on February 25, 2011 with Mr. Goldsmith, Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Minix and representatives from Strand Associates at the request of the EOC Committee so that additional information on the product to be produced could be provided to Committee Members; therefore, Mr. Lanphier was opening the table for discussion by those who attended the presentation on the creation of new Operations & Maintenance process manuals as the decision to table approval of the matter during the February 7, 2011 EOC Committee was to allow Committee members to hear and see the what Strand Associates was proposing so a decision could be made at the March meeting.

Ms. Thorsell expressed her appreciation to Mr. Lanphier for setting up the meeting and was impressed by the presentation and was able to bring away from the presentation was how O&M manuals are produced from each process and how the purpose of this project was to connect all of the dots and explain the entire plant process step-by-step so that anyone can come in during any situation and have all of the information at their finger tips. Ms. Thorsell indicated that she saw what she was hoping to see in that the manuals would fill in some of the gaps or pieces to bring new technology and old technology together as well as knowing that the person who would be in charge of leading the project is a wastewater plant operator not just an engineering so the person has the knowledge of terminology and processes to draw on in creating a product that is able to provide the information in a way that makes to someone who may be coming in without extensive knowledge. Ms. Thorsell explained that at the February meeting, her concern was mainly the cost of the project even though the hourly rate was very fair by industry standards, but feels that this is a political decision with a quality based decision for Strand to do it as they have a large portion of the documentation easily accessible would probably reduce the number of hours to produce a comprehensive document and that any Engineering firm contracted other than Strand would be coming in lacking the knowledge and immediate access to the information that Strand has so readily available to them at this point. Ms. Thorsell indicated that even though the contract does state "not to exceed" she would be hopeful that the cost would actually come in less than the amount indicated.

Mr. Goldsmith indicated that his only concern was that no funds were set aside in the FY2012 capital plan for continuing the project whereas there are two (2) other projects, the asset study and the facilities plan study. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that during the meeting with Strand he was surprised to discover how much time would be required by

GWA staff to be involved in the production of the manuals and is concerned that there is not enough time in the year next year to complete all three (3) of the projects and feels that the recommendation would be to proceed with the asset and facilities study in FY2012 and then possibly plan for the manuals the following year and work to get all of the manuals completed started in FY2013.

Mr. Minix stated that what he took away from the meeting was that Strand is well qualified to prepare the manuals especially relating to the Biosolids processes and is not necessarily convinced that if GWA goes with Strand on this particular set of manuals that GWA is tied to Strand to complete all of the other modules and feels Strand's current involvement places them in the unique position as the most logical choice for doing all of the manuals, and stressed that as time goes on, the task of accessing the information could become difficult as files are moved from current to archive status thus requiring additional resources to dig into the files to pull necessary information. Mr. Minix feels that GWA staff should address the concerns of the demands to be placed on GWA staff expressed by Mr. Goldsmith, but feels that the decision to proceed with this particular module of the manuals get started as it has been long deferred and feels that the dollars are reasonable and that the experience of Strand would help facilitate the production of a quality manual in a timely manner.

Mr. Mueller asked Mr. Lanphier if he wanted to address the concerns regarding the demands that would be placed on GWA staff to complete the manuals. Mr. Lanphier indicated that most of the work for the O&M would not involve the actual writing of the manuals in as much as it would be the gathering of data and deliver the data to the, which would be handled mainly by the administrative personnel at GWA and not so much the entire staff and even then it is more a matter of pulling existing equipment manuals together and providing the information to Strand for them to reassemble in the manuals. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the O&M project with Strand would take approximately eight (8) months out of the next fifteen (15) and anticipates the work load for the asset liability study to be a task wherein we provide them with all of the data currently on file and they compile the necessary reports from that data.

Mr. Burghard asked if a contract has been awarded to Strand for the facilities plan and/or the asset liability studies. Mr. Lanphier indicated that no contracts have been awarded for either and that the plan is to go out to RFP/RFQ on these items. Mr. Burghard indicated that he is surprised that the manuals have not been updated at this point as they are key to keeping the system running.

Mr. Mueller asked what hazard there is at not proceeding with the O&M manuals at this point. Mr. Lanphier indicated that as Mr. Burghard pointed out GWA has had a substantial amount of capital improvement work done over the last ten to fifteen years (10 to 15) years where the process and equipment has changed and that the a delay of several years could result in key people at GWA and Strand who would have the first hand knowledge for accurately assembling the manuals could have moved on thus creating voids in the information. Mr. Lanphier indicated that there are no dire needs to get the O&M's completed with the current staff in place, however GWA is trying to plan for the future by having current information available should the need arise and that, as Mr. Minix pointed out, as time goes on and those involved in the Biosolids project begin

to file things into storage, the costs could rise if hours must be spent digging through archives instead of simply taking what sitting on someone's desk and compiling while the project is fresh with everyone.

Mr. Mueller asked how many volumes are currently in existence or total cost of having the manuals completed. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the total project will consist of five modules and there could be multiple volumes within each module due to the processes and equipment associated with each module and the total costs. Mr. Lanphier indicated that he tentatively project, over the next few years, a total cost for all manuals to be approximately a half million dollars.

Mr. Mueller indicated that he feels this needs to be done however, he is not willing to even make the recommendation for this project based on current economic factors.

Mr. Minix expressed his understanding with Mr. Mueller on the cost of the long term investment, but feels that it is not in GWA's best interest to wait on this particular module because of the timing of the things in relation to staff not only at GWA but at Strand as well as there are no guarantees and does not feel that this particular module is not an outlandish investment.

Mr. Mueller asked Mr. Minix if he felt it was a worthwhile investment to approve this particular set without knowing when the other volumes could be completed. Mr. Minix indicated he felt the investment was worth it at this point in time.

Mr. Mueller indicated that he is hearing in the communities that the State will not be providing funding for infrastructure repairs and feel that only doing one manual is not the way to go if there is no hope of completing all the manuals.

Mr. Burghard indicated that the completion of the manuals will only get more intensive in the future and that the opportunity being presented now is worth pursuing especially if infrastructure funding is going to be more difficult to come by then, the funding for manuals will be equally difficult to come by and thinks this is a great opportunity to get this project done. Mr. Burghard continued by stating that it would not be in the interest of the communities to have to come to residents and request a substantial increase because an opportunity was missed by not acting now.

Mr. Goldsmith indicated that the asset analysis and facilities plan would result a potential increase of fees or service rather than requesting funding for manuals as these studies would then indicate if process changes were necessary before moving forward with creating manuals based on invalid processes. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that he was in disagreement with Mr. Minix in that once Strand began doing the manuals, GWA would have to use them for all of the manuals the manner in which they presented it as a web-based linked software would not allow for another vendor to continue on.

Ms. Thorsell indicated that this is not the case as it is not uncommon for engineering firms to use the same type of software in an given industry to keep things consistent.

Mr. Sexton indicated that Mr. Lanphier stated in his memo that the intention to use Strand for all of the manuals.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that he was under the impression that once the first module was completed and if the product met with the EOC Committee's satisfaction that Strand would produce the other modules and that it was not his intent to imply that Strand would automatically complete all the manuals. Mr. Lanphier spoke to Mr. Goldsmith's issue of completing a process manual only to be advised that the process needs to be changed as a result of an asset analysis or facilities plan evaluation by stating that GWA has spent ten (10) years completing the Biosolids process improvements and there would be no changes to this particular module; whereas the other modules would not have any impact to this particular module.

Ms. Thorsell moved and Mr. Hartweg seconded the motion: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Minix and Mr. Burghard responded "Aye"; Mr. Mueller, Mr. Gron, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Sexton responded "Nay" during a roll vote. The motion failed.

6. At the December 9, 2010 EOC Committee meeting, a motion was made to bring the bulleted item below to GWA's Full Board for discussion. The Village of Lombard would like to have this item removed from Full Board discussions.

- Motion to submit information for discussions considering either a temporary or permanent change in "lead agency" over the Glenbard Wastewater Authority to the Glenbard Wastewater Authority's Full Board.

Motion the EOC Committee to rescind the motion made at the December 9, 2010 EOC Committee meeting to submit information for discussions considering either a temporary or permanent change in "lead agency" over the Glenbard Wastewater Authority to the Glenbard Wastewater Authority's Full Board.

Mr. Lanphier advised that a request to remove this motion from presentation to the Full Board had been presented as this item was still on the table for the upcoming Full Board meeting.

Mr. Burghard asked who made the request to rescind the motion and why. Mr. Lanphier advised he believed the request to rescind came from the Village of Lombard via email asking that the item not move forward at this time. Mr. Sexton indicated that he believes that Mr. Hulseberg did not want to see a delay in the approval of the pending revisions to the IGA and felt that this item, at this time, a squabble over who was going to be lead agency would delay the approval.

Mr. Mueller indicated that as Mr. Minix had indicated, the working relationship between the Village of Lombard and Glen Ellyn has been in existence for a long time and there is a desire to continue that working relationship and Lombard wanted to avoid having something such as this item creating disruption or doubt.

Mr. Burghard expressed that he was in agreement with Mr. Muller, however he did expressed concern over feeling of a sense of division over GWA between Lombard and Glen Ellyn as evident by the recent motion on the operating manuals where all parties representing Lombard vote against an item. Mr. Burghard expressed that he was nervous about the way the voting had gone on that particular item in that all representatives from Glen Ellyn had voted unanimously to approve the item and Lombard representatives had all voted against the measure, raises a concern. Mr. Burghard added that even though he will not be a part of GWA long term, the GWA will continue for many years to come and he would hate to see politics interjected into GWA.

Mr. Mueller indicated he was in agreement with Mr. Burghard and did think that the way the voting went for one particular agenda item should be signal that the villages are placing the success of GWA at risk, especially since there was a lot of discussion prior to the vote.

Mr. Goldsmith moved and Mr. Minix seconded the motion: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Goldsmith, Mr. Minix and Mr. Sexton responded "Aye". The motion carried.

7. Letter of Intent Agreement between AT&T Mobility and The Glenbard Wastewater Authority for a 50' x 50' leased area to construct a 100-foot tall monopole at 21W 551 Bemis Road in Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

GWA requests a revisit regarding philosophical direction and opinions with a motion to proceed with Village of Glen Ellyn and Village of Lombard requirements if EOC discussion warrants.

Mr. Lanphier explained that this is different company seeking permission to install a monopole which will serve as a cell phone tower in the same location on GWA property as the company who had approached GWA last year however a reduced size of 30' x 30' is.

Mr. Lanphier explained that the goal of this is to receive permission for the EOC Committee to continue with the approval process and contract negotiations with each of the villages. Mr. Lanphier explained that the previous company, Clear Wire, experienced management staffing changes as well as some economic issues, which prevented them from pursuing the tower. Mr. Lanphier added that the arrangement with AT&T Mobility would allow for additional cellular providers to sign lease agreements with GWA and generate additional revenue.

Mr. Sexton asked if the item will come back to the EOC Committee for final approval. Mr. Lanphier advised that final approvals will come through each of the villages, Glen Ellyn will have to approve the lease agreement while Lombard will have to give building and zoning approval but that he would bring it the matter back to the EOC Committee and provide a status report.

Mr. Goldsmith inquired as to how many co-locates was anticipated for this tower. Mr. Lanphier indicated that there could be at least three (3) additional carriers.

Mr. Goldsmith moved and Mr. Burghard seconded the motion: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Minix responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

8. Proposed change to the recommended EOC IGA SRI Lift Station & Sunnyside Lift Station.

The SRI Lift Station was a part of the Facilities Improvement Project (FIP2) which began in 1988 and was completed somewhere in the early 1990's. I recommend this lift station stay assigned to the GWA account 270 for operations and account 40 for Capital since the attached Strand Engineers executive summary indicates the lift station was the highest ranked alternative to protect the SRI from wet weather flows created by the larger interceptors (NRI and 22nd Street Interceptor) that were causing flow metering discrepancies, and sanitary sewer overflows (SSO's). The SRI Lift Station also added a potential for odor reduction.

GWA will not present a motion on this item due to the sensitive nature of the discussion. The EOC motion will be left up to one of the representatives from either village.

Mr. Lanphier explained that this item is a follow-up after a meeting between GWA and Mr. Goldsmith per Mr. Hulseberg request at the February EOC Committee meeting to determine if the SRI Lift Station should be considered sole Village of Glen Ellyn cost centers or if they should be considered part of GWA included Division 270 and Capital Division 40 cost centers based on an engineer's report he had previously supplied to Mr. Hulseberg and Mr. Goldsmith for review which explained the purpose of building the lift station as a GWA need and not an Illinois American need which is serviced by the SRI.

Mr. Minix stated that he agreed with Mr. Lanphier's assessment of the engineering report that supported the building of the SRI and Sunnyside lift stations and that they do not solely benefit users from a particular village. Mr. Minix added that the two (2) stations are vital to protecting the main GWA plant, are on the plant property and therefore, concurs with Mr. Lanphier that the financial responsibility should be shared by both villages.

Mr. Goldsmith indicated that he had not had the opportunity to go back with the information for the meeting he had with Mr. Lanphier and Mr. Minix and present it to Mr. Hulseberg, therefore, he would like to request the topic be tabled until the next meeting allowing him the opportunity and time to discuss the information with Mr. Hulseberg and engineering staff and prepare their response especially as there are no projects pending at either of the locations.

Mr. Minix asked Mr. Goldsmith if he proposed going ahead with the proposed IGA as it is currently configured. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that since the IGA revisions have been in process for more than a year, proceeding as it is currently configured involves a minimal amount of funds in terms of the operation and no capital improvement plans are currently in the works for either lift station. Mr. Goldsmith again stated the delay on

resolving this particular issue was so that the Village of Lombard can properly review and consult with their staff to make a decision.

Mr. Minix asked about delaying the IGA approval. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that delaying that IGA is a decision that goes beyond the EOC Committee.

Mr. Burghard indicated that the Village of Glen Ellyn should respect the request by the Village of Lombard to gather additional information and does not object to their request, however he is not speaking on behalf of the elected officials from Glen Ellyn.

Trustee Thorsell indicated that her only concern was if it is determined that changes need to be made to the IGA they would not be made until the next Full Board meeting in April 2012. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that things proceed with the current IGA proposal, then that is correct.

Mr. Goldsmith motioned that this item be delayed until the next EOC Committee meeting to allow the Village of Lombard additional time to review the materials submitted by Mr. Lanphier by their staff.

Mr. Burghard moved and Mr. Hartweg seconded motion: The members responded unanimously to a verbal call of "Aye". The motion carried.

9. GWA Annual Meeting Draft Agenda and Minutes from the 2010 meeting

The Annual meeting of the Glenbard Wastewater Authority is scheduled for Thursday, April 21, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. in Community Room at the Village of Lombard Civic Center. A proposed Agenda and minutes from the 2010 Annual Meeting are attached for review.

Motion the EOC approve the proposed Agenda and 2010 Minutes as prepared for the scheduled April 21, 2011 Meeting of the GWA Board.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that there will be some modification to the agenda as a few additional changes to the budget resulted in numerical changes. Mr. Lanphier indicated that under Agenda Item #8, the Operations and Maintenance number will be changed to \$4,149,500 and the total number for the budget will be \$7,463,500.

Trustee Thorsell asked why if the meeting was held at the Village of Lombard the previous year and should it not be held in Glen Ellyn this year. Mr. Burghard indicated that he and Mr. Hulseberg had discussed Lombard hosting the meeting again as their regularly scheduled Village board meeting is scheduled for the same evening immediately following the GWA Full Board meeting.

Mr. Mueller indicated that as he was reviewing the current IGA for a different reason he realized that the somehow the leadership of the EOC Committee has gotten off track, in that the IGA specifically states that the President for the Village of Lombard will lead the EOC Committee in even numbered fiscal years and Glen Ellyn's President will lead in odd numbered fiscal years and somehow the leadership has gotten off sync and will need to be adhered to in the future.

Mr. Mueller asked if there were any Committee members who would be stepping down. Mr. Lanphier indicated that Ms. Thorsell's term as Trustee will expire on May 1st and she will be leaving the Committee as a result. Mr. Lanphier indicated GWA will have a farewell gift ready for presentation at the Full Board meeting in April.

Mr. Hartweg moved and Mr. Gron seconded the motion: The members responded unanimously to a verbal call of "Aye". The motion carried.

10. Auditor Contract Renewal

Wolf & Company LLP was selected as the Authority's auditor as a result of an RFP conducted in the spring of 2010. Their proposal was for a five year period, with annual renewal by the EOC. Proposal fees were \$12,440, \$12,700, \$12,900, \$13,200 and \$13,500 annually for audit services for the fiscal years ending on April 30, 2010 through 2014.

A Single Audit Report may be required to comply with the terms of the low interest loan from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency to fund the new digester. This loan is funded in part with Federal dollars and necessitates additional detailed audit procedures. The cost for this added service is \$2,200.

Motion to approve the award of independent audit services for the Authority's fiscal year ending April 30, 2011 including the fees for a Single Audit Report, at a cost not to exceed \$14,900 as identified in the Proposal for Auditing Services dated February 5, 2010 by Wolf & Company LLP.

Mr. Noller indicated that approval for the second year of a five year agreement with Wolf & Company for auditing services is being requested. Mr. Noller added that there may be a need for a single audit depending on whether or not additional reimbursement requests are submitted to the IEPA in regards to the digester project loan.

Mr. Sexton clarified that the single audit will only come into play if funds are received in the fiscal year. Mr. Noller agreed.

Mr. Hartweg moved and Mr. Gron seconded the motion: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Minix responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

11. FY12 Draft Budget

The EOC is asked to recommend the approval of the FY2012 Budget to the board at the scheduled Annual Board Meeting to be held April 21, 2011 in Lombard.

Motion the EOC recommend to the GWA Board for approval the proposed FY12 Annual Budget for the Operation, Maintenance and Capital Improvements for all GWA Facilities for a total amount of \$7,478,500

Mr. Lanphier indicated that sheets reflecting additional changes were being distributed.

Mr. Sexton asked Mr. Lanphier if it would be possible to table this agenda item to the April EOC Committee meeting as Mr. Sexton, Mr. Hulseberg and Mr. Goldsmith found some errors that may or may not have been caught by the changes and wanted to review them with Mr. Lanphier.

Mr. Sexton motioned the approval of the FY2012 budget be delayed until the April EOC Committee meeting on April 14, 2011 as additional review is still needed.

Mr. Burghard asked what would happen if some reason the EOC Committee does not approve the budget and the fiscal year expires. Mr. Sexton indicated that there is really no option in not approving the budget. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that one of the issues that Lombard staff have is inconsistency in the presentation of the information and not so much the actual budget and asked is some sort of allocation schedule for liability insurance, personnel, . Mr. Burghard sought further clarification on the approval process. Ms. Thorsell advised that the EOC Committee will be represented with the final budget at the April 14th meeting; the EOC Committee will then approve it for presentation to the Full Board on at the April 21st meeting.

Ms. Thorsell mentioned that during a meeting she had with representatives from DuPage County one of the line items they expressed a concern about was the cost of energy at the plant and felt that the high costs indicated there is a problem somewhere and did not elaborate on what could be the cause. Mr. Mueller asked why the County was questioning costs at GWA and asked if GWA was mentioned specifically. Ms. Thorsell indicated that they did as she was having a conversation with them about GWA and during the conversation they specifically indicated that the expense on electrical power is how and she was curious as to why they would have specifically mentioned this particular line item and wonder if there were any efficiencies that could be implemented to help realize savings. Mr. Lanphier indicated that there are capital improvements that can be done to improve efficiency. Mr. Lanphier explained that in the 1970's GWA opted to install and utilize a HPO system, high purity oxygen process which consists of 500hp motors on the unox deck which creates a high demand for electric. Mr. Gary Scott indicated that GWA is the only plant in Illinois to utilize the HPO system and therefore, an apples to apples comparison with the County and their costs is not logical. Mr. Lanphier added that GWA does not have the personnel costs as most plants since converting to a SCADA system which allows the plant to operate with staff being present overnight unlike the County locations. Mr. Lanphier also stated that GWA has the Lombard facility which only comes online during high flow events which depending on how often the plant needs to operate in directing flow to GWA, the costs could vary substantially from year to year. Mr. Lanphier advised that due the CLR Rider program with ComEd, GWA did receive a check for \$102,000 which will offset the electrical costs somewhat, but in FY 2012 the anticipated Rider payout is expected to be only \$58,000 so the budget for electrical needed to be increased to offset the difference.

Mr. Sexton moved and Mr. Goldsmith seconded the motion: Ms. Thorsell, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Gron, Mr. Burghard, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Goldsmith and Mr. Minix responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

Mr. Mueller asked Ms. Thorsell why she was talking with DuPage County about GWA, as he was concerned as to why.

Ms. Thorsell indicated that it was during a general conversation about how they run their plants and the County was one of several facilities she contacted and posed the general question to.

12. Other Business

12.1 Submittal of the Annual Biosolids Report to the EPA and the IEPA

12.2 Submittal of the GWA Permit Renewal to the IEPA

Mr. Lanphier indicated that the Annual report was completed and distributed to the appropriate agencies and that the NPDES permit application was submitted. Mr. Lanphier indicated that while reviewing the permit application it discovered that the Acute Toxicity testing required had not been done while he was out for his surgery last year. Mr. Lanphier stated that he contacted the IEPA and asked how to rectify the problem. Mr. Lanphier advised that GWA would be completing the necessary testing over the next four (4) months. Mr. Lanphier explained that the testing involves shipping samples from GWA's effluent to a designated lab where they place minnows into the sample, based on the number of days they live and how they act in the sample, determines pass fail; GWA passed the first (1st) month and is confident the remaining three (3) tests will go just as well.

Mr. Lanphier added that so far phosphorus limits have not yet been adopted in Illinois, however at a governmental affairs conference he attended in Wisconsin, which is one of the first states to adopted phosphorus limits, the EPA is giving the state three (3) NPDES permit cycles to bring themselves into compliance with the stringent guidelines which equates for fifteen years to allow for engineering and budgeting to be addressed. Mr. Lanphier advised that for GWA to meet the requirements being discussed for biological phosphorus removal would be a substantial investment of funds.

Mr. Lanphier indicated that he is working to complete the Lombard CSO permit and anticipates it being sent off before the end of March.

Mr. Lanphier advised that the Lombard CSO project is being prepared to bid. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the bid notice is scheduled for publication on March 17th and 24th, with the bid opening scheduled for April 5th at the Village of Glen Ellyn Civic Center with substantial completion slated for October and final completion in November of this year. Mr. Lanphier stated that the work being bid is updating some of the site lighting, repairing the clarifier troughs, lagoon trapezoidal channel and outfall monitoring to provide how high and how quickly the lagoon levels are rising and if the river is rising faster than the lagoons as to indicated infiltration of the lagoons by the DuPage River.

Mr. Mueller asked if GWA was being impacted by the removal of the damn from Churchhill Woods. Mr. Lanphier indicated in his discussions with the Conservation Foundation, the lead engineer and the project manager for the removal, the expressed

there were minimal concerns about what is happening downstream and their main concern is what is happening with Churchhill Woods. Mr. Burghard asked if “minimal concerns” was a polite way of saying they did not care. Mr. Lanphier stated that based on the impact studies they completed any concerns regarding negative impact downstream is minimal.

Mr. Mueller asked Mr. Lanphier if he was comfortable with the situation as it pertains to GWA. Mr. Lanphier replied he was.

- 13. Next EOC Meeting** – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting will be on **Thursday, April 14, 2011 at 8:00 a.m. at the Glenbard Plant.**

The Annual Board Meeting will be held in the Community Room at Lombard Village Hall on Thursday, April 21, 2011. Dinner will be provided at 5:30 p.m. followed by the meeting which needs to be concluded by 7:20 p.m. due to a regularly scheduled Village of Lombard Board meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Minix moved to adjourn the March 10, 2011 EOC Meeting and Mr. Gron seconded the motion. The members responded unanimously to a verbal call of “Aye”. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:18 a.m.

Submitted by:

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Administrative Secretary