

GLENBARD WASTEWATER AUTHORITY

Executive Oversight Committee

MINUTES

Thursday, September 13, 2012

8:00 A.M.

Meeting will be held at the Glenbard Wastewater Plant

21 W 551 Bemis Rd, Glen Ellyn, IL

Members Present:

Mark Pfefferman	President, Village of Glen Ellyn
Phil Hartweg	Trustee, Village of Glen Ellyn
Bill Ware	Trustee, Village of Lombard
Mark Franz	Village Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
David Hulseberg	Village Manager, Village of Lombard
Julius Hansen	Public Works Director, Village of Glen Ellyn
Carl Goldsmith	Public Works Director, Village of Lombard

Others Present:

Erik Lanphier	Wastewater Manager, GWA
Richard Freeman	Sr. Plant Electrician, GWA
Gary Scott	Sr. Plant Maintenance Mechanic, GWA
David Goodalis	Sr. Plant Operator, GWA
Gayle Lendabarker	Administrative Secretary, GWA
Tim Sexton	Finance Director, Village of Glen Ellyn

1. Call to Order at 8:00 a.m.
2. Roll Call: Mr. Pfefferman, Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Ware, Mr. Hulseberg, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Goldsmith answered "Present". Mr. Franz arrived at 8:06 a.m. after roll call.

President Pfefferman asked that Agenda Item #5 to the third (3rd) order of business.

3. Moment of Silence to Honor the passing of the eternally respected Village of Lombard President / EOC Chairperson William (Bill) Mueller.
4. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Ware asked Mr. Pfefferman if, until Mr. Mueller vacancy is filled, only three (3) members from the Village of Glen Ellyn cast votes on items requiring Committee votes. Mr. Pfefferman asked for clarification if the request was for this particular meeting or beyond. Mr. Ware indicated that with all due respect to Mr. Mueller that the voting by only three members from the Village of Glen Ellyn should be in place until the Village of Lombard has a new village president. Mr. Pfefferman indicated that he did not foresee a problem with the request for this meeting only and asked what the by-laws governing the EOC Committee stipulated in cases of absences, with the understanding that this situation is not a typical absence.

Mr. Hulseberg advised that the president does not enjoy the right to appoint someone to fill their position or have a designate come, however, that was violated for many years by this group when the Village of Glen Ellyn did not send its president, but instead sent an alternate which the Village of Lombard recognized that alternate. Mr. Hulseberg continued by stating that rather seeking to violate the agreement, feels that the request made by Mr. Ware was simply that Glen Ellyn would honor a three (3) person rule. Mr. Pfefferman indicated he was merely seeking clarification as to what the rule is so that call can be aware. Mr. Hulseberg advised the IGA says that the president cannot send a

designate so either the president shows up or he does not show. Mr. Pfefferman asked if when Trustee Thorsell served on the EOC Committee at his request was meeting protocol. Mr. Hulseberg advised it was not. Mr. Pfefferman asked for clarification as to what the protocol is in this situation. Mr. Hulseberg reiterated that since the Village of Lombard does not have a president, they cannot appoint a designate, therefore, they do not have a fourth (4th) vote. Mr. Pfefferman asked if it was a little different from when Mr. Gron came in Mr. Ware's place. Mr. Ware explained that Mr. Gron is his designated alternate since he is the liaison for Public Works for the Village of Lombard.

*Mr. Pfefferman clarified that he is **not** taking issue with the request but simply trying to get clarification on the rules regarding who can and cannot have a designate. Mr. Hulseberg stated that all EOC Committee members can have a designate except for the village presidents. Mr. Hulseberg added that when the EOC Committee was working to amend the IGA this was one of the items that was going to be addressed.*

*Mr. Pfefferman indicated **he** was in agreement for this meeting however, it does not sound as if in the IGA it stipulates that this is to be the standard for future meetings. Mr. Hulseberg advised that the Code for the Village of Lombard does not allow for the a Pro-Tem to step in if there is a vacancy in office therefore the six (6) trustees must come together and pick one from amongst them to fill the position of village president, since this effort failed at the last board meeting, the board meetings are ran by a chairman at each meeting until a replacement is selected.*

Mr. Pfefferman agreed to not cast any votes at today's meeting but he would like an opinion before the next meeting. Mr. Hulseberg indicated he did not feel a need for a legal opinion in that the Village of Glen Ellyn members are entitled to cast their votes, but the Village of Lombard does not enjoy that same luxury and is requesting that under the circumstances and out of respect, that Mr. Pfefferman not cast any votes. Mr. Pfefferman indicated a consultation on the matter would not hurt in an effort to insure protocol is being followed.

8:06 a.m. Mr. Franz arrived and requested that he be brought up to speed on the current discussion. Mr. Pfefferman summarized the request for him to refrain from voting out of respect to the vacancy within the representatives from the Village of Lombard, and that we was asking for a consultation with legal counsel to clarify how the matter should be handled going forward.

5. Public Comment

6. Consent Agenda

Mr. Hulseberg motioned and Mr. Goldsmith seconded the MOTION that the following items on the Consent Agenda be approved with the removal of item 6.2 from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Ware, Mr. Franz, Hulseberg, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Aye" during a roll vote. The motion carried.

6.1 Minutes from the August 9, 2012 EOC Meeting

Mr. Hulseberg requested that all of the notes from discussions which took place after 8:23 a.m. when there was no longer a quorum which appear in the minutes from the

August 9, 2012 meeting be stricken from the minutes and placed in a different document if desired. It was agreed by general consensus that these notes would be removed and submitted as a separate document.

6.2 Vouchers previously reviewed by Trustee Hartweg

Mr. Hulseberg requested that on the vouchers, that the charge from vendor #958, Baxter & Woodman (B&W) on page eight (8) in the amount of \$3,770.00 be removed since he feels this charge should be the responsibility of the Village of Glen Ellyn and not GWA and feels that it was a decision made by the GWA Administrator to have B&W prepare a letter reviewing work done by Christopher Burke Associates, which the Village of Lombard hired at its own expense to review the work that was performed by B&W as part of a contract study which the Village of Lombard did not feel was sufficient and can very much akin this action to the time when Terry Burghard came to his office with Stewart Diamond and were having discussions about GWA and was serving two (2) roles those of legal counsel for the Village of Glen Ellyn and legal counsel for GWA; because here we are, the Village of Lombard trying to analyze work that was performed for its own purposes and benefits and the decision was made to go ahead and ask BW to review Burke's work, not to the benefit of the Village of Lombard at all, but rather for GWA and the Village of Glen Ellyn.

Mr. Hulseberg requests that the charge be struck and respectfully asks that the Village of Glen Ellyn make the payment. Mr. Franz stated he was in disagreement with the Mr. Hulseberg as the RFP for the B&W project was approved by the EOC Committee, the work was performed, there were four (4) main issues, a presentation was made before the EOC Committee, the Village of Lombard decided completely on their own and without any discussion with the EOC prior to do their own study. Mr. Franz went to add that the Burke study came back and made some comments regarding B&W's study and GWA staff believed that some of those issues had to be addressed and it was within the authority of the spending limits of the Director has and it the issues were looked into and responded to and it is part of the overall study that was conducted, questions were raised about the study that needed answers now everyone has those answers and disagrees wholeheartedly.

Mr. Pfefferman stated he understands this is hot issue, but asked the technical question to Mr. Lanphier if the charge falls within his spending authority. Mr. Lanphier answered that it does. Mr. Pfefferman indicated that is the charge is within Mr. Lanphier's spending authority then the EOC Committee cannot pick and choose what he purchases.

Mr. Hulseberg stated that the other problem we run into is that the Village of Lombard does not enjoy the opportunity to critique the Executive Director's performance or make any other comments, so he is having to take it at this forum right now and say that his judgment was a wrong judgment and was inappropriate and finds it to be more of a one sided discussion that continues to happen, in his point of view, that he does not feel the Village of Lombard is fully represented by the Executive Director and that he tends to go ahead and represent the views of the Village of Glen Ellyn on many, many occasions and that is unfortunate for the Village of Lombard.

Mr. Pfefferman acknowledged Mr. Hulseberg point of view but the item on the table is approval of the vouchers, which if Mr. Hulseberg wanted to motion be removed from the

Consent Agenda, he was welcomed to do so. Mr. Hulseberg stated he was going to defer to the Village of Lombard's Trustee representative.

*Mr. Ware indicated he would be happy to request that the vouchers be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately. **Please note, there was no formal motion, second or vote to remove item 6.2 Approval of Vouchers from the Consent Agenda for approval separately.***

Mr. Pfefferman indicated that the other issue is a bigger issue which can be discussed under the heading other business. Mr. Pfefferman continued by adding that the job of the EOC Committee is to overseeing the Glenbard Wastewater Authority and it is not, even though everyone has their own hats, it is not a separation of Glen Ellyn and Lombard, it is to support and oversee the GWA; does that include criticism, absolutely so if there are issues, let's get them on the table and talk about them, but it is not Glen Ellyn and Lombard it is the Glenbard Wastewater Authority and he thinks everyone has to wear that hat when they come into the meeting.

Mr. Hulseberg suggested that since the item is not on the agenda that it be placed on the next meeting's agenda so the discussion can take place.

Mr. Franz asked what topic was going to be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Hulseberg explained that the suggestion was to discuss the Executive Director and Lombard's general feelings on whether we are being represented and being given information when things are happening and since it is not on the agenda, we cannot discuss it today!

Mr. Pfefferman asked what the rules governing the calling an emergency Executive Session without it appearing on the agenda are. Mr. Franz indicated that there were some specific guidelines or criteria that the circumstances must fall under. Mr. Pfefferman requested that the question be posed to legal counsel as well.

Mr. Pfefferman called for a motion to approve the vouchers.

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Hansen seconded the MOTION to approve the Consent Agenda Item 6.2 Vouchers.

Mr. Hulseberg motioned and Mr. Ware seconded the MOTION to amend the motion to approve all of the vouchers with the exception of the payment to vendor #958 B&W in the amount of \$3,770.00 on page 8 of the Vouchers report dated August 31, 2012. Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Ware Mr. Hulseberg and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Aye" during a roll vote. Mr. Franz and Mr. Hansen responded Nay. The motion carried.

Mr. Franz made a request to Mr. Lanphier to provide details outlining the work performed that is associated with the B&W voucher in question and that the item be placed on the agenda for the October meeting for further discussion.

Mr. Goldsmith motioned and Mr. Ware seconded the MOTION to approve item 6.2 as amended in the previous motion. Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Ware, Mr. Franz, Mr.

Hulseberg, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Goldsmith responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

6.3 Oxygen System Upgrade Project Award Cancellation

Glenbard Wastewater Authority would like the EOC to withdraw the authorization to proceed with M2T as the contractor for the Oxygen System Upgrade Project for the amount of \$157,000. Sludge Density Meter Purchase Request

6.4 The Glenbard Wastewater Authority’s main treatment facility on Bemis Road co-mingles secondary waste activated sludge along with primary sludge in a gravity thickened clarifier and then pumps this co-mingled product on a timed basis, over a twenty-four hour period to two Primary anaerobic digesters. The current percent solids of this co-mingled sludge feed are typically between 1-1.5 %. Each of these two digesters is heated via two 1.5 million BTU boilers to maintain a temperature of 96 degrees F. In an effort to reduce the water content, thus increase the percent solids of this pumped sludge, GWA has researched instrumentation on the market to accurately measure and control the solids density of this pumping stream. By effectively controlling the percent solids fed to each of the two digesters we can greatly reduce the gas utilization of the boilers, reduce subsequent solids dewatering costs, and maintain proper digester chemistry. GWA’s electrical team has completed the research and onsite testing of solids density meters.

Our recommendation is to purchase the Toshiba LQ-500 at a cost of \$26,950 from JM Process Inc. of Orland Park, IL. Funds for the purchase of this unit have been included in the FY13 Capital Budget, Infrastructure Improvement Account 40-580140.

6.5 Unox Inlet Pipe Gallery Engineering Amendment #1 Notification

Glenbard Wastewater Authority is a two stage advanced wastewater treatment system. The first stage of the biological treatment process is intended to reduce the biological oxygen demand on the second stage process. GWA feels that with some slight modifications to the influent and effluent channels of the Carbonaceous and Nitrogenous stages we will gain flexibility to create a full capacity single stage treatment facility.

The cost for the design and construction services amendment provided by Baxter & Woodman is for a not to exceed cost of \$7,200. This price is based on estimated hourly services to be provided. If B&W are able to efficiently manage this amendment full utilization of the \$7,200 may be avoided.

Mr. Franz asked if Mr. Lanphier he knew what the cost savings might be with making this change. Mr. Lanphier indicated that this change will assist if GWA can successfully change from a double phase nitrification process to a single phase, which is currently being tested with the results of the testing being one of the determining factors of whether or not the change can be done without a negative impact on the remaining plant processes. Mr. Lanphier explained that Manusos would be constructing a channel wall that would aid in the creation of a chamber for the consolidation from a double stage to single stage. Mr. Lanphier indicated that if testing proves GWA can convert to the single phase process, one of the benefits would be the reduction by nearly half in the size of the project to replace the screw pump system which had a catastrophic failure last year, and

the system would not be treating flow twice as it currently does so there would residual long-term savings as well in areas such as electrical costs. Mr. Lanphier added that in addition this will assist with GWA being prepared for the phosphorus and nitrogen removal processes that the IEPA will be mandating in the next ten (10) to fifteen (15) years.

7. NRI/SRI Televising Contract Award

The NRI/SRI Sanitary Sewer Televising Project was based on numerous discussions at the EOC level over the past few years regarding shared projects or projects that can be combined as a potential cost savings measure involving GWA and the two member Villages. Baxter & Woodman was instructed to include Glen Ellyn with our NRI/SRI Televising Project in an effort to accomplish savings per linear foot. The length of sewer GWA was looking at televising is 29,005 feet. Glen Ellyn added another 20,490 feet for a total 49,495 linear feet of pipe ranging in size from 8” to 66”. What we found through the bidding process is that GWA’s trunk sewer and VGE’s collection sewer do not make for the best combined televising bidding opportunity.

Motion the EOC to award Pipe-View LLC of Bartlett, IL the NRI/SRI Televising Project in the amount of \$40,316.95 to be invoiced as follows:

272-520970 Maintenance Piping & Grounds– \$28,849.45

273-520970 Maintenance Piping & Grounds - \$11,467.50

Mr. Lanphier advised that the bidding process was a bidding experiment with the Village of Glen Ellyn to see if any costs could be utilized by combining the lineal footage of both entities. Mr. Lanphier indicated that the results show there was not much benefit to GWA by adding the footage to the Village of Glen Ellyn’s. However, the Village did see a slight savings by combining the two (2) entities.

Mr. Hulseberg motioned and Mr. Goldsmith seconded the motion to award Pipe-View LLC of Bartlett, IL the NRI/SRI Televising project in the amount of \$40,316.95 to be invoiced as follows:

272-520970 Maintenance Piping and Grounds - \$28,849.45

273-520970 Maintenance Piping and Grounds - \$11,467.50

Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Ware, Mr. Franz, Mr. Hulseberg, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Goldsmith responded “Aye” during a roll vote. The motion carried.

Mr. Hulseberg commented that it was a good effort to try and take advantage of any savings. Mr. Pfefferman agreed and indicated that efforts to combine all three (3) entities on similar projects to try and realize cost savings across the board should be kept up.

Mr. Goldsmith indicated that when the Village of Lombard had sought to include GWA’s system into their bidding process he encountered some issues questions from prospective vendors concerning access to GWA’s lines and asked if the same issues were going to be encountered with this contractor. Mr. Lanphier explained that Pipe View came out, walked the lines, measured the manholes and determined that their equipment is the appropriate size for the job and do not foresee any problems accessing the lines and have sufficient quantity of televising cable to handle the project which is the different between Pipe-View and their competitor and gives them the edge

up for this particular work; however, when it gets to the traditional collection systems, they do not have the equipment or the edge up in that situation.

Mr. Hansen added that the cleaning guidelines outlined in the contract by the Village of Glen Ellyn, was to clean the sewers, with no specification as to medium or heavy cleaning, just the generic term of cleaning and he was surprised to see that National Power Rodding was going to commit to the price they did not knowing exactly how dirty the pipes may be and wondering if the Village of Lombard used the same generic terminology. Mr. Goldsmith indicated that the Village of Lombard does not specific the type of cleaning to be done and received very comparable pricing to what GWA and the Village of Glen Ellyn received for the same type of work.

8. Other Business

8.1 Strand Intermediate Pump Station Final Report

Mr. Lanphier indicated that the bottom line is he merely wanted to keep the EOC Committee advised as to the project since it is a big project that was unexpected that had not been planned for in the twenty (20) year replacement plan, it was something that unexpectedly showed up on the plate last year and this evaluation identified three (3) different ways to upgrade the pumping station. Mr. Lanphier summarized that the evaluation by stating that the evaluation provides for the Owner to make the choice from the three (3) as the impact of choosing one format over another is really to GWA staff in the form of on-going maintenance of the equipment. Mr. Lanphier explained that screw pump system requires confined space entries to perform routine O&M work on the equipment, while a pre-rotation system would not. Mr. Lanphier added that since the mid 1990's, staff has encountered ongoing maintenance issues and concerns with the lower bearings on the existing equipment and hopes that other options may present a solution to the problems and concerns staff has encountered.

Mr. Hulseberg asked what other treatment facilities have transitioned from a screw pump system to a pre-rotation pump system. Mr. Lanphier explained that the West Chicago facility is currently using this type of system and they have been using this technology for approximately ten (10) years now. Mr. Lanphier indicated that if staff is successful in changing the overall process to single stage from the current double state, GWA could realize a savings of approximately fifty percent (50%) on the cost of the project. Mr. Lanphier advised that staff is continuing to

references from out of state facilities that are using the technology.

Mr. Hulseberg asked Mr. Lanphier when he anticipated looking at making the transition. Mr. Lanphier advised that until the single stage testing is complete, a decision cannot be made as the results of the testing will help determine if a process change can be instituted or not; which if it can, will result in a reduction in the design parameters by nearly fifty (50%), thereby reducing the costs of the project by the same amount.

Mr. Hulseberg commented that in the long-term the change will save GWA in terms of operations and maintenance expenses. Mr. Lanphier agreed with Mr. Hulseberg's comment.

Mr. Franz asked if the second option evaluated would be cost effective. Mr. Lanphier advised that at this point in time the decision is hard to say until the single stage testing is complete a decision either way cannot be made.

8.2 GWA NACWA Gold Award Received

Mr. Lanphier explained that he had advised the EOC Committee that GWA had received the award last month and the official certificate finally arrived. Mr. Lanphier added that the award a recognition nationwide of GWA's effective management of the plant's operations to go without any NPDES permit violations.

Mr. Pfefferman asked if any news agencies picked up the award press release. Mr. Lanphier indicated that he had not been contacted by agencies looking for additional information on the story.

Mr. Franz asked how many plants in Illinois receive this award. Mr. Lanphier advised that close to a dozen and the longer the plant goes without any violations the higher the award as the next tier is Platinum and it a large factor in consideration is the type of receiving stream each facility discharges their effluent into after treatment as well as their permit requirements.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if Mr. Lanphier was involved in funding strategies that the DuPage Salt Creek River

Workgroup is currently working on. Mr. Lanphier indicated that Mr. Gorman has been forwarding him some information but he is not aware of any in depth particulars on the topic. Mr. Goldsmith advised he will ask Mr. Gorman to Mr. Lanphier on all future correspondence he distributes with any type of updates.

8.3 Baxter & Woodman Asset Analysis Alternative Funding Study Discussion

Mr. Lanphier indicated that this item is a follow-up from the August meeting wherein Mr. Pfefferman asked that the item be placed on the agenda for discussion by the EOC Committee.

After much discussion, the following motions and amended motions were made and voted on:

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Hansen seconded the motion to Amend Mr. Hulseberg's motion to accept the Baxter & Woodman Asset Analysis Alternative Fundy Study in its entirety except for the references to the rolling averages being changed from five (5) year evaluation to three (3) years.

Mr. Franz indicated that his motion is intended to accept the B&W study with the recommended fifty/fifty split of all administrative costs, which is not in the Village of Glen Ellyn's best interest, and does so without consulting with Mr. Hansen, Mr. Pfefferman or the Board for the Village of Glen Ellyn, but feels the comprise is worth it if it allows the EOC Committee to start moving forward from the stalled position it currently is in.

Mr. Hulseberg asked what the dollar amount associated with the Administrative split recommendation. Mr. Franz indicated it was approximately \$6,000 which is close to the amount Mr. Hulseberg is holding point with the current budget format. Mr. Hulseberg indicated it was a lot more \$6,000. Mr. Franz indicated that the Village of Lombard's concern that the flow will change drastically in the future is not supported.

Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Franz, Mr. Hansen responded "Aye" during a roll vote. Mr. Ware, Mr. Hulseberg and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Nay". The motion failed to pass.

Mr. Hulseberg motioned and Mr. Ware seconded the motion to amend Mr. Franz's motion to accept the Baxter & Woodman Asset Analysis Alternative Fundy Study with the striking of references to the capital component specific to flow only; with their ten (10) year rolling average be changed to a three (3) year rolling average, and with a reserve account to be established.

Mr. Ware, Mr. Hulseberg, and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Aye" during a roll vote. Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Franz, Mr. Hansen responded "Nay". The motion failed to pass.

Mr. Franz motioned and Mr. Hansen seconded the motion to accept the Baxter & Woodman Asset Analysis Alternative Funding study's recommendations for funding the Glenbard Wastewater Authority in its entirety.

Mr. Hartweg, Mr. Franz and Mr. Hansen responded "Aye" during a roll vote. Mr. Ware, Mr. Hulseberg, and Mr. Goldsmith responded "Nay". The motion failed to pass.

Further discussions occurred regarding the ongoing discussions on how to resolve the current impasse and reverting back to the 1998 agreement and the ways in which it is being interpreted.

Mr. Pfefferman summarized that he feels the brain power of those around the table and the spirit of cooperation, despite the disagreements, is very high and wonders if mediation might be the best possible solution to the impasse the EOC Committee seems to be at. Mr. Pfefferman posed the question as to how the EOC Committee gets out of the position it currently finds itself in.

Mr. Hulseberg stated that he is obligated to go back to his Village Board. Mr. Pfefferman asked what action was he going to present or discuss with his Village Board, understanding that the Village Board can discuss anything. Mr. Hulseberg indicated that he would be seeking guidance on the direction his Village Board wishes to proceed in.

Mr. Ware clarified that he believes Mr. Hulseberg will come to the Village Board, explain the situation and ask how the members wish to proceed, stand pat with its current decision or become open to making some compromises.

Mr. Pfefferman summarized that the discussion is being tabled for a month until both Village Managers can discuss the matter with their respective Village Boards and bring the results of the discussions back to the EOC Committee meeting.

Mr. Pfefferman asked the EOC Committee members to think of possible solutions to the impasse they are at and submit any ideas to him in the coming weeks. Mr. Pfefferman asked that if anyone needed any information to ask for it in the coming week as there is plenty that has already been distributed.

Mr. Pfefferman asked Mr. Hulseberg to craft the agenda item he wishes to see on the agenda next month whether it be a performance item wherein an Executive Session is required or an open comment item, within the next few weeks as well.

8.4 Propose rescheduling the October EOC meeting for October 18, 2012.

Mr. Lanphier explained that he will be out of town the first week of October and unable to prepare an EOC Packet in time for the regularly schedule October 11, 2012 EOC Committee meeting and kindly requests moving the meeting to October 18, 2012 if everyone's schedule permits. Due to conflicts, the EOC Committee agreed to move the October meeting to October, 22, 2012. The time and place will remain 8:00 a.m. at the Glenbard Plant.

Mr. Franz did request a meeting with Mr. Hulseberg, Mr. Lanphier and himself to sit down and review some of the issues. Mr. Franz indicated that he would like to meet after Mr. Hulseberg has had an opportunity to discuss the situation with his Village Board. A tentative meeting date of October 11, 2012 at 8:00 a.m. was agreed to.

12. Next EOC Meeting – The next regularly scheduled EOC Meeting will be on **Thursday, October 11, 2012 at 8:00 a.m. at the Glenbard Plant.**

Mr. Hulseberg moved to adjourn the September 13, 2012 EOC meeting and Mr. Ware seconded the motion. The members responded unanimously to a verbal call of “Aye”. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

Submitted by:

Gayle A. Lendabarker
GWA Administrative Secretary