

Water & Sewer Minutes 3/17/2008

Commission should not have to go back to Weston & Sampson. Ms. Dam: They have made their recommendation; if we can move forward and assure there won't be contamination; come up with a plan to discuss at our next meeting. She does not agree with Weston & Sampson. Ms. McKissick wants to move forward.

Mr. Gagner made motion we grant the church permission to go ahead and connect to the 8" pipe for fire suppression purposes only, subject to the approval of the Town of Southbridge but not our own engineering firm. Seconded by Ms. McKissick. Ms. McKissick and Mr. Gagner said yes; Ms. Dam was opposed and stated that she was not opposed to water for the church, but felt that our engineering firm should still be involved. Motion passed.

Ms. Dam was directed to work with Mr. DiBasie and Father Bob to contact the Town of Southbridge.

7:55 p.m. The OPM issue was presented to everyone. Mr. Gagner was not in attendance when she presented it. Ms. Dam explained she had sent a letter to the Attorney General. We're moving our RBC's outside and not touching our building. I believe we do not fall under the OPM procurement laws.

Ms. Dam sent scope of work out to 7 engineering firms. We got 3 responses. Ms. Dam recommended that a peer review of the design be conducted; and felt that \$28,000 would cover this. Mr. Gagner was not at the last meeting. Mr. Gagner wants more information. Mr. Gagner: good reasons why we should not go out to bid and that Tighe & Bond will do a good job. Ms. McKissick: need to get this moving. Mr. Gagner does not want to spend \$28,000 if unnecessary. He would like to think about it. Ms. McKissick mentioned Mr. McIntire had asked why we would spending \$28,000 to review something that was already reviewed by Tighe & Bond.

Ms. Dam explained that she had spoken with the Attorney General and the Inspector General. When you have a project like this it is suggested that a peer review be done. Ms. Dam made a motion that we have the peer review of the design. Ms. McKissick seconded the motion; Mr. Gagner: no; Ms. Dam: yes; Ms. McKissick: no – motion failed.

Ms. Dam moved that we reduce the sewer user line item by \$59,000 from retained earnings; seconded by Ms. McKissick; unanimous.

Mr. Gagner made motion that we do not accept the annual contract at a cost of \$1,200 for the Sensus support for our metering system. Seconded by Ms. McKissick; opposed by Ms. Dam. Motion passed.

Ms. Dam recommended that the Commission move forward as suggested by Weston & Sampson to go with the lowest bidder; seconded by Mr. Gagner; to award the interconnection instrumentation and telemetry equipment contract to the lowest bidder (\$58,700), I & C Systems Engineering of Scarborough, Maine; unanimous.

We originally submitted the revised cost estimate for DEP to include the rest of the money we had spent on borrowing for the water line; they had not moved forward; it's becoming a financial issue for the town; so we'd like to roll that into the long-term (approximately \$150,000) which was to finish the line several years ago and I want to include in there the flushing of the mains; they denied it last time because we needed to show movement. I would like permission to resubmit it with a letter stating what we have done; i.e., that we put it out to bid; hopefully they will roll it into the SRF funding.

Ms. Dam made a motion to resubmit the paperwork for the revised project cost estimate summary for the water; seconded by Mr. Gagner; unanimous.

The Commission received an interim letter from the Army Corps in response to a request forwarded to them by Ms. Dam in February.

Water Betterments: the last time when we voted, the letters were so different after reading the procurement bulletins. Ms. Dam recommended that we put out a scope of services and get the pricing to make sure it is right. Ms. Dam prepared the scope of work based on what the Commission needed. We need three prices. Mr. Gagner agreed. Ms. Dam made a motion that she be allowed to send out the scope of work to three qualified engineering firms for the water betterment assistance; seconded by Mr. Gagner; unanimous. Ms. Dam explained that this is less than \$25,000 – for that amount of money, you could just telephone people. It will go out to 3 or 4 firms. The highest price was \$15,000.

Water & Sewer Minutes 3/17/2008

There was an email sent out that there is an Open Meeting Law seminar at the Sturbridge Senior Center on Thursday April 24 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Ms. McKissick explained she had approved the \$28.00 expenditure for the Energy Seminar that Ms. Dam attended. Ms. Dam indicated that she received a tremendous amount of useful information. Ms. Dam has spoken with Tighe & Bond about the upgrade. She has started to put a spreadsheet together of energy use so it can be tracked. She met other wastewater people there who have found ways to save on energy. Mr. Gagner did not have any problems with her going except that it should have been brought before the Board. Mr. Gagner assumed that Ms. Dam was on the payroll for that day as an administrator. Mr. Gagner did not realize that Ms. Dam had asked the Chair. Ms. Dam did not have time as it was a last minute availability of space for her to go.

Prescription drugs at the Masonic Home: A letter was sent asking for their policy. New reports have shown that they can affect the ground water. We are hoping to get our commercial permitting program up and running—we have asked for material safety data sheets so that we know what is being put into the wastewater. We have asked for other things from companies; and you are aware of all the Woodard & Curran reports and the items that have failed.

Our next meeting date is going to be March 31.

Ms. Dam moved to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. McKissick; unanimous.

Adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McKissick

Date

John Elliott, Sr.

Date

Sandra Dam

Date

Paul Gagner

Date

James McIntire

Date

Administrator's Report for March 17, 2008

Training – Attended Energy Management Workshop for Wastewater Treatment Facilities – recommend instituting the Plan-Do-Check-Act approach as outlined in the manual – also recommend advising consultant designing upgrade to consider long term energy use costs in design

Meetings - Attended Dept Head meeting re: budget concerns and Insurance Advisory Committee meeting

Water Betterments – writing scope of services for RFP

OPM - Reviewed procurement laws, spoke with Attorney General and Inspector General's office, sent letter approved by Commission on March 3rd – recommend peer review only – suggest we reduce the line item from \$87,000 to \$28,000 for an engineering review of plans, and reduce the sewer user fee revenue account by \$59,000 and leave the expenditures from the retained earnings at the same level.

Minutes - Staff Transcribed minutes for Nov 19, February 25

Property Questions - Addressed all property information requests regarding sewer/water/meter/explanations and answered all email requests for same – met with engineers as requested

Grease Trap – 5 E – Report in folder, during pumping of wet well – grease entered through a sanitary line and not through the grease trap line – investigation ongoing

Water Budget – Operating budget moved to stabilization fund

Master Plan – previously supplied information as necessary and reviewed/corrected map

Material Safety Data Sheets sent letters requesting information from large users

Interconnection Facility Equipment and Telemetry Bid – worked with Weston and Sampson to finalize information needed to send out bid package

Interconnection Facility – reviewed information necessary and coordinated with Weston and Sampson for cost breakdown/procurement issues regarding DEP grant – grant date corrected new paperwork signed and mailed as requested by DEP

Office Report (period of 2/22/08 – 3/13/08)

Following meters given out: 100 Stafford Street, 63 Old Worcester Road, 4 Brookfield Road, 88 Stevens Park Road, 199 Sunset Drive, 56 Osgood Road, 17 S. Sturbridge Road, 68 N. Sturbridge Road, 31 Main Street; and updated meter data accordingly

Letters sent out regarding 6 City Depot Road and 132 Sturbridge Road requesting completion of commercial forms required prior to obtaining meters.

Letter sent enclosing change of billing address form for completion regarding 142 Worcester Road.

Telephone conversations with various persons at Verizon to request no late charges be assessed to us; fax received on March 4, 2008 advising a permanent late payment exclusion has been placed on our account.

Drain layer's license issued to Bud Webb, Webb Construction Co., Inc.

Entered meter transfers for 118 City Depot Road and 63 Old Worcester Road into the Vadar system: and prepared abatement warrants for these properties.

Preparation of miscellaneous invoices and warrants and copied all documents as requested.

AMENDMENT (page 1, paragraph 3)

If there is public water at that point, I don't think there will be that much of a call. Mr. Gagner did not see stagnation as an issue. **** Use of foot valves; and if there was a concern, you could continue the connection to the bathroom; use of a loop in the line.** I see no reason to hold you up anymore; hopefully Southbridge will be in agreement as well. Is this going to be a private line or have use by others on H. Putnam Road? Ms. Dam: dead ends are not recommended; eventually a loop should be constructed and given to the town. Mark: if resident A and resident B wanted to tap in, we would try to work together and resolve everybody's issues. Ms. McKissick asked about the use of water for firefighting. Ms. Dam stated that it is in the IMA that water used for firefighting would not affect the 100,000 gallons. Ms. McKissick suggested moving forward with Southbridge and felt that the

**removed by Commission vote