

# WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER BASIN PROGRAM

## ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

**February 18, 2016 – Belmont Corner Meeting House**

**Members Present:** The meeting was called to order by Brian Sullivan (Franklin), Chair, at 9:05 am. Sharon McMillin (DES), Jeanne Beaudin (Belmont), Steve Dolloff (Meredith), Peter Nourse (Gilford), Ray Korber (Bay District), Paul Moynihan (Laconia), and Glen Brown (Northfield) were present at that time. Charlie Smith (Sanbornton) arrived at 9:10 am. **Visitor:** Mia Gagliani (Gilford)

**Minutes:** Paul moved, seconded by Jeanne, to approve the minutes for January 21, 2016, as amended. The motion passed.

**Monthly Summary Report:** Sharon McMillin provided the following updates based on the *Monthly Summary Report* for January 2016 as previously submitted to the Advisory Board.

- Franklin WWTP electrical switchgear replacement – Substantial completion was achieved on January 27, 2016. The punch list items pending (as of this date) have a value of \$11,900. WRBP staff is pleased with the work Ewing has done on this project and with the outcome to date.
- Flow metering verification services – Additional information was requested from WRBP by Wright-Pierce (i.e. pumping tests to get pressures) and DES/WRBP staff is scheduling this work. Once Wright-Pierce (W-P) has evaluated all of the data as a whole, DES anticipates receiving recommendations from W-P to document where QA/QC can be improved to make it both more defensible and the information more understandable. It may also be used to make a couple of operating adjustments to improve accuracy (e.g. repositioning sensors to allow for wet well geometry used in some flow calculations).
- As-needed engineering and technical support services – DES' recommendations for W-P to complete the asset management and collection system tasks will be presented to the Advisory Board later in today's meeting.
- WRBP infrastructure ownership – Belmont and DES concur on the respective delineation of infrastructure responsibility. The WRBP met with Laconia and there are a couple of easements requiring further research. Laconia is planning to assist DES/WRBP staff with GIS base mapping efforts. A schedule for meeting with each community is being developed. Eventually, the DES would like to add GIS layers to the map for each member communities' collection system.
- Rate assessment formula: DES will continue to assist the Advisory Board in drafting a rate formula for consideration. The Advisory Board asked for this discussion item to be included on the April agenda, if Gene Forbes can attend.

Steve asked if the Monthly Summary Report should include AG's office and LSRs updates, so it would be easier for everybody to track what is going on with WRBP infrastructure ownership issues (i.e. support of the feasibility study) and progress being made in that regard. Sharon noted that there is already an item on the summary report for the ownership initiative and that the AG's office supports DES and WRBP; with the WRBP charged for their assistance. Jeanne recommended awaiting the outcome of the LSRs prior to asking for the AG's office's assistance, as WRBP does not yet have the use of the funding to even ask for their assistance for the study. Brian recommended revisiting this discussion at a future meeting.

**As-needed Engineering Support:** This item is on the agenda to discuss the DES recommendation for W-P to perform the asset management and collection system evaluation assistance task orders.

Handouts, which were provided by email prior to today's meeting:

- DES' letter to WRBP Advisory Board from the WRBP Administrator, titled *Recommendation to utilize Wright-Pierce for as-needed engineering for Asset Management and Collection System Evaluation Tasks*. Dated February 8, 2016
- Document drafted by W-P for WRBP, titled *Plan of Study – Combined Task 2 & 3 Preliminary Asset Management Program Development and Condition Assessment Planning for Winnepesaukee River Basin Program*. Dated February 8, 2016
- Document drafted by W-P for WRBP, titled *Exhibit A-1: Summary of Estimated Staff Effort (Hours) and Costs for As-Needed Engineering Services – Special Services Tasks, Winnepesaukee River Basin Program, Task Order 2 & 3 AM Program and CS Assessment Combined*. Dated February 8, 2016

Sharon explained that DES/WRBP staff has done their due diligence with regard to both firms and that Eugene concurred with the recommendation in the above-captioned letter. As explained in the letter, W-P demonstrated that they understand and are prepared to provide the scope of work that the WRBP requires; valuing the experience and expertise of WRBP staff so their work will provide value-added benefits and augment available WRBP resources. WRBP operations and collection system maintenance staff unanimously recommend W-P for the combined asset management and collection system evaluation task order.

One of the concerns DES/WRBP staff had with the Brown & Caldwell (B&C) scope for the asset management task order was the proposed open-ended, iterative process starting with a workshop, providing a cost for that, and then moving forward with no defined scope or budget. DES/WRBP staff was uncomfortable with this blank checkbook approach. B&C was given multiple opportunities to articulate the risks they were concerned about and to provide a more defined scope and budget. B&C chose not to pursue such an approach. W-P is going to provide a usable database populated to the level DES/WRBP staff has discussed, with a work order capability, inventory, and a preliminary condition assessment. It will also have the capability to add collection system information into the platform as it becomes available. Both firms were aware that the WRBP is going to do its own contracting for CCTV of the gravity sewers. DES/WRBP staff will need assistance identifying the best methods to assess the force mains considering the cost-benefits associated with investigations versus potential rehabilitation or replacement. The options analysis will need to be iterative; but DES/WRBP staff feels that W-P has the right people on their team and were asking the right questions of both DES/WRBP staff and the vendors. DES/WRBP staff feels that W-P prepared a good, very responsive proposal and DES is recommending moving forward with the combined task orders with W-P. Additionally, W-P understands that if they feel a request is out of the agree-upon scope and budget they must let DES/WRBP staff know immediately and not proceed unless authorized.

Glen asked if there was money in the budget for this contract. Sharon said that there was. Steve asked where the funding was coming from. Sharon said that it would be coming out of the O&M budget. She does not believe there would be a need to use the Replacement Fund for this task order. Sharon asked if members had reviewed the W-P scope and budget that were sent out by email. She noted that W-P had presented alternatives in the budget that DES/WRBP staff and the Advisory Board may not want to

pursue such as the financial analysis included as an option in the asset management portion of the scope.

Steve asked about the limitations in W-P's proposal specifically with regard to the vertical and horizontal limitations. Sharon explained that W-P will be focusing on the aboveground assets, which is to say the (visible) vertical assets. The other assets are part of the phased collection system evaluations (gravity sewers, drainage structures, and manholes), and DES/WRBP staff will handle the condition assessments either in-house or under WRBP contracts with CCTV vendors. Brian asked how CCTV would work for WRBP's portion. Sharon explained that the DES/WRBP staff would be contracting for that and overseeing it directly, and included in the O&M budget. She said the preferred strategy was that the cost could be spread out over time through several service contracts; say over 5 to 7 years, after WRBP staff prioritizes the CCTV work that needs to be done.

Ray asked if the outcome of task 3 would be this prioritized plan. Sharon explained that the outcome of what the DES/WRBP staff are doing on the gravity sewers combined with evaluations done on the force mains side is the objective of task 3. After the cost/benefit analysis for the force mains, a plan for phased assessment would be completed and included in the Replacement Fund or O&M budget as necessary. She further explained that this is why it is a somewhat open-ended plan and that W-P will be helping the DES/WRBP staff integrate data from the gravity and the force main sides. Glen noted that W-P had budgeted one day to select an asset management program and asked if that was enough time. Sharon explained that it was because DES/WRBP staff and W-P have worked together before to identify three potential vendors; including Viewworks that was recently demoed for NHDES/WRBP staff at the Merrimack wastewater treatment plant. The other two potentials are Cityworks and Cartegraph. That one day is really just for the three vendors to come in and do presentations specific to WRBP. This budget is just for W-P's assistance and does not preclude WRBP's further independent research or due diligence.

Brian asked with regard to each task under this contract, if G&C would be involved. Sharon said that only the general contract (as a whole) would be going to G&C, and that individual task orders under the contract would not. Brian asked how much the general contract would be or rather what she is recommending. Sharon noted that it would be a 4-year contract beginning in July 2017, and that it would be a non-lapsing contract and an encumbered one, in that the funds cannot be used for anything else. Sharon said she would probably assume at least \$100,000 per year. Last time, she said, they put \$100,000 per year in the O&M budget with additional money out of the Replacement Fund. She is recommending a split like that this time around too (say \$100,000 each); thus an approximate \$800,000 total over 4 years.

Steve noted that there are a lot of open-ended items and the potential for additional costs. He asked how confident DES is that it is going to get what it is buying and what assurances are there that in 6 months from now that we will not be sitting here looking for more money to complete components of this contract. Sharon explained that very few items are open-ended and iterative; that the scope provided and the budget for that scope are pretty straight-forward. If a discussion with W-P identifies an item outside that scope, W-P will provide a cost estimate before proceeding so DES/WRBP staff can make an informed decision when presenting information about that item to the Advisory Board. Brian asked if she was sure W-P would do this, given the issue with the digester recently. Sharon assured him that they would, having learned from this past experience, and because DES/WRBP staff is confident about what has been proposed and presented in the scope and budget provided.

Ray asked if his understanding of the scope in the proposal for Task 2 was correct, in that for \$75,000, deliverables would include software selection and evaluation (not purchase); asset registry – inventory and criticality, and a database that will be fully populated based on available information; a GIS map of all of the horizontal assets; software implementation – the program, VUEWORKS for example – up and running and useable for capital improvement programming; and a written implementation program for next steps. He also asked if his understanding of the scope in the proposal for Task 3 was correct in that for \$44,800, deliverables would include a written plan for condition assessments with a particular focus on force main evaluations, arriving at a specific game plan relative all the force mains in the collection system. Sharon concurred, noting that Laconia is assisting with the GIS base mapping. Brian asked if there was a task 1. Sharon explained that in the original RFQ, there were several tasks; however, these two priority tasks were combined with the original RFQ numbering nomenclature maintained.

Ray said regarding the asset management piece of the proposal, he compared the former RFQ to the current RFQ, and wished to applaud DES/WRBP staff on getting from where they were before to where they are now. Just as an example, last time around, he said, the asset management software selection was initially budgeted for \$25,000; now it is budgeted at \$18,000. He noted that the former RFQ was around \$1,000,000, and that the current RFQ is nowhere near that amount. He said the new task orders are more in line with the size of our utility, where we are at from a business standpoint, and provide a much more pragmatic approach toward moving forward. He asked who the asset management champion will be moving forward, because he does not generally advise his clients to work on asset management without one, because the software will not be fully utilized by the client. He does not want to see that happen here.

Sharon explained that this initiative is part of the DES/WRBP implementation plan and schedule, and teams and responsible people (champions) had been selected for each initiative, and that check-ins and status updates are included in the implementation plan and schedule. She noted that this is one of the reasons why both the collection system and asset management teams have been involved in the vetting process, and why both teams met with each consultant's proposed team during an extra workshop. She said everybody is on the same page so far as DES/WRBP staff goes, and that City of Laconia staff will be helping with the GIS base map. She said that DES/WRBP staff already has about 95% of the field data needed for mapping – data points for gravity, manholes, and sewers – it is just that they need the expertise (Laconia) for mapping them. Ray asked who the "Asset Manager" for the organization would be. Sharon said that she would be the Asset Manager a/k/a Champion, and responsible for DES/WRBP staff's implementation of its own plan and schedule, and that she would also be providing oversight for the consultant to ensure that their work was on schedule. Sharon indicated that even though she is the champion of the asset management task there is a team in place so no one individual would be doing all the work. She noted that DES/WRBP staff is extremely committed to this process and helping out in any way that it can. She said that DES/WRBP staff especially wants to ensure that data is not lost or misplaced as the new program is populated with data from the old program.

Jeanne asked since the asset management program will benefit all, and NHDES has been pushing for asset management grants for sewer plants and water treatment plants, can funding be found for the WRBP asset management program as a whole or for individual communities. Sharon said she was pretty sure the grants in question were principle forgiveness grants for existing loans, although she will look into it.

Peter asked why W-P cut GIS implementation (p. 12) down from 168 hours to just 50. He noted that it said this was based on the ability of community GIS staff to complete the mapping and database development with limited input from W-P. Sharon explained that this was referring to assistance provided by one of Laconia's GIS staff members. Peter said this was good because his community did not have personnel to help out with the GIS implementation. Ray asked if the communities are aware of the other uses or collaborations for the software once the GIS implementation was complete, and suggested making them aware of them, especially given the remote (i.e. mobile) access the new software will allow. Sharon acknowledged that NHDES and WRBP staff is excited about the remote access and how it will improve their work flow and that they envision additional collaboration with member communities regarding the GIS mobile capabilities.

Steve asked if any vacant positions would be filled in the foreseeable future, and how they affect the NHDES/WRBP staff's overall workload. Sharon explained that there have been some staffing changes and that some vacant positions are being filled; however, the present vacancies do not affect the initiatives discussed today. The new industrial pretreatment coordinator, she said, will be starting during the first week of March. The vacant executive secretary position may be reclassified so that when the vacancy is filled, the new person can help manage the asset management software and the database. There may be a couple of other similar reclassifications of vacant positions to meet present and future program needs.

Steve asked if a CMMS would come out the contract. Sharon said the asset management software platform would have a work order capability. Steve also asked about MP2 data migration, and whether W-P had experience moving MP2 data. Sharon explained that they do because it is really just an MS Access database. She reiterated that NHDES/WRBP staff is very concerned about data being lost or misplaced during the consolidation and will do everything it can to prevent this from happening.

Glen asked when NHDES/WRBP expected to move forward with this recommendation for the asset management and collection system evaluation assistance contract. Sharon explained that the current as-needed engineering contract with W-P expires June 30<sup>th</sup>, so the goal is to have everything in place as soon as possible for the new 4-year contract because getting paperwork through G&C will take a couple of months. She noted that only the contract would be going through G&C, not individual task orders. Sharon said that it could be something like the past contract which had \$200,000/year or \$800,000 over the 4 years; noting that the task orders associated with the asset management and collection system evaluation assistance contract would need to be covered in the W-P contract in the first year or two. Allocations for each firm need to be determined in their respective contracts since they would not be transferable between the two firms. Ray asked if the total allotment would be \$800,000 over the next 4 years or if that was just for W-P? She also noted that NHDES/WRBP staff is not against having both firms available to work on any other general, as-needed engineering services that may arise in the future. However, the initial budget would need to cover the asset management and collection system evaluation assistance task orders for W-P only. She recommended holding off on the Brown & Caldwell discussion until the next meeting. Steve asked if the total allocation to W-P over the next 4 years could be reduced further in any way.

Brian asked Ray how much time Bay District needs to review the handouts as Ray has not been authorized to vote, noting that finalizing the contract (through G&C) will take some time. He asked if

the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting would work for everybody, Bay District included, so far as a vote goes. The general consensus by members present was that April 21<sup>st</sup> would work since several members had conflicts with the normal March meeting date. Sharon said that delaying two months until the April meeting would likely mean that a contract would not be in place by June 30<sup>th</sup>. She said to keep in mind that the money would not be spent unless a service was actually required and a task order was approved. Paul asked if Sharon needed some direction so far as the budgetary placeholder goes. Sharon said she would like to have some consensus on the budgetary placeholder sooner than later and that a March meeting would work well. She agreed to provide a recommendation for the two contract's budgets for the March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting with both W-P and Brown & Caldwell able to provide other general as-needed engineering services that may arise in the future.

Discuss moved to some of the particulars of the W-P task orders. Ray suggested, under Task 2, to remove the optional financial plan review in W-P's scope of services for \$32,000, as that was something that could be handled in-house. Ray also wondered if all three reports under Task 3, pp. 19-20, B.1.-B.7 would be necessary given their costs and that there would be a final report prepared summarizing all of the previous reports. He suggested minimizing the number of written reports prepared for NHDES/WRBP staff, if possible. Paul asked if there was a reason why W-P may have included three reports in their scope of services. Sharon said she would ask W-P for more information or justification concerning these deliverables and their associated costs.

**WRBP Solar Power Update:** Sharon said that NHDES is planning to put out an RFP (through the State) for developers and vendors to install solar arrays on the State's land. The reason for this approach is because NHDES would like to do a thorough cost/benefit analysis to include not just N.H. Solar Garden but all developers, vendors and potential financial arrangements. Sharon said Karen Rantamaki (NH OEP) will be assisting with the RFP and the evaluation of responses received from developers and vendors, in order to help NHDES select the best option for the program moving forward. The best option may or may not be solar. The Advisory Board members agreed with this process to determine what would be best for the WRBP as a whole.

### **Other Business:**

#### **LSRs Update from the Governance Subcommittee**

Jeanne said she, other community representatives and DES/WRBP staff attended hearings for SB484 and SB461 on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. SB461, entitled "AN ACT relative to expenditures of the Winnepesaukee River Basin control program funds," was sponsored by Senators Hosmer and Forrester. SB484, entitled "AN ACT relative to the role of the Winnepesaukee River advisory board," was sponsored by Senator Hosmer. SB 484 includes language similar to that contained in the MOU about having an Advisory Board letter included in capital funding requests going to the G&C. Jeanne said most of the discussions and testimonies from NHDES/WRBP staff and WRBP community members centered around SB461.

Yesterday on February 17<sup>th</sup>, Jeanne said she received an email indicating that an amendment (adding extra language) is being voted on this morning for SB461. It was drafted by Senator Bradley. Jeanne is not sure why the extra language is necessary. The amendment includes the following excerpt: "The Department may not make any changes to the current governance structure unless specifically authorized by Statute." Jeanne asked Elizabeth Dragon (Franklin) for more information concerning the

intent of this amendment, and Elizabeth has yet responded.

### Unusually High CBOD and TSS Concentrations in Belmont

Belmont and NHDES/WRBP have been attempting to identify the source of some unusual laboratory analytical results. Last week, a meeting was held of Belmont departments to discuss the best way in which to handle industrial and commercial discharges which may not be in compliance with local or state sewer ordinances. According to the one commercial facility they contacted, the facility discharged soda products or syrups into the Belmont and WRBP collection systems in the past. Beverage syrups have been known to have a low pH and may contribute to the high CBOD and TSS observed at the Belmont Pump Station.

Jeanne said that Belmont officials are meeting with facility reps next week to discuss the matter. Sharon said she and WRBP staff will help Belmont in any way possible and would like to attend the meeting. Jeanne said she is most interested in receiving historical records from the facility indicating when batch dumps may have been discharged. Steve noted that while soda syrup may cause high CBOD concentrations, he did not believe that it would cause high TSS concentrations. He asked if there was a better way, perhaps, to track unusual laboratory analytical results such as these. Jeanne noted that Belmont requested the laboratory analytical results in question.

Brian asked if NHDES/WRBP staff had any plans to do further CBOD and TSS sampling. Sharon explained that this was actually the first sample round at community boundaries/sectors and was timed as a dry weather sampling event. Another sector sampling round, during wet weather, would be performed – maybe this coming spring if weather conditions are typical. Steve asked if the Advisory Board could receive a more interpretive report; noting that there were other discrepancies in the report (i.e. Winnisquam pump station name was incorrect). Ray noted that it may be difficult to develop a true picture of what is going on without more data over a longer time period. Sharon concurred with Ray indicating that any interpretive report would require more data. She had shared the lab report primarily to provide information to Belmont in order for them to investigate the unusually high strength values.

### Meetings

The next Advisory Board meetings will be held on March 24<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm and on April 21<sup>st</sup> at 9:00 am, respectively, at the Corner Meeting House in Belmont.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.

The minutes were prepared by Pro-Temp Staffing.