



# TOWN OF EDGARTOWN

WASTE WATER DEPARTMENT  
330 WEST TISBURY ROAD  
P.O. BOX 1068  
EDGARTOWN, MA 02539

TEL. 508 627-5482  
FAX 508 627-5169

## TOWN OF EDGARTOWN BOARD OF WASTE WATER COMMISSIONERS

### MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 30, 2016

#### WASTE WATER COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Mr. Glen S. Searle, Chairman  
Mr. Scott Ellis, Commissioner  
Mr. Sean E. Murphy, Commissioner

#### EWWD STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. David Thompson, Facilities Manager  
Mrs. Pia Webster, Administrative Assistant

#### MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

The Board of Waste Water Commissioners of the Town of Edgartown scheduled their Regular Meeting for Thursday, June 30, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. in the conference room at the Edgartown Waste Water Treatment Facility, located at 330 West Tisbury Road, Edgartown, Mass. At 4:00 p.m. Chairman Glen S. Searle called the meeting to order.

#### OLD BUSINESS:

#### PRESENTATION: DRAFT CONDITION ASSESSMENT REPORT FROM GHD, INC.

The first item taken up was a document titled "Town of Edgartown, MA – Wastewater Treatment Facility Plant Evaluation and Condition Assessment *Draft Report* June 2016" (the draft report) produced by GHD, an engineering, architecture and environmental consulting firm. Facilities Manager David Thompson noted that the report in their hands had in effect cost \$80,000 and that the Board members were "going to have to be a little familiar with it." He added further: "It's a really nicely constructed document."

#### POSSIBLE REORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD.

Mr. Thompson interrupted himself to raise the point that because the Annual Town Meeting had transpired in April, perhaps a reorganization of the Board was in order. Or not, suggested Administrative Assistant Pia Webster, if the Waste Water Commissioners were happy with things as they were. Waste Water Commissioner Sean E. Murphy made a motion to reappoint

Mr. Searle as Chairman of the Board of Waste Water Commissioners “by mandate of the voters of the Town of Edgartown.” Waste Water Commissioner Scott Ellis provided a second, and the motion carried unanimously by voice vote. The Board returned to the previous subject under consideration.

DRAFT CONDITION ASSESSMENT REPORT [CONTINUED].

Mr. Thompson directed the Commissioners to page 17 of the draft report, to Table 13 Risk Assessment Matrix. The table, he explained, laid out the system GHD had used to describe how all of the components of the plant were ranked. Running down the left side of the table were the types of LoF ratings (Likelihood of Failure, “Failing” to “Excellent”), determined by considering both the condition and performance of existing equipment, and reading across the top were the types of CoF ratings (Consequence of Failure, “Negligible” to “Catastrophic”). Once each type of rating had been determined, the cell on the table where the axes met set the prioritization for the replacement of the components, from “Low” to “Very High.”

Moving to page 26 of the report, Mr. Thompson went over an application of this system with Table 22 Carrousel™ Aeration Risk Assessment. There, the various sub-components of the Carrousel were each listed, along with their LoF and CoF assignments and resulting risk ratings. He remarked that he would switch the ratings of the two most-at-risk sub-components – the Mechanical Mixer-Motor (Very High) and the Mechanical Aerators (High).

The Facilities Manager also noted that the report advised Facility staff to modify the Carrousel’s variable frequency drives (VFDs) range to prevent the Mixer from operating below the manufacturer’s recommended level of 47.5 Hz.

Next, Mr. Thompson spoke of the disjuncture between the recommendations found in the NEIWPCC’s TR-16 Guides for the Design of Wastewater Treatment Works and the specs of some of the EWWTF’s components. “Our Secondary Clarifiers have 12-foot-deep side-walls,” he said. “The TR-16s say 14 feet. Ours are sub-par.... If our flows expand, that’s the point of weakness in the system.” Down the road, he added, the Department would be looking at adding a third Secondary Clarifier.

The Facilities Manager reviewed the risk assessment results for the Post Treatment Building. The sub-component most at risk, he said, was the UV Disinfection System, with a risk rating of Very High and no spare parts available.

Section 4.11 of the draft report examined the Operations Building. Table 30 on page 33 prioritized the replacement of the Belt Filter Press Control Panels and the Main Control Panel of that component.

Mr. Thompson proceeded to Section 8, the Capital Improvement Plan Project List, laid out in Table 45, the Project Implementation Schedule. The table listed 45 projects in order of urgency, with justifications; the cost in dollars calculated for years in which the work would be done; and the timeframes for completion (Years 1-7). *[Year 1 (2017\$), \$1,419,000; Year 2 (2018\$), \$1,990,000; Year 3 (2019\$), \$1,727,000; Year 4 (2020\$), \$1,733,000; Year 5 (2021\$), \$1,408,000; Year 6 (2022\$), \$1,308,000; and Year 7 (2023\$), \$1,310,000, for a total of \$9,168,000.]* Figure 13 plotted the Annual Capital Costs (2016 \$) of the preceding.

Commissioner Murphy remarked that the draft report had delivered exactly what the Board of Selectman and the Waste Water Commissioners had agreed was needed. The Facilities Manager announced that on Thursday, July 21, GHD Project Manager Marc Drainville and/or his colleague Anastasia Rudenko would present their findings to the Board. All concurred that July 21 should be the next Regular Meeting date and that the Board and staff would report to the Selectmen once the Plant Evaluation and Condition Assessment Report was finalized.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**DOCK STREET HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM PROJECT.**

**Recommendation to Award.**

Mr. Thompson referred the Board members to the original Construction Agreement for the Dock Street Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Project (HMGP Project) drawn up by Tighe & Bond but not consummated because the bids had come in too high. A June 24, 2016 letter to the Facilities Manager from Ian Catlow of Tighe & Bond, Senior Project Manager, on the Recommendation to Award listed the two original total bids: Waterline Industries Corp., \$727,677.00; and Robert B. Our Co., Inc., \$549,000.00. Based on references and Tighe & Bond's direct experiences with the Our Company, Mr. Catlow recommended awarding the contract to the Our Company, contingent upon receipt of the required Performance and Payment Bonds, as well as the required Certificates of Insurance.

**Change Order No. 1.**

The Facilities Manager explained that Change Order No. 1 then lowered the Our bid, along with his sub-bidder Fall River Electrical Associates Co. Inc.'s (FREA's) bid. With a pumping equipment price deduction of \$15,067 and the Main Street fiber and VFD cable deletion of \$48,413.25, the original total bid was reduced by \$63,480.25 for a new total of \$485,519.75.

Commissioner Murphy began to make a motion to approve Change Order No. 1, but Mr. Thompson stopped him, drawing the Board's attention to a letter with the subject "Signature Authorization for Section 00520 Agreement Between Successful Contractor and Owner."

**Contract Signature Authorization.**

The above-referenced letter had as signatories the Board of Waste Water Commissioners and described the action of the Board in their Regular Meeting of June 30, 2016 of making, seconding and passing a motion "to authorize Facilities Manager David Thompson to sign as 'Owner' the Section 00500 Agreement for the Dock Street Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Project (the 'Agreement') once all necessary votes, agreements and procedures have been completed; and further, that it is understood that the signature of David Thompson shall stand for that of the 'Owner' on all Addenda, Change Orders and any other attachments to said Agreement." Commissioner Ellis made the motion as presented, seconded by Commissioner Murphy, and the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**REPORT: SOLE SOURCE PROCUREMENT FOR MACERATOR-GRINDER.**

Mr. Thompson explained that the only macerator-grinder that met the Plant’s needs was the Franklin Miller Model SN 7504, the same type purchased in 2008 to replace one of the two Weismann macerators for the Plant’s sludge pumps. What he would purchase was a replacement model of this equipment from the same maker. In addition, at \$22,825, the cost was below the threshold of \$35,000 that would allow the Department to avoid the bidding process. Thus, Procurement Officer Juliet Mulinare had approved this purchase as a sole source procurement.

In the meeting binders were a copy of the approval e-mail from Ms. Mulinare; a filled-in but unsigned Town of Edgartown Procurement Department Sole Source Request and Declaration; and a letter from Franklin Miller Municipal Sales Manager Joseph M. Macula certifying “that Franklin Miller is the sole single source manufacturer of the Taskmaster Grinder TM 851206/04 and sole source for the supply of a duplicate Grinder to SN 7504 macerator purchased in 2008.”

Mr. Thompson related that he had “jumped through hoops” to find a replacement for the 2008 equipment and that this would be a Fiscal Year 2017 purchase. Commissioner Murphy made a motion to approve the sole source procurement of a Taskmaster Grinder TM 851206/04 for a cost of \$22,825 as presented. Chairman Searle provided a second, and the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**DISCUSSION/VOTE: FY17 SEWER RATES.**

Administrative Assistant Pia Webster explained that according to Article IX, Section 3 of the *Town of Edgartown Sewer Rules and Regulations*, “The user charge shall be so computed that the revenue will be sufficient to defray the costs of operation and maintenance of the public sewer system, treatment facility and related equipment.” She related further that since the adoption of Article IX in 1997, the Department staff, the Board of Waste Water Commissioners and the Board of Selectmen have understood “the costs of operation and maintenance” to mean the budgets of the accounts (FY17 figures) she had listed in the document titled “Proposed Rate Schedule of Sewer User Charges – Fiscal Year 2017.”

Those budget totals were as follows:

	FY17 Budget
Total Salaries and Wages	\$ 536,058.43
Total Operating Expenditures	\$ 442,995.60
Total Capital Outlay	\$ 36,300.00
Equip, Repair, Replace, Upgrade Acct	<u>\$ 50,000.00</u>
Total Operation/Maintenance Costs	<u>\$ 1,065,354.03</u>

Admin Assistant Webster then referred to a pull-out chart titled “Edgartown Waste Water Department Sewer Billing Results/Projections, which revealed the sewer rates and actual revenue for FY13 through FY16. For Fiscal Year 2017, a minimum of an additional 590 Outlets to Drain (OTDs) was guaranteed, she said, for a total of at least 16,151 OTDs, up from 15,561, at \$70 each. Also, there would be one additional Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) Flat Charge

(from 59 to 60, at \$1,425 apiece). With these increases, which were guaranteed, if the Department retained the FY16 Sewer User Charges Rate Schedule, it would raise Sewer User Charges Revenue in FY17 of \$1,251,509.75, meeting the requirements of Article IX, Section 3.

The chart also included revenue calculations for FY17 if the OTD rate were raised to \$71, as well as to \$72. Commissioner Murphy asked when the rates had last been raised, and Mrs. Webster answered, for FY16. Commissioner Murphy then made a motion to retain the FY16 Sewer User Charges in FY17, seconded by Chairman Searle. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**DISCUSSION/VOTE: FY17 SEPTAGE RATES.**

The Board members considered the next chart, which laid out five possible Septage Revenue results in FY17 under five different rates per gallon for Septage: the current rate of \$0.24; \$0.20; \$0.22; \$0.26; and \$0.28. Commissioner Murphy inquired when the Septage rate had last been raised. It had been lowered, from 28 cents, for FY13, replied Mrs. Webster, who added that she had produced the chart only from a sense of “due diligence” and not from any leaning toward altering any of the rates. She reminded the Board that in FY16 the Department had had its highest annual Septage Billed Revenue ever.

“If it’s working, don’t fix it,” declared Commissioner Ellis, to murmurs of agreement from the other members of the Board. Commissioner Ellis then made a motion to retain the FY16 Septage Rates in FY17, seconded by Commissioner Murphy. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**DISCUSSION/VOTE: FY17 MISCELLANEOUS FEES.**

Next the Commissioners looked at a document titled “Proposed Schedule of Miscellaneous Fees – Fiscal Year 2017.” The Facilities Manager advised the Board members to raise the fee for Service Visits from \$50.00 to \$100.00. “This is the fee for egregious neglect,” he explained, then giving examples of the types of house and business calls that merited this charge. The Admin Assistant pointed to the copy of the Service Visits Journal included in the meeting binders, which included descriptions of these call-outs.

Mr. Thompson then described a new fee on the schedule, the Commercial Toilet Trailer Discharge fee. He had proposed this, he said, in response to complaints from haulers about the business of Bert Jamgochian, who emptied the tanks of his trailers at the “Small Batch” station for only \$5.00 a load, even though his tanks held more than 250 gallons, the cutoff for Small Batches. The haulers, on the other hand, had to pay 14 cents a gallon to discharge at Station 1 the same type of waste collected from the same type of trailer, then pumped into their larger trucks.

Mr. Thompson explained that he had arrived at the fee of \$73.50 for the larger of the trailers by multiplying the 14 cents-per-gallon rate for Porta-Potty discharge by 75 percent of the capacity (525 gallons) of the 700-gallon tank. The \$39.38 fee for the smaller trailer was for 75 percent of the capacity (281.29 gallons) of its 375-gallon tank. “This is an attempt to level the playing field,” said the Facilities Manager.

Commissioner Murphy made the motion that the Board accept the new fee category of Commercial Toilet Trailer Discharge Fee as presented, seconded by Commissioner Ellis. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote. Chairman Searle made the motion that the Board accept the new Schedule of Miscellaneous Fees for FY17 as presented, seconded by Commissioner Murphy. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**OTHER BUSINESS.**

**FACILITIES MANAGER'S ANNUAL EVALUATION.**

The Commissioners conducted the Facilities Manager's Annual Evaluation, awarding him all fours ("Exceeds expectations") in Part A of the form and using the word "Excellent" to describe his skills and performance in all areas. It was the Board's decision to grant Mr. Thompson his Merit Raise.

**FACILITIES MANAGER'S REPORT, INCLUDING  
SHORTFALL IN WAGES & SALARIES BUDGET LINE.**

The Facilities Manager reported that he and the Human Resources Coordinator had overlooked a \$3,633.12 shortfall in the funding of his own salary line in the FY17 Operating Budget. This would be remedied, he said, at the Special Town Meeting that immediately preceded the Annual next April. In their meeting binders was the Warrant Article he had already composed for the purpose.

In other news Operator Joseph Rock had passed his Grade 4 test, said Mr. Thompson. In addition, Jeremy Osborne had put in his six years as an Operator and so had applied to the Mass DEP Board of Certification for an Upgrade to a Grade 7 Combined license; the board had approved. "That makes three Grade 7s on the grounds," said the Facilities Manager. In response to the query from Commissioner Murphy, Mr. Thompson explained that the Facilities Manager had to be a Grade 7, the Chief Operator a Grade 6, and the other Operators Grade 4s.

Mr. Thompson also described how the Wiese-Flo screen had failed four times. "The only thing we haven't replaced is the auger," he said, adding that replacement parts were no longer made.

**FINANCIAL REPORTS.**

Admin Assistant Webster went over the end-of-FY16 Septage figures, which had wound up at total revenue of \$433,201.90, total volume of 1,916,743 gallons and 1,685 total trips, records in all categories. Total Septage Collections were \$433,538.57, another record. Lastly, the Septage Billed Accounts Receivable figure was \$8,169.18, just slightly higher than at the end of FY15.

Turning to the FY16 Operating Budget Expenditures Report, Mrs. Webster reported that before the close of the fiscal year, the sum totals of one more payroll and two more bill warrants would be subtracted from the balances shown. She then pointed to the rightmost column, which listed the adjustments made since the start of the fiscal year: \$17,500 transferred from Salaries and Wages in a Chapter 77 Transfer to the Special Service Account; and \$35,456, Article 14, Special Town Meeting, from Free Cash into the Operating Budget Expenses side. As of this date, she

stressed, the Department appeared to be in good shape, with Total Operating Budget Expenses holding at 93.2 percent of the Operating Budget Expenses funds used.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Searle asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Ellis offered said motion, with a second from Commissioner Murphy. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote. Chairman Searle adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Pia Webster  
Administrative Assistant

APPROVED:

BOARD OF WASTE WATER COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF EDGARTOWN



Glen S. Searle, Chairman



Scott Ellis, Commissioner

---

Sean E. Murphy, Commissioner