



# 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 SPECIAL MEETING OF AUGUST 7, 2014

#### **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

#### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Ian B. Catlow, Project Manager, Tighe & Bond, Inc.  
Mr. Matthew Romano, Electrical Engineer, Tighe & Bond, Inc.

#### **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

The Board of Waste Water Commissioners of the Town of Edgartown held a Special Meeting on Thursday, August 7, 2014, 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. *[Commissioner Sean E. Murphy arrived at the meeting at 4:02 p.m.]*

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **VISIT WITH IAN B. CATLOW, PROJECT MANAGER, TIGHE & BOND, INC.**

Engineer Ian B. Catlow, Tighe & Bond Project Manager, thanked the Board for the opportunity to brief them on the two projects on which he had been working with Facilities Manager David Thompson – the Dock Street Hazard Mitigation Grant Project and the Secondary Clarifier Drives Replacement Project. He introduced his colleague Matthew Romano, an electrical engineer at Tighe & Bond who had spent project-site time that day with Messrs. Catlow and Thompson.

**A. SECONDARY CLARIFIER DRIVES REPLACEMENT PROJECT.**

Starting with the Drives Replacement Project, Mr. Catlow described how he and the Facilities Manager had dedicated time to figuring out the Limits of Work for the project. Waste Water Commissioner Scott Ellis wanted to know if the drive mechanism would be replaced. Yes, answered Mr. Catlow, who then laid out how the decking around the drive would be removed and the work staged from below.

The Commissioners were referred to two color printouts in the meeting binders showing a site plan; an aerial view; photographs of each clarifier; plus schematics of the support bridge, rake arms, and so forth. Listed on the sheets were instructions to the potential contractor regarding, among other things, removal of each clarifier from service; support of the walkway; and responsibility for connection of the conductors.

Chairman Searle asked if replacements were required because the drives were 20 years old. Mr. Thompson explained that more important was the cumulative effect of 100,000 hours of service on the drives, plus the fact that glitter had begun to turn up in the oil. Mr. Catlow related that in mechanical terms, engineers speak of "an L10 bearing life of 100,000 hours," with the L10 life being the point at which 10 percent of the bearings in that application could be expected to have failed.

Mr. Catlow continued that he was also working on "pulling together a spec book" for the project. This brought him to the topic of Work Restrictions, which he described as "a dialogue we can have here." For instance, Mr. Catlow said, the contractor's crew would be matching up its work hours with those of the Waste Water Department crew.

Another restriction related to the fact that the project could only proceed during the period when the service of just one clarifier was needed. That meant October 15 through April 15. Truck egress, on the other hand, would not have to be restricted on this site.

Moving on to the subject of Proprietary Specifications, Mr. Catlow stressed the importance of ending up with exactly the equipment intended. After talking to representatives from Ovivo, the company that had bought out the maker of the secondary clarifiers, Messrs. Catlow and Thompson had been decided it best to get the same brand of drive. "I agree," said Chairman Searle and Commissioner Ellis at the same time. "So there's no question," said Mr. Catlow, the Department would want to take steps to ensure they could get what they wanted.

One way to do that, the engineer continued, was Proprietary Product Specifications, a practice that potentially could restrict competition to fewer than three manufacturers or producers. Such specifications were allowed by the Inspector General only for "sound reasons in the public interest." After a reasonable investigation, arguments for using the restrictive or proprietary specifications had to be documented. "This is something we work out with the Procurement Officer," said Mr. Thompson. "Right," said Commissioner Ellis. "It would be nice to have the same equipment," remarked Chairman Searle.

The Facilities Manager pointed out that ultimately the older, removed drives could be rebuilt and could, in turn, back up the newer ones. "My feeling is, we've got a good case,"

he said, for using Proprietary Product Specifications. With all in agreement, Mr. Catlow said he would draft a letter for the Procurement Officer, laying out the reasons the Department should be allowed to issue Proprietary Product Specifications in the Secondary Clarifier Drives Replacement Project.

“Every project is different,” observed Mr. Catlow, turning to the topic of Contractor Insurance coverage. The Drives Replacement Project was a retrofit and an entirely distinct undertaking from the Dock Street Project. For instance, he said, the former would be set on a Town-owned campus, while the latter would be in the middle of the downtown area. “So I need feedback from you on what you want,” he said.

Facilities Manager Thompson related that he had given the whole Tighe & Bond package on the subject of insurance to Town Administrator Pamela M. Dolby, who would probably “kick it upstairs” to Town Counsel or whoever handled insurance matters of this magnitude. As soon as he had heard back from Ms. Dolby, said Mr. Thompson, he would let Mr. Catlow know what was needed and wanted.

The next aspect of the Drives Replacement Project discussed was Contract Duration. Mr. Catlow laid out the following scenario. If the development of the bid package were wrapped up in the next four weeks, and if four weeks were allowed for the bidding process, that would place the awarding of the contract in mid-October. Mr. Thompson found these expectations reasonable, since this project was relatively “cut and dried.”

Next, continued, Mr. Catlow, the Notice to Proceed could hypothetically be issued November 1, and by December 1 the contractor would have received approval for the actual clarifier drive orders. The orders themselves would take 12 weeks to fulfill, bringing fabrication completion to about March 1 and the move onsite to early March. Installation would take two weeks.

Facilities Manager Thompson described how the installation of each drive would be coordinated. “April is a float month,” Mr. Catlow noted, allowing time to make up for any delays.

## **B. DOCK STREET HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROJECT.**

“Shifting gears,” said Mr. Catlow, “moving on to Dock Street.” With the project sited in a busy public area, the first aspect to consider was the Hours of Work. Was seven too early? he asked. Chairman Searle assured him that seven in the morning was fine. Commissioner Murphy noted that work could proceed between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. It was agreed that the work would be done between October 20 and April 30.

Commissioner Murphy wanted to know just how much of the street would be closed off during the project. “Most of the work is underground,” answered Mr. Catlow. Commissioner Ellis pointed out that the project would be taking up the taxi lane where the Dumpster was.

As for Proprietary Product Specifications, Mr. Catlow noted that he had four quotes from companies that made the type of pump they were looking for. Mr. Thompson stressed that

they were not obligated to go with the lowest bidder, so long as they could make a compelling argument for the product they wished to go with.

Mr. Catlow related that he, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Romano had spent time that day going into the Dock Street Station. One thing they had talked about was establishing a bypass pump connection, something that would be needed if both pumps in the drywell died. Responding to a question from Chairman Searle, Mr. Thompson said that the cost of a bypass pump contractor had been included in the grant.

The discussion returned to the degree of disruption to street navigation the project might entail. The Board members were assured that the sidewalks in the area would remain open and that traffic in the area would continue to flow throughout the project.

Next, Mr. Catlow went over the basics of the project, which involved the rehabilitation of the station by replacing the present pumps with ones that could (a) be submerged and (b) be shut off remotely. That way in the event of flooding, the pumps would not be pulling in saltwater, and the lines would not be "full of ocean." Facilities Manager Thompson noted that there *would* be a disruption of service while the pumps were turned off. But the lines would remain clear and ready for use once the power came back up.

Mr. Catlow noted that the rehabilitation was not providing for features like a submersible dehumidifier and so forth. "We can pull it [the pump]," said Mr. Thompson, given enough notice.

Moving on to the subject of a proposed Schedule of Work, Mr. Catlow announced that they were "two months from a complete set of specs." Mr. Thompson pointed out that the pumps in questions had a significant lead time. Commissioner Murphy inquired whether the project schedule had been run by the Police Department and Highway Superintendent Stuart Fuller. Commissioner Ellis said that the Police Department would need little notice.

The discussion continued. Mr. Catlow recommended that they re-evaluate the schedule in September, once he had a better idea when the bid package would be ready. He offered to meet again with the Board members at that time. It was entirely possible that the project would have to be bumped to the following year, given the complexities of the bidding process.

"Good," said Chairman Searle, "We'll put it on the meeting agenda for September or October." The time was 4:30 p.m.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

#### **ACCOUNTING BUSINESS.**

The Board members turned to the topic of some account balances that Admin Assistant Pia Webster had noticed were not being included in FY15 MUNIS budget printouts, to wit: the Paint Silos Account; the Dock Street Hazard Mitigation Grant Project Account; and the Secondary Clarifier Drives Replacement Account. "We're all squared away now," said Chairman Searle. Those present discussed briefly how six weeks into the new fiscal year, the FY14 balances had still not been posted, resulting in gaps in the FY15 printouts.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**LETTER TO OPERATOR JEREMY R. OSBORN.**

Lastly, the Commissioners considered a draft letter dated August 7, 2014 to Operator Jeremy R. Osborn congratulating him on recently obtaining the Grade 6 Combined Wastewater Certification. "That is a big deal!" said Facilities Manager Thompson, who related that the passing rate for 2014 applicants so far was only 8.7 percent.

Mr. Thompson and the Commissioners discussed briefly the Department's plans for Mr. Osborn, whom the Facilities Manager hoped to promote to the position of Chief Operator. "I think the Board would like to congratulate him!" said Chairman Searle. Commissioners Ellis and Murphy agreed, and the Board members signed the letter, along with Mr. Thompson.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business or comment, the Chairman asked a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Ellis offered a motion to adjourn, with Commissioner Murphy providing a second. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote. Chairman Searle adjourned the meeting at 4:36 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