

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CENTRAL BROWN COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Pursuant to §19.84 Wis. Stats, a regular meeting of the **Central Brown County Water Authority – Technical Committee** was held on Tuesday, August 4, 2020 at the Town of Ledgeview Public Works Shop, 1915 Scray Hill Road, De Pere, WI, and via video conference. Note that in light of public health concerns regarding COVID-19, this was a telephone/video conference meeting for Committee members. Members of the public were offered the opportunity to either hear the meeting broadcast live at the location noted above or to contact the Water Authority to obtain telephone access to the meeting.

Members Present: Allouez – Sean Gehin (via video conference)
Bellevue – Shawn Geiger (via video conference)
De Pere – Scott Thoresen (via video conference)
Howard – Geoff Farr (via video conference)
Lawrence – Kurt Minten (via video conference)
Ledgeview – Andy Tenor, Greg Potts

Also Present: Rob Michaelson – Manitowoc Public Utilities (via video conference)
Gary Rosenbeck – McMahon, Inc. (via video conference)
Nic Sparacio, CBCWA General Manager (via video conference)

The August 4, 2020 Central Brown County Water Authority – Technical Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chairman Kurt Minten of Lawrence.

Roll Call:

1. Attendance was recorded as shown above.

Approval of Agenda:

2. Approve Agenda
Motion made by Ledgeview, seconded by De Pere to approve the agenda.
MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Approval of Minutes:

3. July 7, 2020
There were no revisions to the draft minutes.
Motion made by Allouez, seconded by Howard to approve the July 7, 2020 minutes as presented.
MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Appearances:

4. None

Communications:

5. None

Agenda Items:

Items 8 and 9 were taken up next.

6. CBCWA Risk and Resiliency Plan

General Manager Sparacio presented the draft Risk and Resiliency Plan for the Water Authority. This plan is intended to comply with the related components of the American Water Infrastructure Act of 2018. The Water Authority's plan must be certified by the end of this year, and the Members must each certify their own plans by June 30, 2021. Each utility's Emergency Response Plan must also then be certified within six months of certifying its Risk and Resiliency Plan.

Scott Thoresen asked how Sparacio drafted the document for the Water Authority. Sparacio responded that this was an in-house effort for the Water Authority using the online tools provided by the US EPA website. Specifically, this Plan was generated mainly as output from the Vulnerability Self-Assessment Tool Web Version 2.0, but he then modified the document to simplify the output and provide some additional analysis.

Sparacio asked that the Members start reviewing this document. We will discuss it in more detail at a future meeting.

7. Plan review process and construction standards for working near the transmission main

Sparacio explained the flowchart displaying the coordinated plan review and project inspection process involving Manitowoc Public Utilities (MPU) and McMahan. The key decision factor is the level of potential risk in a construction project being conducted by others in proximity to the Water Authority transmission main. He then explained the referenced construction standards that are proposed as guidance for such projects. The standards will be shared with counties, municipalities, utilities, and utility contractors. Thoresen asked whether the standards are meant to be binding. Sparacio clarified that these will be offered as guidelines.

Gary Rosenbeck further explained that the 15 feet referenced in the standards is not meant as a separation distance but as a threshold for discussion. If another utility is placing facilities within 15 feet of the transmission main, then the Water Authority will get directly involved to ensure that the pipeline is protected. Discussion continued on whether the standards should address maintenance activities. Replacing culverts on County Highway R was discussed as an example. The document will need some revisions to that effect.

Thoresen suggested that the Members add these standards as supplemental information to their local excavation permit process. Rosenbeck then suggested that the municipalities

and counties controlling the rights-of-way just provide notice to the Water Authority and MPU. The Committee supports both of these thoughts. This could also be covered under Brown County with its dual review process for utility permits. This approach provides plan review much earlier in the process than relying on Diggers Hotline tickets. The document will be revised to make these requests of municipalities and counties.

Sean Gehin asked how the Members can have access to the as-built drawings for the transmission main. Rob Michaelson responded that the best place to get the as-builts is from the McMahan GIS site. Gehin then asked for clarification on how the plan review process is intended to work. Sparacio responded that MPU is responsible for reviewing all projects under the transmission main operation and maintenance contract. Michaelson receives all Diggers Hotline tickets for the Water Authority. However, McMahan and MPU both are currently reviewing all projects while we work out these standards. The future goal is to have some criteria that can be applied to determine when McMahan review and inspection presence are required based on an elevated risk level. Thoresen left the meeting at this time.

8. Review of Locator and First Responder Agreements between Members and MPU

Sparacio explained that this item came up as related to the leak repair that occurred on West Mason Street last year where the electrical contractor directional bored into the pipe. There is some risk exposure for Members that have executed these agreements taking on the locating responsibilities for the Water Authority main. Michaelson clarified that only Howard and Allouez have these formal agreements with MPU. All other Water Authority locates are handled by MPU through a contracted party. The Water Authority pays (as a pass-through cost) for all locates from contracted parties. Given the limited extent of these agreements, this is just a matter for Allouez and Howard to consider.

Andy Tenor asked whether MPU would consider dropping the locating requirements from the agreement so that they serve exclusively as a first responder arrangement. More Members would likely adopt such an agreement. Michaelson responded that he would look into this alternative. Thoresen returned to the meeting at this time.

9. Results of leak detection and pressure testing on the 48-inch transmission main

Michaelson explained how the satellite leak detection data were tested on the 48-inch transmission main. The results of a 90-minute long pressure test showed no evidence that any of the satellite points of interest were actual leaks. Sparacio added that he was encouraged by these results and wanted to make sure the Members saw the information as well.

10. Project status updates

a. Shoreline erosion in Manitowoc

Rosenbeck presented the plans for the shoreline stabilization project. His engineers produced two sets of plans showing the current phase one approach and a potential future phase two approach. Sparacio added that the phase one approach is adequate to protect the shore and can be added onto in the future. The phase two approach is

reflective of US Army Corp of Engineers standards and can be potentially installed in the future by leveraging grant funds if awarded. Rosenbeck further explained that the cost per linear foot for the phase one approach would likely be in the range of \$250 to 300, and for the phase two approach would be in the range of \$500 to 600. Sparacio then outlined how the exiting budget and cash reserves could be used to generate the necessary funds.

Rosenbeck stated that contractor quotes are due August 25 and asked whether the Technical Committee wants to see the quotes before they go to the Board. There was a consensus that the recommendation from McMahon and the Water Authority can be shared over email. There is not likely a need for a special meeting.

Geoff Farr asked Rosenbeck to explain the difference between the two approaches. Rosenbeck responded that the main differences are the phase two plan extends much further into the lakebed than the phase one plan, and the phase two plan has a greater tonnage of stone. Discussion continued on how these plans differ from the emergency repair that has already been made. The phase one alternative is more robust than what was done for the emergency repair, and the phase two alternative is even more so. Gehin responded that it would be helpful to know the cost of both options in order to determine whether available funds allow us to go right to the phase two approach.

Motion made by Howard, seconded by Ledgeview to recommend to the Board that the Lake Shoreline Stabilization project is authorized for contractor proposals with base and alternate options as finalized by McMahon.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

b. Chlorine system solenoids and analyzers

Sparacio reported that the Water Authority received three quotes for the work to install the chlorine system solenoids and piping for the downstream analyzers in Allouez, De Pere, and Lawrence. All quotes were significantly higher than expected, so we need to look at alternative means of getting this work done.

Rosenbeck reported that he has started talking with Allouez, De Pere, and Lawrence to ask whether they could take a set of plans and hire a local plumber or use utility staff to do this work. Minten responded that he thinks the utilities can do some of this work themselves. Discussion continued on alternatives for adding detention time for the downstream analyzers. Allouez does not need outside piping installed. The mixing chamber used at the Master Meter Station might also be an option.

Sparacio stated that there also seemed to be some confusion on the part of one of the contractors related to controls integration and installation of the solenoids. McMahon will work with them to clarify the scope of work and obtain a revised bid. Farr asked for clarification on the local cost-sharing requirements. Sparacio responded that there are no local costs unless you are adding a second analyzer. There was a consensus that the members installing the downstream analyzers can work together to get the work done. The related contractor proposals will be not be accepted.

c. **Corrosion protection grounded and locating additions**

Sparacio provided an update on the corrosion protection system additions. There was an issue with the grounded installation at the Pressure Reducing Station. The location of the property line was not clear, and the installation crossed the property line. The property owners have been very cooperative, and the Water Authority will offer them an easement to address this. There were also some challenges with finding all the locating test stations, so work will continue on this when the contractor can schedule another trip to finish the work. The annual survey was also completed, so that information is being reviewed.

d. **Modified system pressure**

There were no updates on this item.

e. **Manitowoc pump station optimization**

Sparacio reported that the Board approved the modifications to the 2020 Capital Improvement Program including designating funds for design services on the VFD installation at MPU. Michaelson reported on the control strategy updates. Preferred Controls continues making progress on its scope of work. He will also report back to MPU on approval to proceed with the VFD design services work.

f. **SPLASH Study implementation**

Sparacio reported that the next SPLASH implementation meeting will be set for late August. There will be two demonstrations of compliance tracking systems for Cross Connection Control Programs. Green Bay Water will demonstrate how they use Cityworks, and the Village of Howard will demonstrate how they use their GIS mapping for this purpose. Sparacio also reported that a representative from Hydrocorp has agreed to attend our September Technical Committee meeting.

11. Water sales report through July 31, 2020

Sparacio reported on water consumption for the previous month. Similar to June, July saw close to normal water consumption. Any impacts from the lock-down earlier in the year seem to have subsided. We are just under 1% behind where we were at this time last year. Sparacio reviewed the mid-year true-up estimates. Shawn Geiger noted that there has been significant housing growth in Bellevue, and their water consumption is reflecting this.

12. Preliminary 2021 budget and Capital Improvement Program

Sparacio presented the 2021 preliminary Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The anticipated carry-forward amount has been reduced from the draft presented last month. 2020 project costs are coming in higher than expected, so the carry-forward is smaller. Some additional funds for shoreline stabilization have also been included as a capital project for 2021.

Sparacio then presented a preliminary 2021 water purchase rate and preliminary member charges. Thoresen asked whether the CIP includes related engineering costs or whether

that is a separate line item. Sparacio responded that engineering is included in the CIP. An estimate for engineering is included in each project rather than as a separate line item.

Sparacio reviewed the 2021 preliminary water use projections and asked if there were any changes needed. There were no changes to the projections, so these figures will be used to develop the preliminary budget for the Board to review in August. If all goes well, the 2021 budget would then be approved after the hearing at the September Board meeting.

Old Business:

13. None

Next Meeting:

14. Agenda Items for the Tuesday, September 8, 2020 Meeting

- Updates from Hydrocorp on cross-connection control services

Adjourn:

Motion made by De Pere, seconded by Lawrence to adjourn at 3:25 p.m.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Respectfully submitted,
Nic Sparacio, General Manager