

**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, November 7, 2023 at the City of De Pere Municipal Services Center, 925 S. Sixth Street, De Pere WI, and via video conference.

---

**Members Present:** Allouez – Sean Gehin, John Deuchert  
Bellevue – Teal Spellman, Mike Mahloch  
De Pere – Scott Thoresen, Eric Zygarlicke  
Denmark – Erika Thronson (video)  
Howard – Geoff Farr (video)  
Lawrence – Kurt Minten  
Ledgeview – Greg Potts

**Also Present:** Zach Pethan, Manitowoc Public Utilities  
Gary Rosenbeck, McMahon Assoc. (video)  
Tony Kappell, McMahon Assoc. (video)  
Nic Sparacio, CBCWA General Manager

---

The Central Brown County Water Authority – Technical Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Scott Thoresen of De Pere.

**Roll Call:**

Attendance was recorded as shown above. (Attendees present via video conference are noted with “video.”)

**Approval of Agenda:**

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

**Approval of Minutes:**

2. October 10, 2023  
There were no revisions to the draft minutes.  
**Motion made by Lawrence, seconded by Allouez to approve the October 10, 2023 minutes as presented.**  
**MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Appearances or Communications:**

3. None

**Agenda Items:**

**4. Project status updates**

**a. Ductile iron pipe survey and protection**

Nic Sparacio reported that a draft contract for the project has been provided to Corrosion Integrity, and we await their response.

**b. Emergency back-up supply study**

The Committee discussed in detail the potential recommendations identified in the draft study. Sparacio asked various questions in order to gauge whether the study is heading in the right direction from the perspective of the Member utilities.

The Committee discussed whether in an emergency they would each be willing to rely on the groundwater wells of another Member with better water quality than that of their own wells. There was a consensus that more options are better than fewer in an emergency, but it would also depend in part on the cost of making the improvements to provide the needed interconnections, pumping, etc. There was also a consensus that the water quality differences between Members are minimal and are mainly aesthetic in nature. Some Members have greater concern over well water quality than others, and the benefits of using a higher quality back-up source increase for emergencies of longer duration. Well capacity could also become a concern in an emergency situation, which could also lead to the need to rely on well water from another interconnected Member.

The Committee then discussed the specific recommendations for improved emergency back-up supply in each community. Gary Rosenbeck explained that the concept of transfer of water between Member communities via the Water Authority transmission main is viable and would be helpful for a number of emergency scenarios. There was a general consensus that the value of additional interconnections between Members is a function of risk tolerance. All the Members can already provide their own well water, but it reduces risk to have multiple alternatives available.

The Committee recognizes the lack of emergency back-up power for many of the existing groundwater wells. It would be very costly to add back-up power to every well, but a case can be made for strategic investments in back-up power at key locations. The lack of chemical feed equipment at the wells is also recognized. The Committee discussed whether there would be an expectation of having that equipment in place for an emergency that lasts longer than 48 hours. Rosenbeck clarified that in his conversation with the Department of Natural Resources, chlorination is not required for an emergency back-up well unless you have a bac-T problem. It was also noted that only De Pere and Howard have their wells connected to SCADA.

The Committee identified some additional alternatives that were not included in the draft study. The idea of an additional central storage facility located further west in the transmission system was discussed. Rosenbeck responded that storage is a short-term solution, and this plan is most concerned with longer term interruptions to service. The

idea of constructing one or more new wells at the existing Central Storage Facility was discussed. Sparacio and Rosenbeck responded that groundwater quality is problematic at that location, and the existing wells have more than enough capacity to serve the Membership. The idea of connecting existing wells directly to the transmission main was discussed. This may be a viable option for wells of higher quality that are located close to the Authority main.

Sean Gehin asked whether it would be advisable for any Members to abandon any existing groundwater wells and rely on other Members to provide emergency back-up supply. Sparacio responded that the commitment to share water has to be based on excess capacity. Each Member has the right to satisfy its own needs first, then share any excess. The Committee recognized that this could be a reason to have a centralized system for emergency back-up supply with involvement by the Water Authority and MPU. Discussion continued on the concept of the Water Authority providing a new source of back-up water, but no practical alternatives were identified. Such an alternative also has the disadvantage that it would serve limited transmission system failure scenarios as compared to maintaining the dispersed network of existing wells.

Thoresen asked how the costs of well maintenance and adding back-up power might be shared if a cooperative approach to emergency back-up supply were taken. Greg Potts gave the example of the well maintenance costs being considered in Ledgeview. Sparacio responded that a formula would be required to reflect the different costs borne, and potential benefits received, by each Member. Discussion continued, and there was a consensus that the ability to reach agreement on a cost-sharing concept will depend on the numbers. The next steps will involve selecting the most strategically beneficial wells and estimating costs for the recommended improvements. Geoff Farr joined the meeting at this time.

Discussion continued on the potential costs involved with the various alternatives for emergency back-up supply. The expectations for the potential local cost of any related improvements varied widely between Members. It was questioned whether there is any advantage to completing the study if there will be any local costs involved. There was a consensus that the analysis should be completed before any final conclusions are drawn. While there may not be a big enough difference in water quality to justify major costs, there are some needs that have been identified that may be addressed efficiently through a coordinated approach.

Sparacio then described the next steps in the process needed to formulate a coherent recommendation to the Water Authority Board. The Committee discussed the timeline for making a recommendation to the Board. It seemed reasonable to achieve that by mid-year of 2024.

**c. Hydrant Installation and leak detection near DP-5/LE-2**

Zach Pethan reported that the hydrant has been installed successfully and the modifications to the air release valve pit have been made for the Piper ball leak

detection process. He then described the anticipated process for deploying the Piper ball devices. The Members are welcome to attend and observe that process.

**d. Annual maintenance for chlorine system automatic shut-offs**

Sparacio reported that he is awaiting a quote from Hawkins for annual maintenance on the chlorine shut-offs, but it was not ready in time for the meeting. He further noted that the shut-offs are also due for removal and recertification by the manufacturer, so that will also be included in the upcoming maintenance. He will help coordinate a date that works for everyone to meet the Hawkins representative.

**e. FWPS reservoir roof repairs**

There was no update on this item.

**f. Village of Denmark water supply connection**

Erika Thronson reported on construction progress. The contractor has completed everything they can until the SCADA panels and generator arrive.

**g. Communication planning**

Sparacio reported on progress with the communication planning process. The local officials' presentation on PFAS and water quality was presented to the Board and is now being offered to Member governing bodies and committees. A video tour of the Denmark connection station will be posted on social media in the near future.

**h. Water System Excellence Project report card data**

Sparacio stated that he is prepared to present the financial and infrastructure elements of the WSEP report cards, but this can be postponed until next month for the sake of time. The Committee elected to move this discussion to the December meeting.

**5. Nation-wide water system settlements for 3M and DuPont class actions**

Sparacio updated the Technical Committee on the discussion on this topic at the Water Authority Board meeting. The Committee discussed the nature of the class action settlements and how they are planning to respond. It was noted that communities must opt out of the settlements, or they will be automatically included. Discussion continued on the terms of the preliminary settlements and how little impact they would have on the Members. It was noted that the Water Authority itself is not included in the class.

**6. Annual review of connection station responsibilities**

Sparacio explained that this is an annual review, and nothing has changed in how the connection stations are maintained. Thoresen asked that this be brought back for next month's meeting.

**7. Water sales report through October 31, 2023**

Sparacio reported that water consumption was once again higher than typical for the month of October. Water use overall is still more than 5% above this same time last year. He pointed out that the spreadsheet that was sent out earlier today is accurate. MPU is

working out a SCADA issue that affected data collection for one day, but the meter readings for the month will not change.

Thoresen asked for an explanation of the bottom portion of the estimated true-up report that deals with the volume-based charges. Sparacio responded that these amounts are not included in the true-up process since they are charged on a volume basis. They were added to the monthly report at the request of the Committee so that the Members can see their total charges to date including both the fixed, monthly amounts and the volume-based amounts.

Farr asked whether there are any rate adjustments anticipated at this point. Sparacio responded that he will have to wait to see all the operational expenses for the year, but at this point he does not anticipate an adjustment to the operational rate. It appears that the Members will use a greater volume of water than budgeted, but the total water purchase cost should remain within budget.

**Old Business:**

**8. None**

**Next Meeting:**

**Agenda Items for the Thursday, December 7, 2023 Meeting**

Potential items for the December meeting include:

- Possible review of the proposed construction in the Water Authority easement on parcel D-2141, Town of Ledgeview
- Further discussion on the WSEP water system report cards
- Annual review of connection station responsibilities
- 2024 Technical Committee officers, meeting location, and meeting schedule

**Adjourn:**

**Motion made by Lawrence, seconded by Allouez to adjourn at 3:30 p.m.**

**MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Respectfully submitted,  
Nicolas Sparacio