

**TOWN OF JAMESTOWN  
BOARD OF  
WATER AND SEWER COMMISSIONERS**

Tuesday, January 20, 2004

A regular meeting of the Jamestown Town Council sitting as the Board of Water and Sewer Commissioners was called to order at the Jamestown Philomenian Library, Conference Room, 26 North Road at 7:12 PM by Commission President Kenneth G. Littman. The following members were present:

Julio DiGiando  
Claire W. Ferguson  
Guy Settipane

Also present were:

Maryanne Crawford, CPA, Town Administrator  
Steven J. Goslee, Public Works Director  
J. William W. Harsch, Esq., Town Solicitor  
Denise Jennings, Assistant Finance Director/Water and Sewer Clerk

Absent:

Commission Vice-President David Long

Commission President Littman asked all to pause for moment of silence in honor of Maegan Harpool who passed away in an automobile accident on 01/17/04.

Commission consensus: To allow a presentation by Christopher C. Yannoni, Vice-President-Fay, Spofford and Thorndike, re: Filter Evaluation Report (cost analysis), originally scheduled under **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**.

Commission consensus: To allow a presentation by John Hannigan from Vollmer Associates re: Project schedule and Budget preparation for the proposed Highway facility, originally scheduled under **TOWN BUSINESS**.

Presentation by Christopher C. Yannoni, Vice-President-Fay, Spofford and Thorndike re: Filter Evaluation Report (cost analysis) from Fay, Spofford and Thorndike.

Mr. Yannoni and Donald Bunker were present from Fay, Spofford and Thorndike. Mr. Yannoni distributed a document entitled "Water Treatment Plant Improvements Conceptual Cost Comparison" to the Commission, Town Administrator and the Public Works Director.

Mr. Yannoni stated that in November 2003 he was asked by the Commission to prepare a cost analysis between the two different treatment process options and that he and his associate Mr. Bunker were here this evening to present a summary of their results. The two options were as follows:

1. Increase capacity of existing Water Treatment Plant by adding third filter unit
2. Construct a new Water Treatment Facility with Membrane Filtration

Mr. Bunker gave a brief summary of the Town's water supply requirements as follows:

- 1999 average daily demand-215,000 gallons per day
- Flushing and backwash utilize another 15%-32,250 gallons per day
- Total current water supply requirement-247,800 gallons per day
- Maximum water demand per day-450,000 gallons per day

Mr. Bunker reported the following as to the Town’s need to evaluate and make improvements to the Water Treatment Plant:

- To increase capacity
  - Estimated maximum daily demand is 450,000 gallons per day
  - Current Water Treatment Plant capacity is 350,000 gallons per day
  - There is a treatment supply deficit of 100,000 gallons
- Improve water quality

Mr. Bunker briefly described the process to increase the capacity of the existing Water Treatment Plant by adding the third filter unit and also the process to construct a new Water Treatment Facility with Membrane filtration.

Mr. Bunker displayed diagrams and briefly described each of the following:

- Existing US Filter Trident Process (View 1 and 2)
- Conceptual expansion to the existing Water Treatment Plant
- Immersed Membrane Filtration (View 1 through 4)

Mr. Bunker outlined the estimated capital construction costs for the two options as follows:

	<b>WTP Expansion</b>	<b>New Membrane WTP</b>
<b>Filtration Related Process Equipment</b>	\$435,000	\$1,225,000
<b>Pumping Equipment</b>	\$80,000	\$80,000
<b>Building Improvements/Construction/Site Work</b>	\$515,000	\$500,000
<b>Total Capital Cost</b>	\$1,030,000	\$1,805,000
<b>40% Contingencies &amp; Engineering</b>	\$415,000	\$720,000
<b>Total Treatment Plant Capital Cost</b>	\$1,445,000	\$2,525,000

Mr. Bunker outlined the annual estimated operation & maintenance costs as follows:

	<b>WTP Expansion</b>	<b>New Membrane WTP</b>
<b>Chemicals</b>	\$37,000	\$31,500
<b>Media Replacement</b>	\$500	\$7,800
<b>Equipment Maintenance</b>	\$21,000	\$19,500
<b>Process Power</b>	\$5,000	\$9,500
<b>Pumping Costs</b>	\$21,000	\$21,000
<b>Labor *</b>	\$133,100	\$99,800
<b>Total Annual Operation &amp; Maintenance Costs</b>	\$217,600	\$189,100

\*Please note: See written document submitted by FST for the breakdown of labor costs.

Mr. Bunker outlined the estimated total project life cycle costs as follows:

	<b>WTP Expansion</b>	<b>New Membrane WTP</b>
<b>Capital Costs</b>	\$1,445,000	\$2,525,000
<b>Annual Operation &amp; Maintenance Costs</b>	\$241,600	\$189,100
<b>Operation &amp; Maintenance Life Cycle Cost</b>	\$3,010,000	\$2,355,000
<b>Total Life Cycle Cost</b>	<b>\$4,455,000</b>	<b>\$4,880,000</b>

Life cycle costs are based on 5% interest rate over 20 years.

Mr. Bunker outlined the estimated equivalent annual project costs as follows:

	<b>WTP Expansion</b>	<b>New Membrane WTP</b>
<b>Capital Costs</b>	\$116,000	\$203,000
<b>Annual Operation &amp; Maintenance Costs</b>	\$218,000	\$189,000
<b>Equipment Replacement</b>	\$24,000	\$0
<b>Total Annual Equivalent Cost</b>	<b>\$358,000</b>	<b>\$392,000</b>

Annual Costs Based on 5% interest rate.

Mr. Bunker described the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the existing water treatment plant as follows:

- Advantages
  - Town has existing operating experience
  - Lower capital cost
- Disadvantages
  - Wastes 25,000 to 50,000 gpd of needed water supply
  - Does not provide a physical barrier to pathogens
  - Requires complicated construction to existing equipment
  - Produces more backwash wastewater than the membrane option
  - No decrease in operator attention
  - Relies on 15 year old equipment

Mr. Bunker described the advantages and disadvantages of building a new membrane water treatment plant as follows:

- Advantages
  - Wastes 5,000 to 10,000 gpd (net gain of 20,000 to 40,000 gpd of needed water supply)
  - Ability to meet more stringent regulations
  - Only process to provide a physical barrier to pathogens
  - Produces significantly less wastewater than the existing process
  - Very high effluent water quality
  - State-of-art technology

- Requires less chemicals and operator attention than existing WTP
- Minimal interruption to existing plant during construction
- Disadvantages
  - Higher capital cost
  - High membrane replacement cost
  - Periodic chemical cleaning required

Mr. Bunker outlined the potential schedule to expand the existing WTP as follows:

- Preliminary and Final Design--March 2004-September 2004
- State Review and Approval--September 2004-December 2004
- Bidding and Award--December 2004-February 2005
- Construction--February 2005-March 2006
- Start-up and Testing--March 2006-May 2006

Mr. Bunker outlined the potential schedule to build a new membrane WTP as follows:

- Pilot Testing (two seasons)--March 2004-November 2004
- State Review and Approval--December 2004-March 2005
- Preliminary and Final Design--March 2005-September 2005
- State Review and Approval--September 2005-December 2005
- Bidding and Award--December 2005-February 2006
- Construction--February 2006-February 2007
- Start-up and Testing--February 2007-May 2007

Mr. Bunker briefly described the Bench-Scale Chloramination Trial process.

The Commission asked for clarification on several items as reported by Mr. Yannoni and Mr. Bunker. The Commission President thanked Mr. Yannoni and Mr. Bunker for their presentation and stated that their information will be very helpful.

Commission consensus: To continue this matter to the next Water and Sewer Meeting on 02/17/04.

### TOWN BUSINESS

Presentation by Vollmer Associates re: Project schedule and Budget preparation for the **proposed highway facility**.

Council President Littman briefly outlined the status of the proposed highway facility and then turned the presentation over to John Hannigan from Vollmer and Associates.

Mr. Hannigan stated that he was present to update the Council on the status of the project. Mr. Hannigan reported that he has reviewed the letters and reports that have come in and is aware of the concerns. He further reported that he is ready to move forward with a cost estimate and with the preliminary design of the building. Mr. Hannigan stated that Vollmer and Associates would like to meet with the Town Administrator and the Public Works Director to discuss and select the building structure. Mr. Hannigan briefly described the different types of building structures, the materials used and amenities. Mr. Hannigan stated that once the structure is chosen the cost estimate can be calculated. Mr. Hannigan reported that Vollmer and Associates would be meeting with the State to discuss alternatives for drainage and discharge. The Council asked for clarification on a few items as presented by Mr. Hannigan. Council President Littman asked Mr. Hannigan if he needed any additional information or direction from the Council. Mr. Hannigan stated that he did not need any

additional information from the Council, that he only needed the Council to agree to the process that he has presented. Short discussion ensued regarding the different building structures, cost estimate and vehicle movement. Councilor Settipane stated that he would like to meet with Vollmer and Associates, following their meeting with the Town Administrator and the Public Works Director regarding their discussion on the different building structures. Short discussion followed. The Council President thanked Mr. Hannigan for his report.

Council consensus: To allow Vollmer and Associates to proceed with the process as presented, to ask Vollmer and Associates to report back to the Council on 02/17/04 and to continue this matter to the next Water and Sewer Meeting under Town Business on 02/17/04.

Commission consensus: To allow a presentation by Charles Masso regarding water charges and penalty assessment fee, originally scheduled under **LETTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS** and under **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**.

**Penalty Assessment Fee:**

Commission President Littman briefly outlined the history and the adoption of the Penalty Assessment Fee and stated that there appears to be a lot of concern and anger related to this fee. Commission President Littman further stated that this was done as part of the adoption of the new rate structure in April 2003 and was the intention of the Commission to continue the ongoing conservation measures and to generate revenue. Commissioner Settipane stated that when the fee was adopted, the Commission asked the Town Administrator to address the critical needs of the water system and the need to generate revenue and that one suggestion was to add a penalty fee. Commissioner Settipane further stated that the rate structure was the main focus to generate additional revenue and that the Commission did not foresee the implications of the penalty fee.

The Town Administrator briefly outlined the history and the adoption of the Penalty Assessment Fee, the rate structure and the three options presented for the Water Budget for the 2003/2004 fiscal year.

Solicitor Harsch reported that he had spoken to Commissioner Long who could not be present this evening and he had stated that he would like to speak on this matter at the next Town Council Meeting on 01/26/04.

Commission President Littman asked the Town Administrator for a status report on the rate study. Ms. Crawford reported that the rate study has gone out to bid and that the report may be completed in time for water budget process. She further reported that this would be a three-year study. Short discussion followed regarding the rate study. Following discussion, the Solicitor stated that he would like to review the meeting notices and minutes to see if the Penalty Assessment Fee was properly noticed.

Letter from Charles Masso re: excess water charges and penalty fees:

Charles Masso the co-owner of Chopmist Charlie's and Tricia Tropi Grille was present. Mr. Masso presented the Commission, Public Works Director, Town Administrator and the Water and Sewer Clerk with a written document. Mr. Masso proceeded to read this document and expressed his concerns regarding excess water charges and penalty assessment fees.

Phyllis Bedard, owner of Trattoria Simpatico stated that she agreed with Mr. Masso and that she cannot conserve any more that she already does and that if the rate structure stays the same she will

not be able to avoid the penalty fee.

Following continued discussion on this matter, it was the consensus of the Commission to continue this matter to the next Town Council Meeting on 01/26/04.

**9:10 PM:** The Commission President called for a short break and stated that the meeting would resume at 9:15 PM.

**9:15 PM:** The meeting resumed.

### **READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1) 12/15/03 (regular meeting)

Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commission President Littman to accept the 12/15/03 (regular meeting) minutes. Motion so voted. 3 in favor; Commissioner Ferguson abstained. Commissioner Ferguson was not present at said meeting.

### **REPORT OF TOWN OFFICIALS**

1) **Pumping Report:**

Mr. Goslee reported the following:

- Pumping was up slightly for the month of December, but has since returned to normal. The leak was found and repaired at the intersection of High Street and Walcott Avenue. Mr. Goslee stated that in his opinion, the break was caused by John Rocchio Corp. storing heavy equipment at that site and that he intends to submit a claim for the loss.
- Rainfall was above average for the month of December.
- Reservoir is still historically high for this time of the year.
- Color level has increased slightly.

2) **Town project reports**

#### **Town Wells:**

Mr. Goslee reported that all wells are still off line for the season, with the exception of JR5 which is being used for the RO Pilot and that this is kept running to keep the pipe from freezing.

#### **North/South Pipeline:**

Mr. Goslee reported the following:

- The project is complete and that there may be some clean up work in the spring.
- The total cost for the project came in around \$150,000.
- The original bid for the project was \$196,000.
- Costs came in approximately \$45,000 less than projected.

Short discussion ensued regarding the additional costs associated with the completion of the project.

#### **Aeration System:**

Mr. Goslee reported that the Aeration System is shut down for the winter. Mr. Goslee stated that the

reservoir is starting to freeze and that the system by be turned on to get the bubbles going around the system to keep the ice from crushing the system.

**Beavertail Road water line replacement:**

Mr. Goslee reported that a few additional days have been spent on the project and that it is almost complete. The work will resume as time permits this winter.

**Treatment Plant:**

Mr. Goslee reported the following:

- Training continues on the new Department of Health regulations (effective January 1, 2004).
- New reporting and testing has commenced.
- New THHM testing will be done the second week of February and that this testing will give the Town an idea as to its ability to meet the lowered limits of disinfection of by products.

**Transfer Pumping:**

Mr. Goslee reported that the pipeline has been completed, is available for use and that due to the historical high level of the reservoir he does not anticipate any transfer pumping in the near future.

**Reverse Osmosis Pilot Study:**

Mr. Goslee reported that the plant has been up and running, but due to the sub-zero weather the system has been shut down temporarily and that the project will resume when the weather warms up.

**Sewer Plant Rehabilitation:**

No action taken.

Mr. Goslee commended his employees for doing a great job during this sub-zero weather.

The Commission asked for clarification on a few items as reported by Mr. Goslee.

**LETTERS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

- 1) Letter from **Jocelyn T. Shaw** (6 Blueberry Lane) re: 12/03 Water bill  
Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner Ferguson to accept the communication from Jocelyn T. Shaw (6 Blueberry Lane) re 12/03 Water bill. So unanimously voted.
- 2) Letter from **Anne E. Zettek** (90 Racquet Road) re: Penalty Assessment Fee bill  
Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner DiGiando to accept the communication from Anne E. Zettek (90 Racquet Road) re: Penalty Assessment Fee bill. So unanimously voted.
- 3) Copy of memorandum dated 01/09/04 from the Town Solicitor to the Town Administrator re: **Draft of amendments to the Rules and Regulations** of the Board of Water Commissioners  
Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commission President Littman to accept the communication dated 01/09/04 from the Town Solicitor to the Town Administrator re: Draft of amendments to the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Water Commissioners. So unanimously voted.
- 4) Letter from Charles Masso re: excess **water charges and penalty fees**

Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner DiGiando to accept the communication from Charles Masso re: excess water charges and penalty fee. So unanimously voted.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** (All items were continued from 12/15/03)

1) **Filter Evaluation Report** from Fay, Spofford and Thorndike  
a) Presentation by Christopher C. Yannoni, Vice-President-Fay, Spofford and Thorndike  
Previously discussed.

2) **Penalty Fee**  
Previously discussed.

2) Written guidelines regarding **extension of service**  
Discussion follows.

3) **Retrofit Financial Incentive Program**  
a) Eligibility requirements  
Discussion follows.

Discussion ensued on the Copy of the Memorandum dated 01/09/04 from the Town Solicitor to the Town Administrator re: Draft of amendments to the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Water Commissioners. The Commission President asked the Solicitor for clarification regarding the advertising requirements for the proposed amendments. The Solicitor stated that since the Commission is changing the water and sewer regulations and have given adequate notice on the agenda and all items have been presented in the past, if the Commission simply wanted to move to adopt them it could and if the Commission wanted to hold a public hearing they can. The Solicitor further stated that he does not think that there is anything that states that they absolutely have to hold a public hearing on this kind of technical amendment. Following clarification, motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner Ferguson to adopt the amendments as proposed and presented by the Solicitor in his memorandum dated 01/09/04, with the exception of amendment number 3 entitled "Addition of Rates & Exemptions". So unanimously voted.

4) Award bid for **Pump Station Rehabilitation Project**  
Motion was made by Commission President Littman, seconded by Commissioner DiGiando to continue this matter to the next Water and Sewer Meeting on 02/17/04. So unanimously voted.

5) Verizon Wireless re: Amendment to lease  
Ms. Crawford reported that the Solicitor is working with a representative of Verizon Wireless and their attorney regarding this matter. Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner DiGiando to continue this matter to the next Water and Sewer Meeting on 02/17/04. So unanimously voted.

**NEW BUSINESS**

(None scheduled)

## BILLS AND PAYROLL

Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner Ferguson to approve the Water Bills and Payroll. So unanimously voted.

Commissioner Settipane stated that he would like to be involved in the vote to approve the Sewer Bills and Payroll, but would like to recuse himself from the approval of the Siegmund & Associates bill. Solicitor Harsch recommended that the Commission make two separate votes.

Motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commissioner Ferguson to approve the Sewer Bills and Payroll, excluding the bill from Siegmund & Associates in the amount of \$18,010.80. So unanimously voted.

Motion was made by Commission President Littman, seconded by Commissioner Ferguson to approve the Siegmund & Associates bill in the amount of \$18,010.80. Motion so voted, 4 in favor; Commissioner Settipane abstained.

## TOWN BUSINESS

- 1) Presentation by Vollmer Associates re: **Highway facility**
  - a) Project schedule
  - b) Budget preparation

Previously addressed.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Settipane, seconded by Commission President Littman to adjourn the meeting at 9:47 PM. So unanimously voted.

Attest:

Denise Jennings  
Assistant Finance Director/Water and Sewer Clerk

xc: Commission Members (5)  
Town Administrator  
Town Solicitor  
Public Works Director  
Town Clerk