



Minutes of October 17, 2023

A meeting of the Wausau Water Works Commission was called to order at 11:30 a.m. in City Hall on Tuesday, October 17th, 2023. In compliance with Wisconsin Statutes, this meeting was posted and receipted for by the Wausau Daily Herald on October 13th, 2023.

Members Present: President Rosenberg, Commissioners Herbst, Robinson, Force, Gehin
Others Present: Eric Lindman, Scott Boers, Ben Brooks, Tegan Troutner, James Henderson
WebEx: Monica Dvorak, Susan Wojtkiewicz/ Donohue, Sean Agid/ CIP, Shawn Kerachsky/ CIP, Pete Littleton/ CIP.

1) Approve Minutes of September 5th 2023 Meeting.

Herbst motioned to approve minutes. Seconded by Gehin.

Motion Carried 5-0.

2) Director's Report on Utility Operations.

Lindman began with the asset management. We've been working with IT and the County to possibly get one software for Asset Management. The Utility feels that City Works is the best option for us as it is compatible with Workday, the HR/Finance software, and does everything we would need within public works and the utility. There would be two procurement components: purchase of the software and then hiring a firm for the work/integration of assets into the software. The final step once all for the assets are uploaded into the software there would need to be an integration of the software into Workday. The utility was budgeted in 2023 to procure asset management software and begin implementation. City would be moving forward with City Works Software and start working on a contract and scope of services with them and also using cooperative purchasing to hire a firm to integrate our assets into the software and the software into Workday.

Robinson questioned if we were going to buy or just lease the equipment because sometimes with a lease, they stop providing support so it would be wise to get a commitment on supporting it. With the integration, would we be able to utilize that for the LSL project to categorize the material type?

Lindman replied it would be ongoing 3-5 year renewable contract, there is no cost at this time available but we want to see what other municipalities are doing. The integration would be in asset management, the material types are in our ESRI program with GIS, we won't be doing horizontal assets immediately, it would be a couple years before we are able to do that.

Rosenberg stated the County wants this and we're still talking through what the needs are.

Gehin questioned if we were required by DNR or PSC to have this in place?

Lindman replied we are required to track certain operations and maintenance done on an annual basis. I think City Works would do a great job.

Boers replied a lot of this is trying to keep up with our PM's and maintenance, we have

about 3,000 items to keep track of at the plant and only 3 techs.

Lindman stated another thing is the organization and reclassifications, Finance and I have reached out to Ehlers to prepare financial information on this as requested, once we have all the information put together, there will be a request to have a joint HR/Commission Meeting, you'll probably see some request on availability coming up in the next couple of weeks.

Gehin questioned if the Granular Activated Carbon was before or after the resin bank?

Boers replied the Carbon is after the Ion Exchange currently. The process piping for the GAC has been designed so that this could be reversed in the future if needed.

Robinson questioned if the carbon is after the resin, we are changing out the resin for adsorption of PFAS, the resin in place was for TOC and other issues, would the fact that it's first in line compromise its ability to remove other materials of concern in the resin? Would the resin remove PFAS or are we modifying the resin? The resin can adsorb X amount of material, do we know that the resin's assimilative capabilities will not be impacted by PFAS to negatively impact the TOC? Were we looking at a resin changeout of 20 years?

Boers replied, the ion exchange will remove the TOC making the carbon more efficient for PFAS removal. It won't be overworking the carbon by removing the TOC ahead of it. There will be some PFAS removal by the resin as there is now. As expected, once the PFAS builds up on the resin it starts sluffing off as that last 22.7 parts per trillion number showed that we had, it will be captured in the carbon. It is not expected to compromise that the resin or reduce its efficiency. 6 resin vessels were changed out as of last Friday. The cost was included on bid in the project a little over a million dollars. Disposal has not been done yet, we are storing the extracted resin onsite and looking into it.

Force questioned if we would continue to replace resin once the carbon vessels are in place? It would still last 15-20 years even though there would be some PFAS loading on the Ion exchange? How about the disposal options?

Boers replied we are not intending to continuously change out the resin but there is one more resin change out bid in our contract for construction, after that, the resin is anticipated to go 15-20 years for TOC removal and then PFAS removed from the carbon system on the tail end of the plant. We have sent new resin (not used yet) to State Lab of Hygiene, they will artificially place PFAS on that resin and see if they could remove it. If they figure out how they will remove PFAS from the resin, they will send samples down and tell us how much PFAS is in the resin.

Rosenberg replied that the governor sent out an RFP to communities to host hazardous waste landfill, this will be a continuous conversation. We did as a city sign on to environmental justice resolution so we won't just put it in a spot where it becomes hazardous to the people.

Robinson questioned if we could capture PFAS off the resin, would we be able to reuse that ion exchange in the future?

Boers replied we won't know that I'm not aware of a good process to do that yet but the first step is to find out how much PFAS is in there and what could be done.

Lindman stated EPA is also doing some testing for us and will be doing some bench testing on some of that used resin as well.

Gehin stated the water quality is beautiful right now.

Director's Report Placed on File.

3) Discussion on Proposed Ordinance for Mandatory Lead Service Line Replacement.

Rosenberg began this is for discussion.

Lindman stated this was brought forward a couple of years ago, the ordinance is intertwined in this, the PSC requires a mandatory ordinance in place to use user rates to pay back any loan. In this ordinance, situations are written into ordinances, we are not giving mandated deadlines we know there is a cost burden to the homeowners, we wanted to have this discussion

with explanation and have been working with legal staff and other municipalities that have this in place already. Is this something you want brought back for action? All Commissioners nodded in agreement.

Force questioned if we had a deadline on this?

Lindman replied we are one of the participants in the EPA accelerator program, we have an engineering firm drafting the PSC application for using user rates before end of year but it's not on a hard deadline. Lead Service Line is focusing on just the private side for the 2024 season, as we move forward, if it becomes necessary to use user rates to pay back loans, is the commission and city going to commit to no cost to the homeowner and where that funding is coming from?

Robinson questioned if we know what the cost to the homeowner would be? It would be better if we had the cost or better estimate as we prepare to enter the contract for the acceleration to get better numbers.

Rosenberg replied about \$10k.

Lindman replied we anticipate shorter lines so hopefully less than that, they are giving us a cost per site as a performance incentive. We anticipate less than \$10k on the private side.

Force questioned how many lines were replaced on Grant St between 6th and 7th St and the cost for the private line?

Boers replied it came in lower at \$3100 to \$3200 per line and there were only a handful on Grant that needed changeout.

Gehin questioned item 4 on mineral rich groundwater flowing through the lead/galvanized pipes is not fair to say after we had treatment. I did not see build up in the lead, but I see the buildup in the galvanized.

Force wanted to make sure that the mandated ordinance does not require change out until the street public side is changed as it could be some time. Is there a discussion between contractor and homeowner to what type of boring or trenching would be done.

Lindman replied as October 2024, we would be required for the whole thing to be changed and not partial replacements anymore. It could be reversed too, if the homeowner decides to replace their side, we will have to replace our side too. As we get into this 5-year timeframe, we would get to those properties. Is the city funding 100% private as well as public side, if we don't have the principal forgiveness where is the additional funding coming from? There would be a lot of upfront communication and the contractor and homeowner would have the discussions. Is this something you want us to evaluate and bring back next month to move forward? A good rule of thumb would be \$4,500 to \$5,000 on the private side. Are you looking for private and public side cost or total cost or year to year basis cost as it depends on the funding and principal forgiveness that's based on funding annually.

Robinson replied all of the above, how do we sequence it and the universe of the cost for both the public and private side costs, annual impact, and what that means and ballpark figures.

No Action Taken.

4) Discussion and Possible Action Approving an Agreement with Westrum Leak Detection for Leak Surveys in Years 2025, 2027, and 2029.

Boers stated this is for an approval for agreement with Westrum, they've been doing this for 25 years, knows our system, finds leaks and works well with our staff and pricing is comparable with other companies that do the same work.

Gehin motioned to approve this agreement with Westrum Leak Detection for years 2025, 2027, and 2029. Seconded by Force.

Motion Carried 5-0.

5) Discussion and Possible Action on Sole Source Request for Well 3 Rehabilitation and

Cleaning.

Boers stated the paperwork and sole source was completed but never got a chance to come to Commission for approval. The cost quoted was the same as the price of repair in 2017. The Well hit a wall and was losing production fast, we were able to get them in to do this and now the work is completed. The original quote was over \$30k. They finished the initial work but the results weren't satisfactory, we asked them to do another round of chemical treatment. The well is now fully functional with good pumping capacity. We have an outstanding bill. Because of the PFAS, the plan to keep Well 3 running and just aerate it and discharge to the river is no longer an option; this well will need to continue to be run and the water treated and until the EPA decides it can be shut down.

Gehin motioned to approve the Sole Source Request for Well 3 Rehabilitation and Cleaning. Seconded by Herbst.

Motion Carried 5-0.

6) Discussion and Possible Action Approving Ongoing Sole Source Request for Lab Testing Services through Northern Lakes Services, Inc. (NLS).

Boers stated this a request to get rid of the continued need for an RFP and extra paperwork. Some labs we have used are specialized and some are competitive in their testing pricing, but after you add in the shipping and bottles they become more expensive and less convenient. We have a good working relationship with Northern Lakes Service, we worked out a nice delivery system where we could overnight in-between facilities simplifying the delivery method of the samples. It would be helpful to get this approved.

Herbst questioned the cost?

Boers replied we do about \$150k a year, it's budgeted but reduces the amount we go out for RFP's or requiring samples.

Gehin motioned to approve the ongoing sole source request for lab testing services through Northern Lakes Services, Inc. Seconded by Robinson.

Motion Carried 5-0.

7) Discussion on Utility Financial Strategies and Key Performance Indexes.

Dvorok stated this is not ready yet.

Rosenberg replied we will skip for now and maybe have it ready next time.

No Action Taken.

8) Discussion and Possible Action Approving a Contract with Community Infrastructure Partners (CIP) for Lead Service Line Replacements.

Lindman began this is the contract for LSL 5-year replacement, legal reviewed but had comments to discuss with CIP's Attorney but this is the concept moving forward for this project. If the commission would approve this subject to legal final review discussion and clarification.

Troutner reviewed certain clauses and issues for discussion within the contract that needed to be reviewed and discussed. See YouTube video for Wausau Water Works Commission Meeting 10/17/2023.

Robinson motioned to approve entering a contract with CIP subject to legal review and approval with authorized official signing off on it upon a resolution. Seconded by Herbst.

Motion Carried 5-0.

9) Discussion and Possible Action Approving a Reimbursement Resolution for the Clean Water Fund for the Wastewater Treatment Facility Headworks Project.

Lindman began this is our application to DNR for our headworks screening improvements project seeking principal forgiveness for this project. This allows us to use the grant and loan funds to reimburse us for work done ahead of the funding allocated to the city.

Force questioned if we were adding influent screen if they were not part of the design.

Brooks replied this was part of the initial project design but for cost saving measures it was decided not to proceed with the work. We are venturing into this project to take care of the headworks that should've been done as part of the project.

Lindman replied we have screens but issues with the building prevent us from being able to properly maintain and clean the screens. The city approved \$800k funding with ARPA but this will not cover the total project so we have applied for possible DNR grant funding. We haven't seen the funding allocation yet.

Robinson questioned if this was done already or contingent upon funding?

Brooks replied work has not been done, some engineering done to help out with the applications but there were plans and specs submitted to DNR and we were able to alter those plans to resubmit revisions. We are altering the headworks and redesigning it to get the screens up from the basement and there will be new step screens installed. The ones in place are aged. It will not impact our influent quality. It will capture more solids and larger debris.

Gehin motioned to approve a reimbursement resolution for the Clean Water Fund for the Wastewater Treatment Facility Headworks Project. Seconded by Herbst.

Motion Carried 5-0.

10) Adjourn.

Robinson motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Force.

Motion Carried 5-0.

Link to view meeting in its entirety: <https://tinyurl.com/wausaucitycouncil>

Gina Vang, Recording Secretary

S:\WaterWorks\Common\WaterCommission\2023\November\WWWC_20231017_Minutes.doc.