



Minutes of November 1st, 2022

A meeting of the Wausau Water Works Commission was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in City Hall on Tuesday, November 1st, 2022. In compliance with Wisconsin Statutes, this meeting was posted and receipted for by the Wausau Daily Herald on October 31st 2022.

Members Present: President Rosenberg, Commissioners Herbst, Force, Gehin, Robinson
Others Present: Eric Lindman, Scott Boers, Ben Brooks, Anne Jacobson, Matt Bednarski/ CDM Smith, Amrou Atassi/CDM Smith, Stephen Opatik/ Becher-Hoppe, Susan Wojtkiewicz/Donohue
Via WebEx: 7154****81

1) Approve Minutes of October 4th 2022 Meeting.

Robinson motioned to approve minutes. Seconded by Herbst.
Motion carried 5-0.

7) Closed Session pursuant to s. 19.85(1)(g), Wis. Stats., conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved, regarding Drinking Water Treatment Facility contractual delays by Miron Construction. *(This item was taken out of Agenda Order)*

Motion to go into closed session read aloud by Herbst. Seconded by Robinson.

Rosenberg stated voice vote: Robinson, Force, Herbst, Gehin and Rosenberg Aye. Gehin remained in the Council Chambers and did not participate in the closed session.

8) Reconvene Meeting into Open Session for the purpose of acting upon Closed Session Item, if necessary. *(This item was taken out of Agenda Order)*

Rosenberg stated we are now back into open session and welcome any comments from our commissioners.

Robinson stated the commission is outraged over the delays in completing the water treatment plant which results in the public's continued exposure to PFAS in the water supply and while I'm not at liberty to discuss the details, staff are evaluating all options to ensure completion of the water treatment plant in an expedited manner.

Rosenberg stated we will also try our best to keep the public informed as we continue this process and can expect more communications from us moving forward.

2) Director's Report on Utility Operations.

Lindman began the proposed funding and the intent to apply with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Safe Drinking Water Fund loan closed yesterday. We requested funding for several projects that we are proposing to undertake for capital to offset some of those costs. We requested funding for our 2023 projects through American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and the Finance Committee accepted those and it has moved forward to the Council for final decision this month. Water and Wastewater utility have not realized full rate increases yet, so cash has been and

would continue to be a struggle until we fully realize all our rate increases. Ehlers will put together a presentation for us in December.

Robinson questioned the characteristic standards for a Class A classification.

Brooks replied it would have to maintain a minimum measurement of heat and time through the drying process to be classified as Class A sludge. The Veolia dryer ran through the performance test last week with a 48-hour period that had to prove it would operate unattended. It produced sludge but it wasn't classified as Class A. It was Class B since but we haven't received the report yet from Veolia and it had 90% plus total solids. Wisconsin DNR will be onsite within the next month or so to inspect and monitor time/heat factor to make sure the sludge we will be producing would be Class A. This would be scheduled through the engineering company (Donohue) and has not been scheduled yet.

Force questioned if Brooks had any concerns that this would not qualify as Class A by DNR standards?

Brooks stated he currently did not have any concerns.

Gehin questioned if there was a water main size issue or piping issue that we are going from 48th -60th Ave with new pipe on Stewart Ave, from 48th to 72nd Ave?

Boers replied an addition of water main would be added from 60th -68th Ave, the project would coincide with Wastewater force main project. Water main addition would be 60th – 68th Ave to make that loop.

Director's Report Placed on File.

3) Presentation by Ehlers on Funding, Borrowing and Status of Water/Sewer Rate Cases.

Rosenberg stated this item is tabled until possibly December meeting.

4) Presentation by Clark-Dietz/ CDM Smith on a Lead Service Line Replacement Plan.

Lindman began that we were moving forward with a lead service line replacement plan and Clark Dietz and CDM Smith were working with us on this project.

Bednarski began at page 54 in the packet, with material inventory and background review, targets and strategies, policy discussion, funding, public outreach, and next steps.

Force questioned the cost of \$10,000 because most of the public side were replaced.

Atassi stated we could separate it out and the overall cost would go down. Lead was federally banned in 1986. Anything galvanized connected to a goose neck would be considered lead, next year would have more clarification but if you are on a block with a few galvanized, my recommendation would be to replace those.

Robinson questioned the timely perspective, ARPA timeline and its requirement to have those funds expensed by 2026. Should we do more work in the earlier years to capture that or what are your recommendations and strategy?

Atassi replied the recommendation would be a pilot project in 2023 or in one of the high priority areas identified and pilot the outreach strategy, look at costs and issues that are preventing homeowners from participating as well as taking advantage of the ARPA fund.

Force questioned if internal piping with lead solder was considered?

Atassi replied that the lead and copper rule revision focus was on the lead service line (from water main into the house). We could educate homeowners during the outreach phase to advise that it would not take care of all the lead as there are some lead piping inside the home and reiterated the scope had to be only the lead service line. We should not initiate an ordinance without a pilot first and with good outreach we may not need an ordinance. After the pilot, if we did everything to partner and people are still not participating then maybe we could start thinking about the ordinance but what is the cost, would it be potential water shut off or a fee?

Force added that the pilot study would be useful as a mandatory ordinance may create resistance.

Robinson stated maybe the ordinance could say if we are replacing public side, you must

replace the private side and there's funding available. What is the City's role? What if we only had 20% participation in the pilot and later we have the other 80% come in and ask for the money. It would cost us more at that time.

Atassi added this would be a 15-year plan zooming in on the first 5 years which includes the pilot that would go in parallel, it would allow recalibration, the 5 in the 15-year strategy, that includes the outreach strategy too.

No Action Taken.

5) Discussion on Potential Future PFAS Regulations Associated with Wastewater Effluent and Biosolids.

Robinson questioned if we received the results from the DNR testing on the influent/effluent testing?

Lindman replied it only included the influent.

Brooks replied that the samples were inconclusive.

Robinson stated we have talked about developing a wholistic approach to PFAS not only what we take in but what we discharge. If we could address the issue on the intake side, it would reduce the effluent or discharge and collection of the biosolids. We could look at where we are when the new system is in place and what is in the biosolids through the Class A sludge? It would be important for us to stay on top of that issue.

Force questioned the pilot study in conjunction with what kind of influent was being delivered to the wastewater plant.

Lindman replied we looked at the regeneration of the an ion-exchange to see if the backwash water contributed to the PFAS water but it was very low concentrations, the PFAS are adhering to the anion media vs being wasted to the Wastewater. With PFAS we must take a wholistic approach as Robinson stated so we can properly and methodically manage PFAS as we move forward and wait for the rules. Our discharge permit is up in 2024- we believe there would be a requirements in 2024 to test the influent and effluent but not the biosolids.

Force questioned if we could test the biosolids for PFAS?

Brooks stated there is currently no approved method for testing the biosolids yet.

Rosenberg reiterated that statement as well.

No Action Taken.

6) Discussion and Possible Action Amending WMC 3.24 Special Assessments, Water and Sewer Connection fees.

Lindman began that the Village of Maine was looking at alternatives for their wastewater of either updating their facility or if it could be carried over to their neighboring community and approached us requesting for the potential fees. In looking at the ordinance, we have connection fees written for individual homes so there's criteria and calculation but nothing that addressed the connection of a municipality. They are all residential at this point so proposed changes specifically addresses if a municipality wanted to connect and we would run the calculations based on the changes. This was written with the attorney's office and consultation from the staff.

Force motioned to approve. Seconded by Robinson.

Motion carried 5-0.

7) Adjourn.

Motion to adjourn by Herbst. Seconded by Gehin.

Motion carried 5-0.

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

Gina Vang, Recording Secretary

S:\WaterWorks\Common\WaterCommission\2022\December\WWWC_20221101_Minutes.doc.