

**SELMA-KINGSBURG-FOWLER
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT
MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING**

August 9, 2007

The regular Board Meeting of the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District was called to order at 4:07 p.m. by the Chairwoman, Judith Case.

DIRECTORS' ROLL CALL

Leland Bergstrom, Vice-Chairman (present)
David Cárdenas (present)
Don Tow (present)
Bob Waterston (present)
Judith Case, Chairwoman (present)

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PRESENT

David Michel, General Manager/ Board Sec.
Ben Muñoz, Jr., Assistant Manager
Veronica Cazares, Supervising Engineer
Robert Whitley, District Engineer
Craig Strong, California Employers' Association

OTHERS PRESENT

Ed Blanton, Kingsburg Resident
Norman Krebbs, Kingsburg Resident

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

There being no comments from the public, a motion to approve the minutes of the Board Meeting of July 12, 2007, was made by Director Cárdenas, seconded by Director Waterston, and approved by the following vote:

AYE:	Directors, Cárdenas, Waterston, Bergstrom and Case
NO:	Director Tow
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Schedule for Organizational Review

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that the following is the staff plan to review the District's organizational structure to identify opportunities to improve efficiency & communications, and to maximize staff's & consultants' expertise.

July 2007 - General Manager and Assistant Manager meet several times to discuss organizational structure, job duties & responsibilities, preparations for succession planning and future District personnel needs. Develop draft recommendations.

Early August 2007 - General Manager and Assistant Manager meet with staff and District Engineer to present draft recommendations. Revise recommendations after receiving staff input.

Late August 2007 – Review recommendations with Director Bergstrom who has been assigned to work with staff on the organizational structure review. Revise recommendations after receiving input from Director Bergstrom.

Early September 2007 - General Manager and Assistant Manager meet with staff and District Engineer to present recommendations after receiving input from Director Bergstrom. Revise recommendations after receiving staff input.

Late September 2007 - Review final draft with Director Bergstrom.

October 2007 – Present recommendations to Board.

Chairwoman Case requested that the Board see a draft.

Schedule for Development of District Strategic Plan

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that the District is in the process of increasing plant capacity to 6.3 million gallons per day (mgd) to accommodate up to 4,400 new ESFR's already identified. The prospect of additional growth, including an additional 5,000-6,000 ESFR's being planned for the Golden State Boulevard – Mountain View area, makes it imperative that the District begin to plan for treatment and disposal facilities for flows in excess of 6.3 mgd.

A strategic plan is a set of identifiable actions to achieve specified objectives. The following is staff's schedule for development of District Strategic Plan (GM=General Manager; AGM =Assistant General Manager; DE=District Engineer).

August 2007 - GM, AGM and DE create a list of possible objectives.

September 2007 - Management staff and DE meet, with facilitator, to modify, increase or decrease the list of possible objectives and to develop a list of actions for meeting objectives.

October 2007 - DTAC, limited staff and DE meet to modify, increase or decrease the lists of objectives and actions.

Late October 2007 – Management staff and DE meet (or conference call) to refine the lists of objectives and actions.

November 2007 - DTAC, limited staff and DE meet to review and refine the lists of objectives and actions.

Late November 2007 - GM, AGM and DE finalize draft lists of objectives and actions to present to joint Board-DTAC meeting.

December 2007 - Board and DTAC have a special meeting with only agenda item being strategic plan.

January 2008 - GM, AGM and DE finalize objectives and actions to present to Board for approval.

February 2008 - Board approves the strategic plan at a regular Board Meeting.

Eisenhardt Group, Inc. Close-Out Billing

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that the Board has authorized a budget of \$56,048 for the operations and maintenance audit performed by Eisenhardt Group, Inc. (EGI). The final close-out billing from EGI includes extra work that was either requested by the Board or was necessary to complete the project. The Board should increase the authorized budget amount by \$4,499.20.

The final close-out billing from EGI shows the following services rendered:

Preparation and attendance at the June 14, 2007 Board Meeting regarding developer impact fees (requested by Board)	\$2,024.07
Unanticipated additional hours to complete the project and the Assessment Report (see attached letter)	<u>\$2,475.13</u>
TOTAL	\$4,499.20

Staff recommended that the Board increase the budget for the EGI work from \$56,048.00 to \$60,547.20.

Consent Calendar Approval

There being no comments from the public, a motion to approve the consent calendar as stated above, was made by Director Tow, seconded by Director Bergstrom, and approved by the following vote:

AYE:	Directors Tow, Bergstrom, Cárdenas, Waterston and Case
NO:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

PUBLIC COMMENTS (first call) None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Aeration Basin No. 3 Repair Plan

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that the following is staff's plan and schedule to repair the air leak in the Aeration Basin No. 3 (AB-3) piping and to assess the overall condition of the fine bubble diffuser system. The project will require a temporary usage of more electricity. Some subsequent savings in electricity usage may result from the repair, depending on wastewater loadings to the treatment plant.

August - October 2007 – Prepare new piping, collars, domes and floor fittings on dry ground. Wait until peach season is concluded in late September and until threat of rain on raisins has passed. District Engineer to confirm the sufficiency of horsepower in Aeration Basin No. 2 (AB-2). Prepare standby equipment and standby basin.

November 1, 2007 – Begin to turn on additional 825 horsepower (HP) of electrical equipment in AB-2. Begin to transfer activated sludge from AB-3 to AB-2.

November 15, 2007 – Begin adding process water to AB-3 to flush out remaining activated sludge. Maintain operation of 350 HP blower in AB-3.

November 22, 2007 – Begin to drain the flush water from AB-3. Maintain operation of 350 HP blower in AB-3.

November 30, 2007 – Turn off 350 HP blower in AB-3 and start to wash down work areas with 2" hose.

December 7, 2007 – Begin repairs of air leaks and assess the condition of the fine bubble diffuser system.

January 7, 2008 – Turn on 350 HP blower in AB-3 and begin to add process water to test the repairs.

January 21, 2008 – Begin to reduce the 825 HP in AB-2 and begin to transfer the activated sludge from AB-2 to AB-3. Maintain operation of 350 HP blower in AB-3.

February, 2008 – Staff and District Engineer discuss next step (clean, replace or modify AB-3 fine bubble diffuser system).

February 7, 2008 – Begin to add process water to AB-2 to flush it out. Maintain adequate HP in AB-2.

February 21, 2008 – Turn off all aerator HP in AB-2.

District Engineer Whitley said that he concurs with the repair sequence.

Kingsburg resident Ed Blanton said that the system had not been cleaned in 20 years. He referred to a letter dated August 6, 2007 which had been distributed to the Board and to the public and which is attached to these minutes.

The consensus of the Board was that, while staff should proceed with preparations, this item should be presented to the District Technical Advisory Committee (DTAC) for their review and no basin is to be turned off or turned on for this project without first reporting back to the Board.

NEW BUSINESS

Clarifiers and Grit Tanks Weirs & Baffles

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that wastewater contains various constituents that are corrosive to metal components of treatment structures, even when the installed metal is coated with epoxy. A weir is a notched overflow plate that keeps the water elevation at a certain height. The weirs at the grit removal chambers and at Clarifiers Nos. 1 and 2 are corroded and need to be replaced with fiberglass weirs. A baffle is an inner ring around a clarifier that keeps floating material inside to be collected by a scraper arm while letting clear water flow underneath and then up and over the weirs. The baffles at Clarifiers Nos. 1 and 2 (283-foot circumference) are corroded and need to be replaced with fiberglass.

This refurbishment project is identified in the budget as item 8047-204-02 and was estimated at \$100,000 in anticipation of contracting out the work. District forces can and should do the work as a continuation of ongoing maintenance. The materials to be purchased are estimated to cost no more than \$40,000.

Staff recommended that the Board activate budget item 8047-204-02 with an appropriation of \$40,000 instead of \$100,000 and direct District forces to follow purchasing policy and perform the project as part of ongoing maintenance.

Kingsburg resident Ed Blanton concurred with the proposed project.

There being no further comments from the public, a motion to activate budget item 8047-204-02 with an appropriation of \$40,000 instead of \$100,000 and direct District forces to follow purchasing policy and perform the project as part of ongoing maintenance, was made by Director Cárdenas, seconded by Director Bergstrom, and approved by the following vote:

AYE:	Directors Cárdenas, Bergstrom, Tow, Waterston and Case
NO:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Treatment Site Buffer Strip Landscaping

In a written memo, General Manager Michel reported that if the Board wishes to establish a tree lined buffer strip around part of the treatment plant site, the first step is to authorize the clearing of the 100-foot wide strip. Eventually, an irrigation system will need to be installed by the District and then the trees can be obtained by a State grant. This item is identified in the budget at \$25,000 which needs to be increased to \$60,000.

Staff has planned for a 100-foot wide buffer strip of trees on the east and south side of the treatment facilities. Additionally, a 50-foot wide buffer strip on each side of Conejo Avenue has been planned. The 100-foot strip is intended to be planted with a double row of *Sequoia sempervirens* "Aptos Blue" (Coast Redwood). The 50-foot strip would have one row. The trees would reduce the possibility of odor and fly nuisances and would beautify the plant perimeter.

After the Board amends the budget from \$25,000 to \$60,000, the first step would be for staff to notify the various lessees. Then staff would follow purchasing procedures to have the strips of land cleared by early 2008 (approximately \$12,000). Then, staff would solicit bids to design/build a 14,000-foot irrigation system using treated effluent (approximately \$48,000). Then, in 2009, a \$50,000 tree grant would be obtained to purchase the 500 trees, stakes, ties and fertilizer through the California Department of Forestry.

Neither the land clearing nor the irrigation system is grant eligible. District staff and California Consulting staff looked into a grant for trails, but the cost to the District would be the same or more, a wider strip would be needed (reducing the land available for treatment facilities) and there would be ongoing maintenance costs.

Staff recommended that the Board amend budget item 8052-204-02 to increase the appropriation from \$25,000 to \$60,000, direct staff to notify the lessee's, authorize staff to follow purchasing procedures in requesting quotes for clearing the necessary strips of land, authorize staff to solicit bids for the design/build of a 14,000-foot irrigation system and authorize staff to apply for a grant for trees.

Chairwoman Case advised that the developers should do it. The District needs to save money and staff time for other things. Director Cárdenas said that landscaping is not a priority at this time. We have no current problems with neighbors. Director Bergstrom said that at least we should fence it and clean it up and prepare it for trees.

Kingsburg resident Ed Blanton said that the District should sell the land on the west. Director Bergstrom said that Mr. Blanton's colleagues on the operations audit team recommended buying more land. Kingsburg resident Norman Krebbs opposed the expenditure. The money should be spent to get the plant back where it should be.

Director Tow said that the money should be spent on getting the inside of the plant working and clean up the perimeter. Director Case said that ultimately the District should try to get one farmer to lease all the land.

There being no further comments from the public, a motion to approve the staff recommendation was made by Director Waterston. The motion died for lack of a second.

A motion to not accept the staff recommendation and bring back "use of the buffer zone" as a future agenda item, was made by Director Tow, seconded by Director Cárdenas, and approved by the following vote:

AYE:	Directors Tow, Cárdenas, Bergstrom, Waterston and Case
NO:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Guidelines for Administrative Implementation of Ordinance No. 42

In an written addendum memo, General Manager Michel reported that, as requested by the Board, staff has prepared a preliminary draft revision to the Guidelines for Administrative Implementation of Ordinance No. 42 (draft 8-3-07) and it has been reviewed by the District Engineer and General Counsel. It has been prepared to address the waiving of industrial connection fees and to reflect the recently evaluated average daily capacity of the treatment and disposal facilities. Staff recommended that no action be taken until the industrial users have been given a chance to review the preliminary draft and request changes to the baseline discharges established therein.

Ordinance No. 42, which was adopted in 1986, established a surcharge fee for excessive industrial discharge. Guidelines for implementing Ordinance No. 42 were established in 1986 and identified a baseline discharge (BLD) for each industrial discharger.

A summary of the changes to the 1986 policy are as follows:

- 1) References to “Grant-Funded Industrial Capacity” have been deleted as a result of recent treatment plant capacity engineering evaluations.
- 2) References to the Board waiving connection fees under certain circumstances have been deleted.
- 3) References allowing existing industries to increase their Baseline Discharge capacity entitlement upon annual request, with no payment of connection fee, have been deleted.
- 4) Aggregate Industrial Capacity remains in the Resolution. Table 13 (Aggregate Industrial Capacity) has been revised to include the exact monthly amounts of Flow, BOD and Suspended Solids upon which are based the fixed charge for the adopted FY 2007-08 budget. Those amounts are the actual discharges, or BLD, whichever is higher, for the 12 months ending February 28, 2007.
- 5) References to surcharges for excessive discharge have been deleted. If an industry discharges in excess of BLD, and the aggregate industrial capacity is also exceeded, then the industry must reduce its discharge (or purchase additional BLD).
- 6) The term “Significant Industrial User (SIU)” has been changed to “Major Industrial User” because SIU is a specifically defined term in the federal pretreatment program and does not match SKF’s BLD-related definition, causing confusion.

It was the consensus of the Board that an industrial users workshop be held and that the matter be referred to the District Technical Advisory Committee (DTAC).

COMMUNICATIONS

General Manager Michel distributed a letter dated 8-6-07 from the City of Selma asking for a response to their letter dated April 4, 2007, which had been referred to General Counsel Hargrove. Chairwoman Case said that the District should respond.

General Manager Michel reported that Director Cárdenas will be attending the conference of the California Association of Sanitation Agencies in San Diego from August 15th through August 18th. He will be attending sessions on Saturday and therefore needs to stay in the hotel Saturday night,

which will be billed at the regular rate rather than the conference rate. Chairwoman Case said that the cost of the hotel was worth the knowledge gained.

Director Bergstrom described a tour of a dairy which he recently had taken. They hosed down all animal waste to a covered pond, collected the methane gas, and used it to fuel Caterpillar engines that turned electrical generators supplying much of the electricity for running the dairy. He asked if such technology was used in wastewater treatment. General Manager Michel said that anaerobic digestion and electrical generation was a common technology and was used throughout the central valley. Board members expressed interest in a tour of such facilities. The consensus of the Board was to tour the District treatment plant at 2:30 p.m. immediately prior to the October Board Meeting.

Director Tow requested that the EGI report be placed on the next agenda for discussion.

ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS

Chairwoman Case asked that a description of the various electrical bills and a review of the phone expenses be presented at the next meeting. There being no comments from the public, a motion to accept the warrant list report showing checks issued in the amount of \$677,731.78, was made by Director Bergstrom, seconded by Director Cárdenas, and approved by the following vote:

AYE:	Directors Bergstrom, Cárdenas, Tow, Waterston and Case
NO:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

PUBLIC COMMENTS (second call) None.

CLOSED SESSION

General Manager Michel reported that there was no change in the status of the labor negotiations as reported in the confidential memo and a closed session was not needed.

ADJOURNMENT

The consensus of the Board was to set the next Board Meeting for 4:00 p.m. on September 20th to avoid a conflict with League of California Cities and a previously-authorized absence by General Manager Michel. There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairwoman Case declared the meeting adjourned to September 20, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. on a motion duly made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote at 6:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved,

David Michel, General Manager/
Secretary of the Board

Judith G. Case
Chairwoman of the Board

C-D-B
RECEIVED
AUG 07 2007
S-K-F CSD

DATE: August 6, 2007

TO : SKF CSD GOVERNING BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ED BLANTON, 2301 12th Avenue, KINGSBURG, CA 93631
SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON ITEMS OF THE AUGUST 12th BOARD AGENDA

AGENDA ITEMS: C-1: I encourage the BOARD's full participation and a ZERO BASED BUDGET ANALYSIS for each position added to the Organization since the 1998-99 Budget year which had a staff of 27 employed of a 28 chart level.

C-2: The plan has AB-2 being started up and used during the repair work on AB-3, but then after AB-3 repairs or refurbishment work is completed, the plan suggests AB-2 be shut down. I do not understand why AB-2 has been off line at all nor why AB-1 was converted to a digester from its configuration as part of the biological (Activated Sludge) accumulative 8.00 MGD capacity as reported to the RWQCB in the Application for Discharge Order and in subsequent reports. Since the plant now has centrifuges for solids disposal all year round, the use of AB-1 as a digester seems imprudent and effectively reduces the plant's capacity because the efficient rating of the least unit is the plant's capacity, AB-1 should be returned to the biological process. These facts have not been mentioned by staff, WBA or in the EGI study. The thrust during the past year has been to deceptively convince the Board that new plant facilities must be constructed to increase the plant capacity that was found deficient by studies of other plant components which yield invalid conclusions because of failure of the biological unit AB-3 and the removal of AB-1 from service and AB-2 out-of-service.

These operation management decisions to fail to properly maintain AB-3 per the manufacturer's instructions, to remove AB-1 from use as an activated sludge reactor and finally to leave 35% of the total designed activated sludge treatment capacity, AB-2 off line after diverting 15% to other use and going twenty years without performing maintenance on the 50% unit leave me without any understanding of the rationale for them. I know that staff's and WBA's failures to apprise the Board of these facts as they reported failures of the clarifiers, DAF unit, ponds (un-cleaned for 20 years) and the effluent pipe to the overfull ponds seem to simply convince it that the plant is worn out and needs to be rebuilt anew. The worse distortion of facts is staff's and the engineer's representation of the plant as over thirty years old. Its true effective life began in 1983 with the completion of four Clean Water Grant Construction Grants projects to completely refurbish the 1975 plant. This means its age is only 24 years but its condition as far as treatment processes is un-maintained.

I again ask each of you to review what I have repeatedly pointed out over the past year and recall how clear facts were stated in support of staff recommendations and whether you fully understood what you were doing and the full costs. Did the District get full value on its investments in physical plant use or have things generally been represented

with "Urgent Need" flags and you allowed it to go forward without all you questions been answered?

C-3: My letter to the Board containing remarks on ITEMS on the July 12th Agenda did not get presented so I attach it here for your review especially my comments on EGI as the answer to the Board's intention to have an "Independent Engineering Firm" review staff and the district's engineers' decisions over the past few years and most importantly considering the \$1,300,000 + in fees paid to WBA these past seven years.

E-1: The AB-3 repair outline should, at a minimum, replace with new diffusers all 15,000 of the twenty year old domes which have not ever been cleaned, not once whereas the manufacturer's instructions followed would have provided over 20 high pressure washings and 20 acid sprayings. Does anyone wonder why the unit failed?

F-1: I am not certain if this project intends to replace the clarifier fiberglass weirs which were installed in the late 1980's, or if only the Grit Chambers are intended for this project. This broad project description that combines two separate treatment processes is exactly what I mean when I refer to intentional to incompetent explanations of the project. This distorts the costs of individual processes and the accurate identification of cost per million gallons for each process. These costs are critical to "management control" and are the "Bench Marks" EGI referred to in their report. The individual processes can be easily compared to other public WWTP plant costs.

Fiberglass does not corrode so these clarifier weirs are likely in good condition as I would believe that staff would have immediately repaired or replaced any impact damaged weirs.

F-2: Projects not specifically treatment processes directed should NOT divert the very short cash resources of the capital funds or add M&O Operations costs that do process wastewater or a by-product of a plant process. This Buffer area thing is so distorted from the simple down-wind land ownership of a few acres the Board agreed to in 1996 that it has become a cancer and has improperly diverted millions of capital dollars for a paranoid idea that residential growth is just around the corner and that contiguous property lines with a WWTP are incompatible. I would believe the least costly option would have been to wait for the event of such growth and cover any treatment process that may be an odor source.

What has happened in the management's distortion of the original intent, in my opinion, has put the District in Violation of CEQA, the District's Revenue Plan and has remove from the County's Revenue sources property taxes and agricultural production (jobs) and now the push is continuing toward "Park and Recreation" uses which very clearly is not a "latent power" under the State's County Sanitation District Act.

The District's original plant acreage was included in the SKF CSD Environmental Impact Statement and additions, modifications and repair/refurbishment activities were in compliance with the Master EIS which allowed the District's GM to process and communicate the Assessment forms, hearing schedule and prepare the findings for filing with the County. This process required no outside consultant services after Brown And Caldwell's work for the 1978-83 CWG plant fix up project. Why does the District now ignore CEQA or farm the work out at great cost?

F-3: Industry expansion as well as new connections must Not be without payment of connection and annexation fees and the service charge system should apply surcharge of double or greater multipliers for industrial dischargers exceeding the approved or permitted loadings. Do away with the current estimating system for the loadings anticipated during the year and implement a moving five-year discharge average value to plug into the Revenue Calculation forms. This will meet industry's main objection to its fiscal planning because the rate changes will be very flat. Another stabilizing method would be to use the previous year's actual rate with a bond guaranteeing payment should the business cease.

This whole mess came about from the initial engineering application values of the existing connected industries to the three cities forming the new regional district as its industrial needs, the existing municipal loadings and the USEPA permissible growth rate value all added together to result in the fundable plant capacity. Firm contracts were to be made with each industry before the submission of the capacity number, but were never done and no EPA challenge was ever communicated and as a result, the attested existing industrial discharges included firms that refused to continue in the system or to connect. Libby's in Selma was an example as well as the McCall Avenue Meat Packing plant. These represented a significant capacity that was arbitrarily assigned as a "wind fall" to the industrial inventory instead of to the community general capacity reserve. This must now be corrected as well as reversal of the forgiven fees which unfairly pass costs on to community users.

I am submitting these remarks to, I pray provide you each with truth, historical understanding and my opinions (educated guesses).

Sincerely,


R. Ed Blanton

DATE: July 12, 2005

TO: GOVERNING BOARD, SKF CSD
FROM : ED BLANTON, 2301 12th AVE., KINGSBURG
SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM COMMENTS: C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, C-5 and C-6

C-1 The Cities have long done nothing to justify this 5% of service charges collected within their boundaries and these monies should be used for the district costs to comply with the new State Permit to operate local sewer systems.

C-2 A 40 foot trailer and its tractor is too large to safely operate within the plant. I object to another TOAT GOAT waste.

C-3 Why was this land purchased? Why does it now need a fence just because a public agency owns it? Mr. Morgan moved to this locale and a private owner had no fence so why does district ownership mandate this expense. Sell this surplus property and all except 70 to 80 acres adjacent to the east and south property lines.

C-4 The City of Selma collects connection fees for improvements to its collection system and it permitted or constructed this sewer. Has it lived out its useful life or is this an improvement enlarging the pipe. Why is it being constructed as individual lateral crossings instead of a single pipe on the connections side of the street to a manhole sited opposite a manhole into which a single crossing can be made?

C-5 This is yet another design "oversight", as was the failure to provide infrastructure and equipment mounting fasteners for a second unit if a second unit was known to be needed. The EGI report in the 6-30-07 Final Report ATTACHMENT B. c.2. "The DAFT..." noted as did I and was contradicted by David Michel, that the centrifuge should be run more hours and days to maximize utilization and capital return. The REPORT also called out the AB-3 maintenance needs and the problem with evaluating the clarifiers while processing poor quality discharge from AB-3.

C-6 I have reviewed the REPORT and feel a bit like saying "I told you so", but I preface my remarks by noting it was favorable to and supported WBA engineers' recommendations irrespective of the evaluation errors. The force main perk ponds project failed to note that these conditions are a repeat of those of 1983-86 which were corrected by dredging the ponds, by dewatering by pumping to the sludge injection site and 1979 drying beds. This allowed the cleaning of the ponds, the construction of Pond No. 4 (4 & 5) and their restoration to service for over 20 years. They should have had repeated cleaning over those years to maintain their functionality as designed. The poor WBA engineers would never have been misled had this maintenance program been continued.

from and vital information deficits have resulted in costly misdirection as the forced main and Pond No. 6 represent and which should be halted. The Board should direct that Ben Munoz be assigned to prepare a maintenance outline report immediately for the restoration of the activated sludge system to effective service and to refurbish AB-3 while concurrently dewatering and cleaning the Perk Ponds. No other projects should distract staff until these two facilities have had their neglected maintenance programs restored.

RECOMMEDDATION: I analyzed the Effluent Pipe (feed to PP-1 through 5) which was stated to have an engineering estimate (instead of a firm fixed fee) of \$190,300 for a grossly inflated construction estimate of \$2,000,000. This a fee of 9.51% which is the level defined as "more than average complexity" by the "Guidelines" from the ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING BASIC SERVICES FEE PERCENTAGE NEGOTIATION which is now used in lieu of the ASCE MOP No. 45. In 1987, I had a HOBAS liner jacked into the 36-inch concrete pipe of the WARD DRAIN through and under 800 L.F. of the plant for \$150,000 with engineering cost at \$2000. This was for one manhole and about 800 lineal feet of 32-inch liner inserted at a cost of \$185/L.F. Assuming the rate is \$225/L.F. now, the 3708 L.F. proposed forced main would cost \$834,300. Engineering should be the lowest level as a flat rate task to mark up sheets of the original construction plans, put on notes pertinent to the to insertion of the liner and the five valves feed to the ponds. The engineering cost for this part of the project should not exceed \$10,000 plus time and materials for the pond feeds and pump station. The total cost of that engineering should be \$10,000 additional. This twenty thousand dollars is a far cry from \$190,300. Somebody in the district is asleep at the wheel or ignorant of construction and negotiating engineering fees.

This is the first project I have analyzed, but I think it is typical judging on the 10% rates planned for the pond Alternates 1, 5 & 7. I believe the earthwork is not a high complexity design task nor should fees be calculated on contingency allowances nor mobilization and demobilization. Alt. 1 engineering fee estimate is stated as two amounts, \$76,240 and \$289,740 for a grand total of \$365,980. I suggest fee negotiations be reviewed for work over the past seven years.

The Alt. 7 estimates were \$252,550 and \$189,300 for a total of \$441,850.

All were at ten percent and were applied to estimates and contingencies costs estimates. The earthwork is the simplest work, and is able to be performed by a licensed surveyor or even a licensed contractor within the price of his bid. Turnkey on such work will save thousands in inflated engineering costs.

I strongly suggest a change to an engineering firm in our market area. Thirty years is quite enough especially when those people originally hired no longer do the work. The errors of the past five years and the inflated estimates of degree of complexity for tasks, demand a change. On top of that the "Independent engineering audit" was solicited from only one firm, whose principal is a close personal friend of the district's engineer. In addition it is not an engineering firm, although one of its associates is a retired engineer. The principal until a few years ago, was a Vice President of Malcolm Pirine, Inc. of its National Utility Management Consulting practice and before that he was President of Envirotech Operating Services (EOS) contract services for operating municipal water and wastewater facilities. That was why he refused to accept AB-3 and the Perk Ponds lack of maintenance as significant. He just ain't no Operator or engineer. He is good at studies, statistics and graphic representations of "apples" and "oranges".

These are my opinions, assessments which are based on recent and historical facts and I respectfully submit them for your consideration.

Ed Blanton