

VILLAGE OF GRAFTON

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, MAY 6, 2019

The Board of Public Works meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Chair Tom Krueger.

Board members present: Trustee Tom Krueger, Trustee Sue Meinecke, Trustee David Liss, Pat Murray, and Les Blum.

Staff present: Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Amber Thomas, Utility Superintendent Tim Nennig, Facility Operations Coordinator Larry Roy, and Administrative Assistant Melissa Depies.

Others present: Jonathan Butt – Symbiont, Trustee Dave Antoine, Trustee John Gassert and Trustee Lisa Uribe Harbeck.

HEAR PERSONS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD

None

WATER & WASTEWATER

Discuss Final WPDES Permit Compliance Plan Options

Director of Public Works/Village Engineer Amber Thomas explained that the Village has been discussing and planning for phosphorus removal as it pertains to the WPDES permit compliance for a number of years. The Village must submit a Final Compliance Alternatives Plan to the DNR by June 30, 2019.

Jon Butt, Symbiont, explained that the Village has two options:

- Plant Improvements: Options include the following Tertiary Filter Options:
 - Cloth Filtration + Coagulant Addition
 - Sand Filtration + Coagulant Addition
 - Membrane Filtration + Coagulant Addition
 - Algae/Membrane Filtration

Mr. Butt noted that filtration with cloth media is the most cost effective. The life expectancy of the filters is 7 to 10 years. The cost of the cloth is \$1,200 to \$2,000 per cloth and each filter disk has multiple sections. Disposal of the cloth can be done with regular garbage collection; there would be zero additional disposal fees.

- Adaptive Management: With this option there are no guarantees that the work completed will meet the permit requirements. The Village could invest in improvements and still not meet the requirements. Cost will be kept at a

minimum in years 1 and 2 and will increase in year 3 provided improvements are being shown.

Trustee Gassert questioned if the Village would receive a credit if they would eliminate farmland by adding a subdivision. Mr. Butt responded that the DNR will not consider that as a best management practice; however by changing a bare field into lawns it will reduce the run off level. Monitoring should show the reduction in levels.

Director Thomas stated that Utility Superintendent Nennig put together a list of the pros and cons for both options. Adaptive Management does appear to be the cheapest option; however has a risk of unknown results.

- If adaptive management is chosen, the Village, at any time, can choose to change to treatment plant upgrades. Consequently, if treatment plant upgrades were chosen now we could never change to adaptive management.
- Adaptive management extends the timeframe for compliance from 5 years to 15 years. This gives the Village time to figure out further solutions, continue to weigh options, and extends the timeframe for associated costs.
- The last instream monitoring by the Village was done in 2012. At that point numbers were very close to actually meeting current water quality standards for our stretch of the Milwaukee River. With positive changes occurring upstream as well, new instream monitoring should be done to see what the current concentrations are. Adaptive management would buy the Village time to do additional in-stream water quality monitoring.
- Upstream communities are currently considering tertiary filters and those improvements will lower the concentrations of phosphorus in the Village compliance area as well. Furthermore Ozaukee County, MMSD, and farm communities are all looking at doing improvements, and with adaptive management the Village would take advantage of any up-stream improvements.
- Changes at the legislative level are currently occurring that may greatly change the process for nutrient trading. If this option becomes more desirable in the future, choosing adaptive management now, would give the Village the option to change to nutrient trading in the future if they so desired.
- Adaptive management would allow the Village time to test out options for adding a second location of chemical addition at the plant, and determining how that could help meet compliance.

Utility Superintendent Nennig stated that monitoring will be done in house utilizing Utility staff, lab, and materials. In 2012 (the last time samples were taken) staff sampled 7 locations. Sampling locations would be reduced in the future.

Trustee Krueger questioned what the DNR monitoring requirements were. Mr. Butt responded that he anticipated that samples would need to be taken monthly April through October for the duration of the permit.

Trustee Krueger questioned if the Village achieved compliance in the first permit term; would future permits be issued without further testing. Mr. Butt anticipated that the DNR would continue to want the monitoring.

Director Thomas recommended that the Village authorize Adaptive Management and re-evaluate the plan on a yearly basis.

Utility Superintendent Nennig stated that Adaptive Management is a risk however the savings could be significant and all improvements being done upstream will also benefit the Village directly.

Mr. Blum questioned if the Village would take a sample now and meet the permit requirements would we need to continue with all this.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Thomas stated that interviews for the Utility Clerk are being conducted Tuesday, May 7.

Trustee Krueger questioned if the Village was still working with City Water to complete the utility billing while the new Utility Clerk is being hired. Director Thomas responded yes.

The Village is receiving applications for the plant operator until May 14.

ADJOURN

Motion by Mr. Blum, seconded by Mr. Murray, to adjourn the meeting at 6:58 p.m. Motion carried.