

**TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
TOWN COUNCIL WORKSHOP
Wednesday, August 1, 2012
TOWN HALL CHAMBERS
7:00 p.m.**

A Town Council Workshop of the Old Orchard Beach Town Council was held on Wednesday, August 1, 2012. Chair Quinn opened the meeting at 7:03 p.m.

The following were in attendance:

**Chair Bob Quinn
Vice Chair Michael Tousignant
Councilor Sharri MacDonald
Councilor Robin Dayton
Councilor Michael Coleman
Town Manager Mark Pearson
Assistant Town Manager V. Louise Reid
Chris White, Superintendent of Wastewater Department
Ed Leonard – Wright Pierce Engineering
Lindsey Brough – Wright Pierce Engineering
David Laskey –Wright Pierce Engineering
Stanley Quinlin – Treasurer – Harmon Museum
Charles Davis – Harmon Museum – Board of Trustees**

The Town Council had requested that we re-review the suggested phasing plan identified in the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan to prioritize efficiency, safety and reliability items. The following material was reviewed by the Town Council.

A revised phasing plan for the recommended improvements to the Town's Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) and pumping stations. The recommended improvements are documented in the "Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan" (Wright-Pierce, July 2009). The revised phasing plan was prepared based on the items you identified for us on June 12 and June 22.

A suggested timeline for completing the planning process in order to align with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) State Revolving Fund (SRF) low interest loan program annual application process. The current SRF interest rate is approximately 1.5% for a 20-year loan.

Please note that the Phase 1 projects are higher priority based on equipment condition, co-related, safety-related or efficiency-related. The Phase 2 projects are also recommended, but can wait another 10 years for implementation. The Phase 3 projects are primarily associated with potential future nutrient limits (i.e., nitrogen to Saco Bay) if issued by Maine DEP. Section 5 of the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan identified several project financing scenarios, including the potential funding sources available to the Town. As outlined in the report, the annual debt service for a \$10,500,000 project through an SRF loan was estimated at \$642,000 (20 year term, 2% interest). If the Town was to stay with its

current property tax based system and was to fund the project through the DEP SRF program, the project was estimated to increase the property taxes of a typical single family residence by \$110 per year.

The Town Council had requested that we re-review the suggested phasing plan identified in the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan to prioritize efficiency, safety and reliability items. As per your recent request and our discussions, attached please find the following documents which address that request:

□ A revised phasing plan for the recommended improvements to the Town's Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) and pumping stations. The recommended improvements are documented in the "Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan" (Wright-Pierce, July 2009). The revised phasing plan was prepared based on the items you identified for us on June 12 and June 22.

□ A suggested timeline for completing the planning process in order to align with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) State Revolving Fund (SRF) low interest loan program annual application process. The current SRF interest rate is approximately 1.5% for a 20-year loan. Please note that the Phase 1 projects are higher priority based on equipment condition, code-related, safety-related or efficiency-related. The Phase 2 projects are also recommended, but can wait another 10 years for implementation. The Phase 3 projects are primarily associated with potential future nutrient limits (i.e., nitrogen to Saco Bay) if issued by Maine DEP.

Section 5 of the Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan identified several project financing scenarios, including the potential funding sources available to the Town. As outlined in the report, the annual debt service for a \$10,500,000 project through an SRF loan was estimated at \$642,000 (20 year term, 2% interest). If the Town was to stay with its current property tax based system and was to fund the project through the DEP SRF program, the project was estimated to increase the property taxes of a typical single family residence by \$110 per year.

The purpose of this Workshop was to describe the existing electrical services and emergency power systems at the Town of Old Orchard Beach Wastewater Treatment Facility, and to present several alternatives for modifications to these systems, the purpose being to rectify certain violations of the National Electrical Code (NEC) which exist in the Process Building. The electrical distribution at the facility is served by two electric utility services: (1) a pad mount transformer that feeds both the Process and Control Buildings and (2) a set of pole mounted transformers which feed the Effluent Pump Station. Each of these services has a dedicated emergency generator to provide standby power during utility power interruptions. Further description of each service follows. In addition, the attached Main Single Line Diagram — Existing Conditions depicts the facility services and distribution systems in diagram form.

Electric Service No.1 consists of a pad mount transformer which feeds the Process Building at 1600 amps and the Control Building at 300 amps. The standby emergency generator for this system consists of a newer 180 kW diesel generator (known as the Halfway Generator) installed in 2006 to replace the old unit in the Control Building. This generator is a Detroit Diesel outdoor unit furnished with its own sub-base fuel tank. The system also includes a

C:\Users\kmclaughlin\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\Y0TT4TNR\8 1 12 workshop on wright pierce and harmon museum.doc Page 2 of 11

newer Detroit Diesel automatic transfer switch, rated 480 volts, 260 amps, three phase, three pole. The switch was installed in 2006 in the Control Building in the old generator room. Only part of this electrical service and distribution system is capable of being powered from emergency power, including MCC-1 within the Control Building and MCC-3 within the Primary Pump Room. In addition, a feeder extends from MCC-3 in the Primary Pump Room to one motor control center section (known as MCC-3 Section 8) located in the Process Building basement. MCC 3 Section 8 then supplies power to certain lighting and distribution panel boards in that building. Therefore, a limited amount of emergency power is supplied to the Process Building, but not through its 1600 amp main service equipment. This system, in place since 1985, has been largely unaltered with the exception of equipment replacements noted above. The original system design and installation has certain inherent violations of the National Electrical Code, discussed in more detail later.

Electric Service No.2 was installed in 1994 and was originally designed to supply both normal utility power and emergency power at 800 amps, 480 volts, three phase to the Effluent Pump Station only. The emergency power system consists of a Caterpillar 500 kW diesel generator installed in an outdoor enclosure. Its fuel tank is located inside the Effluent Pump Station on the main floor level. The system also included a Caterpillar automatic transfer switch; however that switch had subsequently failed and was to be replaced. This system has been significantly altered since its original design and construction in that a new feeder was later installed from the Effluent Pump Station to the Process Building. This additional feeder provides normal and emergency power to Aeration Blowers No.2 and No.3 in the latter building. More recently, another feeder was tapped from the aforementioned Aeration Blower feeder to provide power at 480 volts, three phase to the Effluent Sampling Building. The system alterations have created certain violations of the National Electrical Code, discussed in more detail below.

The Process Building was constructed in approximately 1985. There are multiple power feeds to this building, as described below:

- a) There is the main 480 volt, three phase, 1600 amp normal power feed to this building from the pad mount utility transformer previously noted. This feeds two 800 amp main circuit breakers in the 1600 amp ITE main switchboard located in the basement Electrical Room. This building service is part of the original 1985 design and construction.**
- b) There is a 480 volt, three phase, 100 amp normal and emergency power feeder to MCC-3 Section 8, also located in the basement Electrical Room, from the Primary Pump Room. This feeder is also part of the original 1985 design and construction.**
- c) There is a 480 volt, three phase, 350 amp normal and emergency power feeder to Aeration Blowers No.2 and No.3 (and subsequently to the Effluent Sampling Building), which originates from the Effluent Pump Station. As previously described, the Effluent Pump Station has its own utility service and emergency generator. This feeder is not part of the original 1985 design and construction; this was installed by facility personnel or their contractor sometime after 1994.**

There are no readily-accessible power disconnecting means at the Process Building. To disconnect power at this building requires travel through the building to the basement Electrical Room to open main circuit breakers #1 and #2 (normal power only). To disconnect emergency power requires travel to the Primary Pump Room to open the feeder circuit breaker to MCC-3 Section 8. In addition, travel is required to the Effluent
C:\Users\kmclaughlin\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\Y0TT4TNR\8 1 12 workshop on wright pierce and harmon museum.doc Page 3 of 11

Pump Station to open the feeder circuit breaker to Aeration Blowers No.2 and No.3. These conditions constitute multiple violations of the National Electrical Code, as discussed in a letter from Wright-Pierce to the Town dated July 15, 2005.

Subsequent to the various power feeds noted above, facility personnel have installed a means to temporarily feed emergency power to MCC-4 Sections 4, 5, and 6. This involves back feeding Sections 4, 5, and 6 with a hard-wired temporary connection between lugs in MCC-3 Section 8 to a circuit breaker in MCC-4 which formerly fed Aeration Blower No.2. This requires opening and disabling 800 amp Main Circuit Breaker #2 in the ITE switchboard to prevent back feeding generator power (originating from the Control Building Halfway Generator) to the utility pad mount transformer. This operation is reported to be done only during extended power interruptions to provide emergency power to the following equipment in the Process Building:

Return Sludge Pumps, Froth Spray Pumps, and Yard Drain Pumps. This practice constitutes violations of the National Electrical Code as well as utility company standards, because operator error (failure to open MCB #2) could result in simultaneous connection of generator power with utility power.

Identification of Alternatives

Several alternatives to correct the aforementioned NEC violations are presented and discussed briefly below. Reference is also made to the attached Single Line Diagrams for each alternative, which depict that alternative's modifications to the facility services and distribution systems in diagram form. It should be noted that cost estimates are based on conceptual designs only, and must be refined before proceeding with any work.

Alternative No.1 — Disconnect all feeds to the Process Building from the Effluent Pump Station. As shown in the Single Line Diagram for Alternative No.1, the Aeration Blowers would need to be reconnected to MCC-4 as originally designed. This alternative would result in very little of the Process Building, and essentially none of the secondary process, being capable of operating on emergency power. This alternative would get the facility back to the conditions present in the 1985 design and would also not address other NEC violations as noted on the associated Single Line Diagram (i.e. no local disconnect for MCC-3 Section 8 and no readily accessible means to disconnect power). Estimated cost is in the range of \$20,000 to \$30,000.

Alternative No.2 — Add new disconnect switches or circuit breakers at the Process Building, along with appropriate signage, to address NEC violations. As shown in the Single Line Diagram for Alternative No.2, existing feeders to the Process Building would remain intact, but would be re-rerouted to new building disconnecting means to be installed in one location on the exterior of the building. This approach would keep Aeration Blower No. 2 and No. 3 on the Effluent Pump Station utility and standby power services. This alternative is believed to address all identified NEC violations, however, this would need approval of the authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) before commencing any work. Estimated cost is in the range of \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Alternative No.3 — Add a new main circuit breaker, generator set and automatic transfer switch (ATS) for the Process Building only. As shown in the Single Line Diagram for Alternative No.3, the existing feeders to the Process Building from other buildings would be removed, and the Aeration Blowers would need to be reconnected to MCC-4 as originally designed. This alternative is believed to address all identified NEC violations, but would result in the facility now having three emergency generators to operate and maintain. A significant advantage is the Process Building would be entirely capable of being operated on emergency power. Estimated cost is in the range of \$200,000 to \$250,000.

Alternative No.4 — Install a new main circuit breaker, generator set, automatic transfer switch, and distribution switchboard for both the Control Building and the Process Building, and remove the existing Control Building generator set. As shown in the Single Line Diagram for Alternative No.4, the existing feeders to the Process Building from other buildings would be removed, and the Aeration Blowers would need to be reconnected to MCC-4 as originally designed. This alternative is believed to address all identified NEC violations, and would result in the facility still having two emergency generators to operate and maintain. A significant advantage is the Process Building would be entirely capable of being operated on emergency power. Estimated cost is in the range of \$300,000 to \$350,000.

Alternative No.5 — Consolidate systems to one new electrical service and one new generator set and transfer switch for entire facility. As shown in the Single Line Diagram for Alternative No.5, this alternative is the most far-reaching and comprehensive, and would require a significant amount of new electrical equipment and demolition of existing equipment and wiring. This alternative would typically be most justified as part of a facility-wide complete upgrade of all systems, including electrical. Estimated cost is in the range of \$450,000 to \$500,000.

Discussion between the Council, Staff and Wright Pierce continued throughout the presentation. In a presentation this evening he summarized the above two documents including updates on the blower project, electrical service evaluation update, revised phasing plan for the upgrades, funding and grant sources, a project timeline and time for discussions. The blower project update included completed preliminary design in May; issued the RFP for Blower Equipment in June; Received Bids on Blower Equipment in July and had 90% of the design done by early August. The next steps included a decision needed on how to address the building electrical service; awarding the blower equipment contract; soliciting bids for general contractor installation and awarding the GS installation contract. The electrical service update included authorization to proceed in the month of April; identified five possible alternatives on May 2nd and evaluated two preferred alternatives at a workshop on May 16th. The next step is to decide how to address building electrical service. Discussion of the revised phasing plan included the fact that the Town hired Wright-Pierce to conduct a wastewater facilities plan in 2008; they prepared the draft report which was issued in 2009; a workshop was held in April of 2011; the council requested that the phasing plan be reconsidered to prioritize energy efficiency, code/safety and reliability project components; and completed the review on June 22nd. Discussion continued with information on Old Orchard Beach the population of Old Orchard at 9,250 with a peak seasonal amount of approximately 70,000; and existing development is over 90% sewered. There are 36 miles of sewers (approximately 22,000 feet); and nine pump stations. The average daily flows is 1.0 mgd winter and 1.9 mgd

summer; with the design average daily flow of 3.5 mgd. Estimated replacement costs would be about \$100 million. They discussed the plan including preliminary – removing debris, floatables, grit; primary – removes 50% of particulate material; secondary – removes 90% of organic material and some nutrients; and Disinfection – kills bacteria. Factors that are Impacting Needs includes the need to provide reliable and effective service for current and future flows and loading; need to maintain treatment performance for current and future NPDES permit; and to reduce or maintain operating costs associated with aeration blowers, sludge processing and disposal, chemical use, electricity – fuel, oil, lighting, etc., and labor. The needs at the Pump Station included upgrades of pump control panels, telemetry and electrical service for all (completed 2009-2010). Replacement pump stations needed for Milliken Street Pump Station, Portland Avenue Pump Station, and the Ross Road Pump Station. Comprehensive upgrades needed for Halfway Pump Station (at the Waste Water Transfer Station), Comfort Pump Station, East Grand Pump Station, and Dunegrass 100 and 200. Needs at the Transfer Station including the constructions and upgrade at the facility numerous phases: 1960—original construction; 1972 – comprehensive upgrade; 1985 – comprehensive upgrade; 1994 – ocean discharge/dewatering; and 2000 – secondary clarifier. Approximately 70% of the facility infrastructure is twenty-five years old; and approximately 50% of the Town’s electricity budget is from the Waste Water Facility. Again and inefficient equipment and code issues is pressing for solutions. In conclusion Waste Water Transfer Facility is well operated and meets current permit, however, significant portions are aging, inefficient and do not meet current codes and standards; the facility will not meet future permits without upgrades; the facility needs investments to address some safety and code related items; and the pump stations need investment to maintain reliability and efficiency long-term. They discussed the phases of the plan including Phase I – 2013-2017; Phase II – 2022-2025; and Phase III – 2025 – 2030. Project costs included Phase One - \$10.6 million - Schedule 2012-1017; Phase II - \$14.7 million – 2022-2025; Phase III - \$10.4 million – 2025-2030; for a total of \$35.7 million. Annual operating budget (in current dollars) is 2009 - \$1.08 million; After Phase I - \$1.0 million and debt service; and Phase III - \$1.2 million and debt service. In funding and financing – Loan possibilities included – DEP CWSRF – 20 year loan at 2% below MMBB – USDA Rural Development – 30 year loans at market price; General Obligation Bonds at market rate. Grants include Efficiency Maine Grant; Community Development Block Grants; State and Tribal Assistance, USDA/Rural Development (only with user fee) and Maine DEP grant (only with user fee.) The DEP CSWRF Timelines including the annual process starts in March each year; completed by April each year; and enter into a loan by September of the following year. In addition there was discussion of the June 22 memo including Planning – 2012-2013; Design – 2013-2014; Construction – 2014-2016 and start paying new debt – 2016 -2017.

Discussion among the Council the question asked by the Chair about the increase in cost for the Halfway Pump Station. The original Phase One included provisions for screening and grit removal. Under this design, Halfway Pump Station would share equipment and infrastructure therefore reducing costs. Under the revised plan, screening and grit removal was not included. Wright Pierce is proposing to place the Half Way Pump Station in existing unused tanks, but the design and location can be changes. Councilor Coleman asked about the SRF loan schedule. In order to start the project in 2013 the Town would need to have design and cost estimates completed by February of 2013. The Town would not be eligible for major grants due to the lack of a sewer user fee. Bond payments would

not begin until the completion of the project. Councilor Dayton again said that the many hours of discussion on possible sewer user fee indicated the citizens were not interested and although she would push for another discussion, it is obvious the majority do not want it. Councilor MacDonald requested a study to reduce the licenses discharge amount. The current Waste Water Facility is licenses for 3.5 mgd. It currently receives average daily flows (ADF's are dry weather flows) of 500,000 – 750,000 gallons in the winter and 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 in the summer. The actual Waste Water facility capacity under 'wet weather' conditions is upwards of 11.0 mgd. Licenses limits are based on the facility's capacity and ability to treat a certain ADF. To us Councilor MacDonald's comparison – the actual volume of the 'swimming pools' (tanks) determines your license limits. The proposed upgrade does not increase the facilities 'swimming pool' capacity no does it increase the licensed limit. Most of the proposed upgrade is centered on replacing aged and inefficient equipment, consolidating processes and eliminating code issues. The facility, as a whole, has sufficient capacity for years to come; but some of the individual pieces of the facility could never handle ADF's of 3.5 mgd. The Department of Environmental Protection is not increasing licensed discharge flows and prefers to increase the nutrient removal rates. Future license limits would increase costs. Decreasing capacity may also limit growth in Town. It was recommended that contact be made with the Department of Environment Protection. If the Council wants to go further they would need to have Wright Pierce perform an engineering analysis to estimate savings and whether or not it is even plausible to reduce the license limit. The Chair asked for a consensus on addressing the code violations and the Council seemed to have a consensus that Option 2 of the Alternative solutions presented was preferred and Wright Pierce was to refine the estimate to more accurately reflect the costs and bring in forward on the August 21st agenda.

In response to the Old Orchard Beach Town Council's request for information regarding Harmon Museum and Old Orchard Beach Historical Society bank records, the following information was provided to the Council. The Board of Trustees of Harmon Museum and the Board of Officers of the Old Orchard Beach Historical Society have been put into a most uncomfortable position, due to recommendations of Town of Old Orchard Beach that their funds be turned over to the Town, For the following reasons, the Harmon Museum believes that it is inappropriate for these funds to be turned over to the Town for the following reasons:

1. In his 1974 will, W. Warren Harmon left \$15,000 in a trust for the purpose of maintaining the building at 4 Portland Avenue, commonly known as "The Harmon Museum." The Board of Trustees has tried to keep these funds earmarked for the maintenance and future expansion of the Harmon Museum. In fact, since 1992, only eight withdrawals totaling \$1929 have been made from the Harmon Trust checking account at Saco & Biddeford Savings Institution, all used for maintenance of Harmon Museum flooring, plumbing, electricity, a new roof, and painting of the Museum's exterior.
2. It is the recommendation to the Town by the Finance Director that there be a withdrawal of funds from the Harmon Trust to reimburse the Town for expenses associated with account

#50450 ("Building Repair and Maintenance"). For this fiscal year, that withdrawal would be equal to \$4000 taken from the Harmon Trust Fund, an action we strongly oppose.

3. On July 2, 2012, the Finance Director informed Harmon Board of Trustees president Daniel Blaney that, in a workshop, the Town Council had discussed the \$4000 and decided that \$6000 should be withdrawn from the checking and savings accounts of Old Orchard Beach Historical Society, to be used as part of the Town's FY 2013 budget. Therefore, the \$16,500 budget request made by the Harmon Board of Trustees for FY 2013 would be trimmed to \$6000.

4. On July 12, 2012, The Harmon Museum Board of Trustees voted unanimously to use \$25,000 of Harmon Trust funds to purchase new windows at the Museum. The Board also voted not to withdraw \$4000 from the Harmon Trust funds for painting the exterior of the Museum.

5. It should be noted that the Old Orchard Beach Historical Society checking and savings accounts, currently totaling about \$5800, are not supported by the tax-payers of Old Orchard Beach. Rather, they are raised from membership dues, sponsorships, donations, sales of discount water park tickets, along with sales of books, posters, and souvenirs - all as part of a good faith effort to be self-supporting and to not rely upon funds from the Town of Old Orchard Beach Annual Budget. We are concerned that these sources of revenue would disappear if the public became aware that its money, given to Old Orchard Beach Historical Society, was actually going to Town coffers. These monies are used to support the professional goals and programs of Old Orchard Beach Historical Society, such as purchasing acquisitions of historical importance to the Town, archival-quality storage materials, and items needed for the proper display of artifacts, along with the technology needed to successfully manage a museum. In short, the internal operation of Old Orchard Beach Historical Society is an enterprise fund of its own, working to provide a valuable public-relations asset to the Town of Old Orchard Beach.

6. There is internal oversight of the funds of Harmon Museum and Old Orchard Beach Historical Society. Checks made out to an officer must have another officer's signature. All financial records are readily available for inspection by any officer at any time. Additionally, receipts are kept and attached to vouchers requiring signatures of any business or individual who receives a payment.

7. From late June through Labor Day weekend, volunteers from Old Orchard Beach Historical Society serve as tour guides, interpreting the exhibits at Harmon Museum Tuesdays through Fridays from 10:30 a.m. to 4:00 pm. and on Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. From mid-September through early June, approximately fifteen volunteers donate about 3000 hours creating and maintaining exhibits, answering phone calls, letters, and e-mails from all over the United States and Canada, providing historical and genealogical information on the people, places, and events that have made our town the summer resort capital of the East Coast.

8. In summation, we believe that the funds of the Harmon Trust and Old Orchard Beach Historical Society are well-managed and completely disagree with Town's plans to take these funds.

The following discussion was held between the Council and the Harmon Museum staff.

The Council discussed at length the programs that are used to raise this money and consensus was that a request to re-appropriate \$6,000 from Account Number 20118-50350 – Contingency, with a budget of \$296,178 to Account Number 25900-40606 – Harmon Museum budget, with a balance of \$10,000. This would be on the August 7th agenda for Council discussion and approval. It was also suggested that the time for the painting of the building be reevaluated based on the work being done on the window replacement.

**WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY & PUMP STATION UPGRADES FACILITIES
PLANNING
JULY 2009 (ENR INDEX 8566)**

DESCRIPTION	PHASE	ESTIMATED COST	PHASE 1 2012 - 2017	PHASE 2 2022 - 2023	PHASE 3 2025-2030
HALFWAY PUMP STATION	1	\$653,000	\$653,000	\$0	\$0
PRIMARY TREATMENT	2	\$552,000	\$0	\$552,000	\$0
ACTIVATED SLUDGE/ AERATION TANKS	1	\$368,000	\$368,000	\$0	\$0
SECONDARY CLARIFICATION	1, 2	\$489,000	\$219,000	\$270,000	\$0
CHLORINE CONTACT TANKS	2	\$246,000	\$0	\$246,000	\$0
SLUDGE STORAGE TANKS	2	\$381,000	\$0	\$381,000	\$0
EFFLUENT PUMP STATION	2	\$278,000	\$0	\$278,000	\$0
PROCESS BUILDING	1, 2	\$2,670,000	\$1,789,000	\$881,000	\$0
CONTROL BUILDING & 1960 CLARIFIER (DEMOLITION)	1	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$0	\$0
NEW HEADWORKS BUILDING	2	\$1,615,000	\$0	\$1,615,000	\$0
NEW DISINFECTION BUILDING	1	\$470,000	\$470,000	\$0	\$0
NEW ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	1	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0
NEW MAINTENACE BUILDING	1	\$390,000	\$390,000	\$0	\$0
ELECTRICAL & SCADA SYSTEMS	1	\$1,475,000	\$1,475,000	\$0	\$0
FUTURE ODOR CONTROL ALLOWANCE	2	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
FUTURE ACTIVATED SLUDGE	3	\$2,172,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,172,000
FUTURE CHLORINE CONTACT TANKS	2	\$412,000	\$0	\$412,000	\$0
PUMP STATIONS	--	\$5,130,000	\$0	\$2,514,000	\$2,616,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		\$18,461,000	\$6,024,000	\$7,649,000	\$4,788,000
GENERAL CONTRACTOR OH&P AND GENERAL CONDITIONS	15.0%	\$2,769,000	\$904,000	\$1,147,000	\$718,000
ELECTRICAL/ TELEPHONE SERVICE ALLOWANCE		\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
BONDS & INSURANCES	1.75%	\$323,000	\$105,000	\$134,000	\$84,000
UNIT PRICE ITEMS	0.3%	\$55,000	\$18,000	\$23,000	\$14,000
UNACCOUNTED FOR ITEMS	5.0%	\$923,000	\$301,000	\$382,000	\$239,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION COSTS		\$22,581,000	\$7,402,000	\$9,335,000	\$5,843,000
ENGINEERS ESTIMATE OF CONSTRUCTION COST		\$22,580,000	\$7,400,000	\$9,340,000	\$5,840,000
TECHNICAL SERVICES AND PROJECT CONTINGENCIES	35%	\$7,900,000	\$2,590,000	\$3,270,000	\$2,040,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST IN JULY 2009 DOLLARS		\$30,480,000	\$9,990,000	\$12,610,000	\$7,880,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST, INCLUDING INFLATION		\$35,770,000	\$10,600,000	\$14,770,000	\$10,400,000

**TABLE 4-2:
ESTIMATED
PROJECT COSTS**

	1.06	1.17	1.32
--	------	------	------

INFLATION TO MIDPT CONSTRUCTION (use 2% per year)

**TOWN OF OLD ORCHARD BEACH
SUGGESTED TIMELINE FOR WASTEWATER PLANNING
Wright-Pierce, 22 June 2012**

Milestone

July 2012 **WW Facilities Plan Workshop #2**

Discussion/decision on Aeration Blower pre-purchase award

Discussion/decision on Electrical Service alternatives

September 2012 **Meeting to decide on Aeration Blower General Contractor award**

November 2012 **Add 2 members to Town Council**

December 2012 **WW Facilities Plan Workshop #3**

January 2013 **Discussion/decision on WW Facilities Plan project implementation**

February 2013 **Complete Aeration Blower Upgrade start-up and testing**

DEP issues annual request for CWSRF Project Information (see attached form)

March 2013 **CWSRF project information submittal deadline**

April 2013 **DEP publishes CWSRF 2013 Intended Use Plan.**

Town needs to commit to DEP that it will enter into a loan with DEP/ MMBB by

September 2014.

June 2013 **Council votes on annual budget.**

If WWTF Upgrade approved, Town initiates SRF Application and continues to items below

September 2013 **Town initiates Design phase**

December 2014 **Town completes Design phase**

February 2015 **Town completes Bidding phase**

March 2015 **Town initiates Construction phase**

March 2017 **Town completes Construction phase and closes on SRF loan**

May 2017 **Town begins paying debt service on SRF loan**

The meeting was closed at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

**V. Louise Reid
Town Council Secretary**

I, V. Louise Reid, Secretary to the Town Council of Old Orchard Beach, Maine, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of teneleven (10~~1~~) pages is a true copy of the original Minutes of the Town Council Workshop of August 1, 2012.

V. Louise Reid