WORK SHOP MINUTES

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
29592 ELLENSBURG AVE
GOLD BEACH OR 97444
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2010 @ 10:00 A.M.
DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL

ROLL CALL:	PRESENT	ABSENT
Mayor James Wernicke	x	
Council Position #1 Jeff Crook	x	
Council Position #2 Larry Brennan	x	
Council Position #3 VACANT		
Council Position #4 Doug Brand	x	
Council Position #5 Tamie Kaufman	x	
City Administrator Ellen Barnes	x	
Public Works Supt Will Newdall	x	

Others Present:
The Value Engineering Team:
Laurie Dennis; Keith Whisenhunt; Mike Sailor and Dave Ewing.

The Dyer Partnership:
Steve Majors and Aaron Speakman

Oregon DEQ:
Bob Haberman; Francis Dzata; Jon Gasik (attended telephonically)

Kerbo Engineering:
Janette Kerbo

Sailor Engineering:
Mike Sailor

BUSINESS: for the Stakeholders, Design Team and VE Team

The Value Engineering (VE) firm of RH & Associates, Inc., gave a report on the results of the goals, objectives and review of the VE Methodology and Agenda.

The VE then gave a project overview, confirmed constraints and identified performance attributes for evaluation criteria.

ADJOURNED: Workshop adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Passed by the Gold Beach City Council on March 8, 2010.

James H. Wernicke, Mayor

ATTEST:

Shirley Walker, Recorder

The location of the hearing/meeting is accessible to the disabled. Advance notice is requested if special accommodations are needed. Call (541) 247-7029 so that appropriate assistance can be provided. The City of Gold Beach is an affirmative action EEOE and complies with section 504 of the rehab act of 1973. Complaints of Discrimination should be sent to: USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Washington, D.C. 20250-9419

Recap Notes from Wastewater Plant Value Engineering Findings Meeting

February 26, 2010

Prepared by Jan Kerbo

Meeting called to order at 10:00 AM

Jon Gasik of DEQ attended by phone.

Introductions.

Reason for doing the wastewater phase 2 project is to meet regulations.

Focus of the study was on risk management, constructability, ease of future maintenance, and cost savings.

A handout was given to all present listing viable ideas and ideas that were recommended. Over 100 ideas were brainstormed and some were great, some were good, and some had a fatal flaw. Some of the recommended items are either/or and others can be combined.

Ten ideas are recommended for follow up by the City and the design team:

1) TS-11: Install a new glass fused to steel tank and demolish the existing donut plant and the two existing small digesters. Move sludge storage pit over next to sludge equipment instead of in a separate building. This change will save about $600,000 and get rid of structures that have known structural problems and are likely to also have unknown structural problems. It also frees up space on the site for the contractor, which is likely to reduce his labor bid in other areas.

2) TS-14: Instead of dividing the digester into three subtanks and installing diffusers and blowers, make it one big tank with pumped aspirated air (complete mix design.) This measure will save about $153,000 in construction costs and a 20-year maintenance cost of $166,000. It can be combined with measure TS-11.

3) TW-01: Raise elevation of SBR, equalization basin, and UV basin and gravity flow to drainfields, eliminating drainfield pump station. This measure would save $370,000 in construction cost and a 20-year maintenance life of $27,000.

4) TW-06: Eliminate pedestrian bridge over Riley Creek. The foot bridge does not contribute to the treatment system and so can be eliminated. Construction cost savings $37,000.

5) TW-10: Eliminate two of the effluent flow meters. Construction cost savings of $12,000 and no maintenance savings.

6) TW-13: Add a second sampling station and eliminate tank drain pump station. Construction cost savings of $72,000 and a 20-year maintenance cost of $22,000.

7) TW-17: Delete the manual bar screen and pay for installation of screen at jail to catch rags and coveralls. Jail staff to maintain, City to pay for construction. Construction cost savings of $10,000 and a 20-year maintenance cost savings of $27,000.

8) TW-24: Move headworks pump station to directly east of the headworks and up against the SBR tanks. Will increase the construction cost by $75,000, but will free the site up to allow the contractor to stage construction better and puts the station in a better position for pumping and maintenance.

9) TW-25: Change the open channel UV system to closed system (UV lamps are installed in a large closed pipe under pressure). This may allow elimination of the drainfield pump station. (This measure and TW-01 are similar and are either/or.) Construction cost savings estimated at $451,000 with a 20-year increase in maintenance costs of $23,000. Raising the plant may require reapplying for a new FAA height variance.

10) TW-26: Downsize the UV and only disinfect flows to Riley Creek, not the drainfields. Discussion about DEQ requirement for disinfection. Jon Gasik stated that no other community disinfects flow to drainfields. DEQ had raised the requirement at the 60% design meeting and required a viral study if the effluent was not disinfected. The estimated cost of the viral study was $45,000 and the study may find that disinfection was required. Construction cost savings of $25,000 and a 20-year maintenance cost savings of $82,000.

11) AR-03: Replace the three drainfield transmission pipes with one larger pipe. Dyer had investigated this option early in the design and discarded it due to the complexity of controlling the flows at the drainfields with this setup. Construction cost savings $26,000 and no maintenance savings.

12) AR-05: Eliminate flow measuring flume to Riley Creek. Construction cost savings of $10,000 and no maintenance savings.

If measures TS-11, TS-14, TW-6, TW-10, TW-13, TW-17, TW-25, AR-3 and AR-5 are completed it would reduce construction costs by an estimated $1,410,000.

Other recommendations:

1) Have Dyer lay out project sequencing and put the sequencing and schedule in the bid documents or present at pre-bid walkthrough. Because the existing plant needs to be kept in operation, the Contractor will want to see the steps that will allow them to build each component and what temporary measures they will need to put in place to keep the plant running.

2) Have a Class 1 construction cost estimate completed prior to bid. The existing estimate has a lot of lump sum items. A Class 1 estimate is an actual take off of each valve and yard of concrete and will provide a much narrower price range going into bidding.

DEQ will require a predesign memo for the sludge system changes and technical memos to be submitted on changes in other processes. Jon Gasik will provide Dyer with the areas he needs updated information in response to process changes.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 AM