

1 STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

2 NARRAGANSETT BAY COMMISSION

3

4

5

IN RE: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

6

7

8

DATE: January 26, 2016

9

TIME: 10:00 A.M.

PLACE: Narragansett Bay Commission

10

Corporate Office Building

One Service Road

11

Providence, RI 02905

12

13

COMMISSIONERS:

14

Vincent Mesolessa, NBC Chairman

15

Robert Andrade

James Bennett

16

Dr. Richard Burroughs

Bruce Campbell

17

Mario Carlino

Michelle DeRoche

18

Jonathan Farnum

Seth Handy, Esquire

19

Paul Lemont, Esquire

John MacQueen

20

Alan Nathan

Angelo Rotella, Esquire

21

Richard Worrell

22

ALSO ATTENDING:

23

Raymond Marshall, NBC Executive Director

24

Joseph DeAngelis, Esquire-Legal Counsel for the

1 OTHER ATTENDEES:

- 2 Thomas Uva, NBC
- Jennifer Harrington, NBC
- 3 Laurie Horridge, Esquire, NBC
- Tom Brueckner, NBC
- 4 Joanne Maceroni, NBC
- Paul Nordstorm, NBC
- 5 Karen Giebink, NBC
- Jean Lynch, CAC
- 6 Howard Schacter, CAC
- Jamie Samons, NBC
- 7 Sean Searles, MWH
- Richard Bernier, NBC
- 8 John Zuba, NBC
- Sherri Arnold, NBC
- 9 Gail Degnan, NBC
- Alice Marchessault, NBC
- 10 Leah Foster, NBC
- George Palmisciano, Pare Corp.
- 11 Christine Cooper, NBC
- Kathryn Kelly, NBC
- 12 Karen Musumeci, NBC

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

1 (MEETING COMMENCED AT 10:03 A.M.)

2 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Okay,

3 recognizing a quorum we will call the January

4 26, 2016, Board of Commissioners meeting to

5 order. First order of business is the Approval

6 of the Previous Minutes of the December 15th.

7 Have all of our members had an opportunity to

8 review the previous minutes, and if so, are

9 there in any comments, questions or corrections?

10 Hearing none. All of those that are in favor of

11 the motion. Motion to approve by Commissioner

12 Farnum. All of those that are in favor of

13 approval will say aye. Any opposed? None

14 opposed, and the motion carries.

15 (UNANIMOUS VOTE)

16 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Next order of

17 business, Item Number 3, the Executive

18 Director's Report. Mr. Secretary, do you have a

19 report for us today?

20 MR. MARSHALL: I have a very short

21 report.

22 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Proceed.

23 MR. MARSHALL: Both treatment

24 facilities are producing high quality affluent.

25 There's no major problems in the interceptor

4

1 maintenance area. The storm that we had over
2 the weekend was handled by our staff very well,
3 everything was cleaned up and ready to go by
4 Monday morning. We're making good progress on
5 the new water quality science building. That's
6 the new name for the lab, Water Quality Science
7 Building, and we're making a lot of progress
8 there.

9 If anyone would like a tour inside
10 of that, they can contact Rich Bernier and he
11 can arrange to walk you through it, and you can
12 see all that is going on. We should have a
13 dedication some time this spring, maybe a ribbon
14 cutting, maybe May-June timeframe. We'll let
15 you know as we progress. The FY-16 budget is in
16 good shape. We're developing the FY-17 budget
17 and the new CIP, so you'll be seeing those in
18 the next few months.

19 In December we billed \$8 million
20 dollars and collected \$9.8 million dollars. So
21 both the billing and the collections are going
22 very well, and we're working on our capital cash

23 flow projections for the upcoming year. That's
24 associated with our borrowing with the Clean
25 Water Finance Agency. Actually, it's the Rhode

5

1 Island Infrastructure Bank now, I'm sorry. The
2 policy planning staff was asked to and made a
3 well-received presentation to Commerce RI in
4 terms of our permitting process and we emphasize
5 our quick turnaround for new businesses coming
6 into the district, as well as those that want to
7 expand.

8 Also in PP&R has spent quite a bit
9 of time working with both Coronal which is the
10 solar energy firm selected by the board in
11 November, as well as Wind Energy Development,
12 the wind energy proposers that the Board
13 authorized to have us continue to have
14 discussions. There is nothing final at this
15 time, but we still continue to work on those in
16 case you are wondering how that is progressing.

17 The stormwater issue continues to
18 be widely discussed and evaluated throughout the
19 Metropolitan area. I met with DEM on January
20 8th to have a discussion on what the second
21 phase of their report would say. We didn't
22 really come to any conclusion, but we talked

23 about a number of different possibilities. The
24 CAC met last Wednesday and had a presentation
25 from Liz Scott from DEM who's is one of the

6

1 folks heading up the stormwater regional study.
2 And I don't know if there's someone from the CAC
3 here who might be giving a report, oh, there's
4 Howard. And he can bring you up to date on
5 that. In the upper base Stormwater Steering
6 Committee is scheduled to meet this Friday on
7 January 29th.

8 So that issue is one that has the
9 interest of quite a few folks out there, so we
10 continue to be involved and provide input. Our
11 turbines in 2015 produced 45.6 percent of the
12 power needed at the Field's Point Wastewater
13 Treatment Facility. For references purposes in
14 2013, which is our first full year, it was 43
15 percent. And in 2014, it was 48 percent.

16 And, finally, our connection with
17 the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation
18 which we effectuated in mid-November of 2014.
19 From that point through the end of December
20 2015, we have billed and they have paid \$444,000
21 in revenue, so that's new revenue that we've

22 received over the least year that we didn't have
23 prior to that. And that is it, Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: So, thank you,
25 very much for your report. Do any of our

7

1 members have any questions for the Executive
2 Director with regard to his report this morning?
3 Commissioner Campbell.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Who came up
5 with the new name for the laboratory?

6 MR. MARSHALL: The new name for the
7 laboratory is, we came up with -- staff came up
8 with a number of different options, and it was
9 originally called the Regulatory Compliance
10 Building. That sounded too, like, big
11 brotherish, so we decided we wanted to bring in
12 more of a, embrace more an open and
13 mission-appropriate name. So we came up with
14 the names. We sort of took an internal vote, we
15 ran it by the Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Nobody asked
17 me, they just told me.

18 MR. MARSHALL: No, we didn't. We
19 sent you a memo. We sent an e-mail and said,
20 you know, what do you think of this he says,
21 yeah, that sounds good. So do you have any

22 thoughts?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: No, no, no, no. I

24 was just curious. It wasn't the Campbell

25 building.

8

1 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: It has a nice

2 ring.

3 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: You named

4 the other one after Mike Salvatore.

5 MR. MARSHALL: I don't think you

6 really want to go there, do you.

7 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Oh, I'm sorry,

8 commissioner.

9 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: Two things:

10 With the success of the windmills, turbines.

11 Should we get a relook at the, how long it's

12 going to take us to pay that back. It looks

13 like it's quicker.

14 MR. MARSHALL: I'll do those

15 calculations for you and get you them in the

16 next -- certainly by the next meeting.

17 COMMISSIONER CARLINO: Wasn't it

18 originally 12 years?

19 MR. MARSHALL: Originally, it was

20 about 12 years, yes.

21 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: The other
22 thing was, maybe it's time to organize a tour to
23 Bucklin just to take a look.

24 MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Spring okay?

9

1 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah, we're in no
2 rush.

3 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: All right.
4 Are there any other -- Commissioner Carlino.

5 COMMISSIONER CARLINO: I just have
6 a quick question. The state is getting involved
7 or passed something regarding the stormwater
8 clean up requirement. Now they're going to
9 clean out all the manholes, whatnot, so --

10 MR. MARSHALL: Are you talking
11 about the DOT?

12 COMMISSIONER CARLINO: Yes.

13 MR. MARSHALL: I just wanted to
14 make sure.

15 COMMISSIONER CARLINO: So now the
16 state has finally accepting that they have to do
17 this, and they have plans, are the cities and
18 towns planning on doing that? And I don't know
19 if know this. That's my question, and have they
20 approached us, has the state or any of the

21 cities and towns approached us regarding taking
22 over some of the stormwater issues?

23 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: All right, do
24 you want to answer that or do you want me to
25 answer?

10

1 MR. MARSHALL: Well, we can answer
2 it jointly why don't you go ahead first.

3 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: All right. So
4 the DOT basically generally doing their own
5 things, as far as I know. They would have to be
6 doing it, of course, in conjunction with the
7 regulations that are being promulgated by the
8 Department of Environmental Management, that's
9 the first.

10 The second thing: I think we're
11 going to hear more about it a little later, but
12 Ray and I have had protracted discussions about
13 the matter. Because we understand the costs
14 associated with a stormwater program. So, I
15 mean, I think there's a consensus among the
16 people thinking about how to resolve the
17 stormwater issue among the cities and towns and
18 the Department of Environmental Management, that
19 this agency, the Narragansett Bay Commission's

20 probably best equipped to deal with a program,
21 or develop a program for stormwater.

22 We're in a difficult position
23 because I think confronted with the enormous
24 task that we have dealing with, you know, Phase
25 III, and now dealing with stormwater and the

11

1 associated costs of stormwater. I don't think
2 our agency, I think even the consensus amongst
3 the board members over the months that I don't
4 think we want to be associated with that as a
5 Narragansett Bay Commission initiative, when it
6 really is a Department of Environmental
7 Management initiative.

8 So, the problem with the Department
9 of Environmental Management is how are they
10 going to bring cities and towns on board that
11 actually convince them that they need to
12 implement a program, and I think that's where
13 the difficulty lies. So, and I think they're
14 looking for an administrative resolution as
15 opposed to a city and town's political solution.

16 I think the cities and towns
17 recognize that in order for them to proceed with
18 the programs there are costs associated with
19 that, and that would have to be passed on

20 obviously to the taxpayers, which they certainly
21 don't want. On the other hand, they don't want
22 to relinquish responsibility to someone else to
23 develop a program. So I think, and Ray can
24 continue on with this discussion, there was a
25 meeting with the Department of Environmental

12

1 Management and the stormwater group and Ray
2 attended the meeting, I did not, that they would
3 like us to take over this, but we have expressed
4 that the Board generally is somewhat reluctant
5 to assume that responsibility at this time. I
6 don't think we've slammed the door on it, but we
7 left the door open for further discussions, but
8 we have not accepted.

9 Now whether or not there's a
10 statutory initiative by the Department of
11 Environmental Management requiring us to take
12 it, we don't know if that's going to happen. I
13 met with the speaker on the matter. I told him
14 that we're not ready for that. And at the very
15 least, if they required us to do it, that we
16 would need a number of years to implement it, we
17 couldn't just accept it immediately and just
18 implement a program. That's where we are right

19 now. But Ray went to the meeting.

20 MR. MARSHALL: I mean, every city
21 and town is required to deal with their
22 stormwater. Some are doing so, and DEM seems to
23 be happy with those folks. Some are not, and
24 some are really struggling and the City of
25 Providence and DEM actually came up with this

13

1 regional study concept, and that's under Mayor
2 Tavares where he acknowledged that they have
3 neither the technical nor financial resources to
4 deal with that issue. So the regional study has
5 been ongoing. Now they're in Phase 2, and a
6 couple of years into it. And essentially where
7 they are in the study is that it's an issue best
8 handled regionally in the Metropolitan area, so
9 Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, East
10 Providence, and maybe in the Pawtuxet River
11 Valley, Warwick, Cranston, West Warwick. But
12 that's just the general concept. The devil's
13 always in the details.

14 So it's -- you have a new regional
15 authority or two new regional authorities, or do
16 you have one existing regional authority, us who
17 steps into that role in the area that we
18 currently service. All of those things are up

19 in the air right now, and this Board is probably
20 going to be approached at some point to wrestle
21 with this issue. We've heard, we've had a lot
22 of discussion, you know, the concern we have for
23 the impact on the ratepayers from Phase III.
24 Well, stormwater is going to be hundreds and
25 millions of dollars more. Anybody that tells

14

1 you it's going to be five or ten bucks a month
2 and that's the end of it, is not telling you the
3 whole story. That's only in the early stages.
4 Because in the end when everything is done to
5 get the systems functioning properly, and you
6 quantify the flow and determine what the quality
7 is coming out of those storm drains, they will
8 violate water quality, unquestionably. Then the
9 question is what's it going to cost to collect
10 it and treat it.

11 Because that is where this
12 eventually is going. So, you know, if you don't
13 think the expenditure on CSOs is worth the water
14 quality benefits, the expenditure on stormwater,
15 I think, at least falls into the same general
16 category. So the report will come out -- and by
17 the way, the other thing that I'd like to point

18 out is the concept of a regional authority is a
19 good one; however, the communities who are going
20 to be part of it have to buy into it.

21 The chairman can tell you about the
22 conversations we had going back years with
23 Warwick, West Warwick, Cranston, Newport,
24 Woonsocket, among others, about taking over
25 their wastewater facilities. The staff from

15

1 those communities loved the idea. The chief
2 administrator generally was on board, but every
3 time it got to the counsel level, that's when it
4 became, you know, where it went down in flames.
5 It was like we wanted to take over the crown
6 jewel of the community, you know, their
7 wastewater system, and they all said no. So I
8 suggested, you know, before you go make this
9 recommendation to the entire state or to the
10 public, make sure all the councils are on board.

11 If they're not a board, then your
12 recommendation is really worthless, so I don't
13 know if they'll go in that direction, but that's
14 what I'm going to push for. That's basically
15 the status of where we are. And so not every
16 community in our district is part of this upper
17 bay regional study, by the way; Lincoln,

18 Cumberland, North Providence, Johnston are not.

19 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: So, I guess I
20 just want to say one last thing and then we'll
21 open it up for everyone. I mean, you know, Ray
22 is suggesting to the department that the Board,
23 the Board at this time is really not inclined to
24 jump in head first. At some point in the next
25 month or two, we're going to come back to the

16

1 board and ask you guys, I mean, what are you
2 thinking of, is this something that you want to
3 consider or not consider, laid all the facts as
4 we've known them, decide at what level we want
5 to be involved or not. And I think, you know,
6 we're already doing through CSO Phase III, some
7 integrated planning, you know, to help to
8 resolve some of the stormwater issue that I
9 believe are contained within the plan, am I
10 right, Ray?

11 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: That's
13 contained within the plan so we're already doing
14 our share to mitigate stormwater issues. If the
15 Board, entirely up to you, decides we want to
16 get more involved in the process, we'll do it.

17 We've indicated at least until now, that the
18 Board's attitude is not -- but it's entirely up
19 to you. Commissioner Burroughs?

20 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Has there
21 been any discussion of the EPA's initiative on
22 integrated planning as these different groups
23 move forward in, maybe not yet an integrated
24 fashion?

25 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I brought that

17

1 up at the meeting that I referenced, back on
2 January 8th. See, the issue with the integrated
3 planning is that the stormwater cost projects
4 benefits are so far behind the CSO work, that we
5 have been doing that it will take them years to
6 catch up so you could have a fair
7 apples-to-apples comparison.

8 And then on top of that if you add
9 the lateral sewer issues which no one has a
10 handle on within the communities what they need
11 to do within their own sewer systems. Those
12 three things need to be balance out the
13 treatment plants we have already taken care of.
14 So DEM is not going to let us wait three or four
15 or five years for all of those other issues to
16 catch up before they say, or before we move

17 forward on CSO.

18 As soon as they give us the okay on
19 the reevaluation, they're going to want us to
20 begin work on that. I mean, we can make that
21 appeal, but that would assume that, I mean a lot
22 of different things. I mean, are we going to
23 take full responsibility and begin an immediate
24 full evaluation of stormwater issues now like we
25 did with CSOs.

18

1 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Yeah, I
2 think it's fair to say that the state is
3 ill-equipped to do integrated planning. And one
4 of the consequences of that is that NBC may be
5 asked to pay a lot to fix a small part of the
6 problem only to find out, as we're learning
7 here, that there's a lot more expense coming.
8 And if we were to double, just stay the
9 stormwater process as much as we've got on the
10 table for the CSO and we're going to double that
11 amount, then when we flip over to all of
12 rhetoric about affordability, we're in deep red
13 territory.

14 MR. MARSHALL: Yeah, we will
15 essentially have probably have gobbled up in

16 lack of a better term the affordability by doing
17 CSO work.

18 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Right.

19 MR. MARSHALL: And there probably
20 won't be a whole lot left. Although, we did
21 allocate some costs toward the communities
22 working on their stormwater and their lateral
23 sewer system, just based on lineal footage of
24 the pipe. So it's not totally ignored, but I
25 think that the extent of the problems are

19

1 probably greater than those standard metrics
2 would probably lead you to believe there has
3 been so much neglect.

4 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Commissioner
5 Burroughs.

6 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: So in the
7 case of Seattle where they do have an integrated
8 plan is there anything that we can learn from
9 that to somehow he can expedite our costing of
10 all these different worlds?

11 MR. MARSHALL: I guess what is to
12 be learned from that is they're probably not the
13 only example, but, having all those
14 responsibilities under one roof is really the
15 best way to effectuate a true plan.

16 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Commissioner

17 Handy?

18 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Now we're

19 back to the issue Vinny raised.

20 COMMISSIONER HANDY: My opinion,

21 sir, is right now we're getting some of the end

22 of pipe responsibility, a lot of the end of pipe

23 responsibility for this problem, and we're not

24 getting any rates for it. So that's the dilemma

25 as far as I can tell. If we can enter a

20

1 situation where we're getting compensated for

2 the work that we're doing, it seem that would be

3 a valuable thing, and I mean, I guess my other

4 question is how much of the capital cost that

5 we're incurring might have been avoided had the

6 cities and towns been compliant with their

7 obligations with the stormwater.

8 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: These are very

9 difficult and complex questions to answer. And,

10 you know, the one thing, the one thing above all

11 is paramount in my mind is, that the cost

12 associated with a stormwater program; however,

13 it's an issue implemented. It's not something

14 that I want the public to think it's been

15 initiated by Narragansett Bay Commission.

16 I mean, you know, if DEM wants to
17 put their name on the bill and they want to send
18 the bill out, that's one thing, but if you're
19 going to say well, Narragansett Bay Commission,
20 you're going to have to implement a program, and
21 by the way, put it right in your bill. That's
22 problematic for our Board, I think. I think
23 it's going to be very expensive to resolve the
24 issues.

25 COMMISSIONER HANDY: I think our

21

1 ratepayers are picking up tab for something that
2 belongs on the property taxes.

3 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: We talk about
4 this all the time. When DEM requires the cities
5 and towns to implement a program and determine
6 the cost associated with their program, and the
7 cities and towns say, no, we're not doing it.
8 Well, I mean, what are going to do, are you
9 going to send the Marines in, I don't know.
10 What will we do?

11 How will they deal with that? We
12 don't care what EPA says. We don't care what
13 the department says. We don't have the money to
14 do it, we're not going to do it.

15 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: At the end of
16 the day a proper stormwater system, do we have
17 the capacity then to clean if we were to be
18 getting extra waters into our systems, or do we
19 size ourselves for that, do we size the new
20 Phase III for that?

21 MR. MARSHALL: Well, I mean, the
22 answer is no, we don't have the capacity to
23 handle stormwater over and above what we get
24 through the combined system. You'd have -- I
25 mean, there would be extensive work associated

22

1 with collecting stormwater and treating
2 stormwater. Many times it's done at a, you
3 know, on a site-by-site localized, you know,
4 type of basis. For a central collection and
5 treatment facility for all of stormwater would
6 be probably billions of dollars. I mean, if you
7 wanted to make pipes large enough to handle the
8 storms that we see throughout, you know, our
9 district, and then treat it at some level at the
10 ultimate end of the pipe in the treatment type
11 plant. And what level of treatment would you
12 have to provide, no one's really identified that
13 either.

14 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Commissioner
15 Worrell.

16 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: I think one
17 of the big issues that we've talked about just a
18 little bit are these lateral sewers. And do we
19 have any sense of the magnitude of that issue,
20 for example, in the City of Providence, if you
21 just take that for a minute.

22 MR. MARSHALL: Well, there's 400
23 miles of sewer in the City of Providence. We
24 own, throughout our entire district, 110 miles
25 of pipe. So there's a comparison just in terms

23

1 of footage of pipe. The City of Providence has
2 no regular inspection and maintenance program at
3 all and they react to problems through
4 emergencies, and that's the extent of it. So if
5 we were to take over that system, or any system
6 for that matter, especially their's, I guess, we
7 would immediately need to have a program that
8 cleans and inspects all those lines to see what
9 the deferred maintenance is within that system.

10 And that could include anything to
11 from crushed pipes to illegal connections from
12 stormwater type or rainwater type discharges,
13 and we have 22 people to handle 110 miles of

14 pipe now. We'd have to hire probably a dozen
15 people and buy new equipment, flushers and
16 roppers. And then if we took stormwater to
17 boot, there would be more of that to deal with.

18 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: Is DEM
19 putting any pressure on -- let's talk about the
20 city of Providence because it's identifiable.
21 Is DEM putting any pressure on the city to
22 maintain the system of laterals, you know of?

23 MR. MARSHALL: Nothing that I would
24 consider even remotely aggressive. I know that
25 North Providence, they sent down an

24

1 administrative order a number of years ago,
2 2007, that told them that they had to create
3 something that we already had in place at that
4 time. A CMOM plan capacity management operation
5 and maintenance plan, and to my knowledge, that
6 has never been generated by the town. So it's a
7 situation like, you know, the Chairman just
8 expressed. They're told to do something and
9 they go, and then there's no follow up.

10 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: As Seth
11 pointed out, we end up at the end of the pipe
12 handling whatever problems there are. If we

13 were to get them, that is the City of
14 Providence, to maintain and clean up their
15 laterals, we'd probably end up with a lot more
16 water treatment, am I right?

17 MR. MARSHALL: We might end up with
18 less water treatment depending how much
19 infiltration inflow they have coming into their
20 system. We could actually have less water to
21 treat. If all the communities had a nice tight
22 system where we were only getting, I mean,
23 there's an allowable amount of infiltration
24 inflow that's expected in any system.

25 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: What's

25

1 infiltration inflow?

2 MR. MARSHALL: Infiltration is
3 groundwater coming into the pipes through
4 joints.

5 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: Through
6 breaks and joints.

7 MR. MARSHALL: And inflow it would
8 be like roof liters tied in. Inflow's more
9 storm related. Street drainage, there might be
10 an isolated catch basin that is tied directly
11 into the sewer rather than into a storm pipe.

12 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: Should we be

13 advocating for tougher a stance by DEM -- these
14 would be the City of Providence, for example.
15 It might help.

16 MR. MARSHALL: Well, you know,
17 indirectly or unofficially, when we meet with
18 DEM we point out these things to them, but
19 there's no real followup or change in what's
20 happening out there. I mean, they love to pick
21 on the people -- that's poorly said. It's much
22 easier for them to focus on the communities and
23 on the entities like ours or East Providence or
24 Newport or West Warwick that have treatment
25 plant point source discharges, you know, that's,

26

1 they spent a lot of time on that, and I guess
2 you can make the argument they do a very good
3 job at that and they make sure that we all
4 comply. But then there's all these other issues
5 like how you take care of your lateral sewers,
6 how you handle your stormwater that are much
7 less aggressively, you know, regulated. Would
8 you say that is fair, Commissioner Lemont?

9 COMMISSIONER LEMONT: Absolutely.

10 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Commissioner
11 Handy.

12 COMMISSION HANDY: With the
13 different things that are happening across the
14 country whether it is Flint's water problem or
15 the gas problems in California, is there a
16 public health issue associated with these leaks,
17 as well the water quality concern?

18 MR. MARSHALL: I think maybe where
19 public health issues arise is when, I mean, if
20 lateral sewers are not properly maintained --
21 and by the way, it's also the building
22 connection that is sometimes an issue from the
23 street into the building itself. I mean, if you
24 start having backups into basements, or things
25 of that nature, I consider that to be a public

27

1 health issue, and I guess most people would. So
2 if you have a properly maintained lateral sewer
3 system, then you minimize, you know, the number
4 of those occurrences. And usually in my monthly
5 report we get seven, eight, nine, a dozen calls
6 about backups into homes or businesses that are
7 really the responsibility of the communities
8 that they occurred in and we try to help the
9 people to get to the right municipal official to
10 deal with that issue.

11 And we might have one backup or

12 overflow, you know, every other month, but in
13 most months you'll see backups reported in
14 various buildings, so that's a public health
15 issue. Other than that, like I said, a manhole
16 could surcharge and run down the street. We
17 don't really see a lot of those. I'm not aware
18 of a lot of those. I don't know if Paul, if you
19 ever hear about any of those?

20 MR. NORDSTROM: The only one that
21 comes to mind is the one in Middletown. The
22 beaches were being closed so that was a public
23 health issue. It took action against and they
24 straighten out the storm sewers. They had
25 problems with the pump station that was

28

1 overflowing into the storm drains.

2 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: So like I
3 said, it's a very complex, very difficult issue.
4 As things develop we'll be back to the board and
5 take a temperature on how involved you want to
6 be, I mean, in the process. And that will
7 happen in the next couple of months?

8 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, a couple of
9 months.

10 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: All right.

11 Okay, any other comments or questions regarding
12 the Executive Director's Report? Okay, moving
13 right along. We're going to Committee Reports
14 and Action Items Resulting. The first report is
15 from the Construction Engineering and Operations
16 Committee. Commissioner MacQueen, do you have a
17 report for us today?

18 COMMISSIONER MACQUEEN: Yes, I do,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Proceed.

21 COMMISSIONER MACQUEEN: Review and
22 approved of Resolution 2016:01 Authorization to
23 Procure Engineering Services for CSO Program
24 Phase III Initial Design Engineering Activities
25 For Contract 308.00D.

29

1 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Thank you. Is
2 that a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER MACQUEEN: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: We have a
5 motion to approve Resolution 2016:01,
6 Authorization to Procure Engineering Services.
7 Is there a second? Seconded by Commissioner
8 Farnum.

9 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Explanation.

10 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, sir. Back in

11 2013, the Board approved Resolution 2013:38 to
12 allow staff to negotiate a contract with MWH for
13 the reevaluation of the Phase III CSO Program.
14 The authorization was for \$1.64 million. We did
15 negotiate with them and entered into a contract
16 in December of that same year for \$1.2 million.

17 And they began their 18
18 month-effort to generate the reevaluation
19 report, which you all reviewed extensively, and
20 on April 28th approved the report that was
21 submitted to DEM at the end of June of 2015.
22 You probably recall that the Phase III work is
23 estimated to cost \$815 million and that we've
24 asked that the schedule be extended out to 2038
25 and DEM is considering that request as well as

30

1 the changes in the facilities that were
2 recommended. The original contract was signed
3 under a procurement whereby we follow our normal
4 progression which is we hire a consultant to
5 work on a project for us from planning through
6 design through construction. That's always our
7 intent to have that continuity from one phase to
8 the next, but it's all hinges upon A, whether
9 the project goes forward or not, and B, whether

10 the consultant has done a good job and MWH has
11 done that for us in the first part of their
12 assignment.

13 So utilizing the \$1.6 million
14 dollar original authorization, we amended the
15 contract a couple of times, one to get some
16 additional hydraulic modeling done and then
17 Amendment 3, as we call it, is to perform
18 mapping services and to bring in a new hydraulic
19 sewer model into the program, and we did that
20 under the prior authorization also utilizing the
21 provision in our procurement regulations that
22 the Chairman and I can go up to 5 percent over
23 the Board-approved amount. And the reason why
24 we did that is because as time ticks away here,
25 once DEM approves the reevaluation report the

31

1 clock is going to start ticking on us to get our
2 preliminary design in, and then they'll do
3 another review and then the final design. And
4 so, for example, in the amendment that was just
5 signed, it included aerial mapping services
6 which we need for all the design plans.

7 And if we wait too long, the spring
8 comes around, the trees bud, once the leaves
9 come out your aerial mapping is much less

10 effective and accurate. So we want to be in a
11 position to move forward with that once the
12 clock starts ticking on us. So what this
13 request today, under Resolution 2016:01, is
14 before you for is to begin the design work,
15 begin the design work of the tunnel, the tunnel
16 pump station, the drop shafts, some interceptor
17 work and some green stormwater infrastructure
18 projects.

19 And so I have listed for you on the
20 second page of my memo, it's in bolded format,
21 the different items in the scope of work as we
22 currently envision it. Amendment Number 4 has
23 not been fully negotiated, it has not been
24 signed. We're asking for your approval to work
25 within an amount that's just under \$6 million

32

1 because we have more negotiating to do with MWH.
2 We've already met with them half a dozen times
3 on this, identifying scope in hours and dollars.
4 We want to continue to look at the rate impacts
5 and the affordability of the CSO program. We
6 will need their support when we negotiate the
7 consent agreement or renegotiate the consent
8 agreement with DEM.

9 Inhouse staff will lead the charge
10 on that, but we need their technical expertise
11 in terms of timing and other issues, and they
12 have worked with other communities such as
13 Atlanta and Baltimore in that capacity.

14 We really want to spend some time
15 doing flow monitoring and bringing this new
16 hydraulic model into our tool chest because we
17 believe that we can save several million dollars
18 by optimizing the existing system in finding the
19 issues that are going on in the current system
20 -- the existing system, excuse me, that there
21 are, for lack of a better term, more
22 cost-effective fixes further back up in the
23 system, so we want to extend this into the
24 Pawtucket and Central Falls city-owned sewers
25 that sort of gets to what Commissioner Worrell

33

1 was asking, I believe, but as it related to the
2 City of Providence because Phase III is in the
3 Blackstone Valley district. We want to take a
4 look at how we can maybe short-circuit some of
5 the problems that are now coming into our system
6 by going further into theirs, and we can
7 evaluate that.

8 We need to look at how we package

9 the contracts. We effectuated quite a bit of
10 savings in Phase 2 because we were able to carve
11 out packages that made for very competitive bids
12 across the entire spectrum of contractors that
13 are out there, the very large, to the local guys
14 that don't have a lot of capacity, but certainly
15 are capable of participating at an appropriate
16 level.

17 We're going to have public outreach
18 we're going to have to do and we're going to
19 have to do an environmental assessment of this
20 work which is something that for some reason is
21 coming back into the construction grants program
22 list of things to do. It was something that was
23 very big back in the early days and then it
24 became a process through which you had to go
25 through very early. Once you did that, you no

34

1 longer had to do it for each individual project.
2 For some reason EPA is asking that, and asking
3 the states to have an assessment done of each
4 project that goes forward for funding. This
5 also involves all the project management
6 associated with the Phase 3A work. You remember
7 we have Phase III, but it's A, B, C, D as it

8 breaks out over the years, and its just under \$6
9 million dollars, \$5,993,141.

10 Now if I can just call it 6 million
11 for the next minute or so. That is part of a
12 total design fee for Phase 3A of \$35 million
13 dollars. That's \$554 million of construction in
14 3A, \$35 million of it is designed at the 6.3
15 percent. Now, over the many years, we've been
16 doing this kind of work and others have been
17 doing this kind of work. There are various
18 standards within our industry that we --
19 benchmarks that we look toward.

20 Very complex projects like
21 treatment plants, major pump stations, and
22 frankly, tunnels are more in the 10 percent
23 range, simple projects, straight pipe work with
24 no real sophisticated issues associated with it
25 are more in the 5 percent range. Okay, so

35

1 that's generally the bracketing that we look at
2 when we evaluate these requests by consultants
3 to do work for us. There are variations from
4 that, but generally, that's where we are. So
5 the 6.3 percent is within that bracket. And we
6 have not finished negotiating amendment number 4
7 with MWH.

8 We want your approval so that we
9 can continue to negotiate and then sign
10 something that we think is fair and reasonable
11 for approximately \$6 million dollars out of the
12 total \$35 million dollar design fee for 3A. And
13 that was identified, that amount was identified
14 in the reevaluation report that was sent to DEM
15 for approval.

16 So I guess I'll stop there. That's
17 the best explanation that I can give you at this
18 point in time. Other requests for design monies
19 will come back to you mid to late 2016,
20 somewhere in that time range. I don't know if
21 we'll come back for all of it at one time or
22 whether they'll be additional segments, so that
23 you can question it each and every step of the
24 way. That's what's contained in Resolution
25 2016:01 and what we ask your approval for today.

36

1 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: You need a
2 motion?

3 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: We have a
4 motion. We have second. Discussion?

5 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: How does
6 design for 3A fit with Alternative 2 that was

7 approved by the Board in April? Is the design
8 for all of Alternative 2, or just a portion of
9 it?

10 MR. MARSHALL: All of Alternative 2
11 is what is now we're calling Phase III, right?

12 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Right.

13 MR. MARSHALL: So it takes from the
14 very early projects which would include the
15 tunnel and the tunnel pump station, right to the
16 projects that won't be completed until 2038,
17 which might be some final interceptor or maybe
18 some sewer separation. I just want to make sure
19 we set the stage.

20 So of the total \$815 million
21 dollars in Phase III, the total design fee would
22 be \$48 million, okay, and that's a shade under 6
23 percent, 5.9 percent. What we're talking about
24 in the first four or five years is a \$35 million
25 dollar design fee out of that 48. And the

37

1 construction cost on that is \$554 million
2 dollars. So that's 6.3 percent, okay. Now, one
3 of the things that I should point out is that
4 some of the work that will be done early on, for
5 example, the aerial mapping and all the
6 hydraulic modeling and all of the flow

7 monitoring, how we set up all the construction
8 documents, all that work will be used throughout
9 Phase III.

10 So we need to spend some money up
11 front in 3A to get 3A going, but we're going to
12 do the mapping for the entire district or the
13 aerial for the entire district and the modeling
14 for the entire district. So that will be
15 carried over. That's the reason why the
16 percentages drop as you go from the early work
17 to the later work because you're spending some
18 money up front that you're going to use later on
19 10 or even 15 years from now.

20 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: I know
21 that the material that you presented indicated
22 that the DEM has not responded. What portion of
23 the \$6 million dollars that we are asked to
24 spend today could be changed if DEM sent us in a
25 different direction. In other words, are we

38

1 going to invest in engineering services which
2 are somehow changed by the DEM response that we
3 get and then we enter some cost that we --

4 MR. MARSHALL: I don't think we'll
5 see a scenario where DEM will say, you want to

6 know what, you don't have to do the tunnel, you
7 don't have to do the tunnel pump station, you
8 don't have to do the drop shaft. That's where
9 the real money is allocated. What we've heard,
10 I think the chairman has heard this as well, is
11 that we might get some feedback from DEM that
12 says you need to do more green early on.

13 So that's a small percentage of the
14 overall effort, but, it's something that we have
15 to be ready for and willing to do if we want
16 their approval. I don't know to what extent
17 they'll push it, but that's sort of the general
18 drift that I've been catching over the past
19 several weeks. But they're not going to say
20 don't do the tunnel, or you don't have to do the
21 tunnel or put the tunnel off for another 15
22 years. I do not see that happening.

23 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: If they
24 did go that route --

25 MR. MARSHALL: What route is that?

39

1 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Put the
2 tunnel off. Would there be engineering stuff in
3 this thing that we need done anyway
4 irrespective, or all of this really presuming
5 that they're going to say, build a tunnel?

6 MR. MARSHALL: Most of it is pretty
7 much, you know, presuming, but the real cost of
8 designing the hardcore brick and mortar and
9 water pumps and piping and tunneling will come
10 later on when we come back for additional
11 authorizations. And this is really laying all
12 the groundwork for all the work that has to be
13 done in Phase III, the real heavy duty design
14 work. This could potentially take it to 10
15 percent design on everything. It's not going to
16 go any further than that.

17 The really heavy duty design will
18 be once the DEM has given us their final
19 approval and we go out we hire the so-called
20 PDEs, the project design engineering teams,
21 that's when it will really start, but I know how
22 crazy it is to say. That's when it really will
23 start getting expensive. As if \$6 million
24 dollars isn't expensive right now, but
25 relatively speaking. So I don't think we're

40

1 wasting any money by moving forward with this.
2 And remember, we haven't signed this yet. It
3 will take us a couple more weeks to reach a
4 point where we have a signable contract and by

5 that point, DEM has told us they will have given
6 us their input.

7 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: So you and
8 the Chairman will have the latitude to wait for
9 DEM to give you a document so that we don't get
10 surprised before you procure the --

11 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: So just so you
13 know, my discussions with the director of DEM.
14 Obviously, they're pushing for more green
15 projects and I had to remind them that this is
16 not big sky country. If they could determine
17 where these green projects might go we'd be
18 happy to consider them, but we don't have a lot
19 of area for green projects. But to the greatest
20 extent possible, you can consider any green
21 projects that they are willing to offer and that
22 would could find.

23 COMMISSIONER BURROUGHS: Yeah, what
24 I'm hearing is other cities, they're
25 incentivizing mostly homeowners to become

41

1 partners in the green projects. Whether that's
2 a good idea or not, I don't know, but that would
3 presumably open up a lot of territory.

4 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: And I think

5 DEM should do that. I think DEM should get
6 right out there and I think they should get out
7 there and incentivize the homeowners. All
8 right, so --

9 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Quick
10 question, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Commissioner
12 Bennett.

13 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: So really
14 the financial commitments from DEM just aren't
15 there; is that correct, they don't have access
16 to the capital?

17 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: No.

18 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: So
19 ultimately, I think a lot of their money is
20 coming from the feds, a good part of their
21 budget, I guess is from the Federal Government.

22 Is there an opportunity to work that angle to
23 maybe get them to carry their weight?

24 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: I'm not sure.

25 MR. DEANGELIS: Are you referring

42

1 to the congressional delegation for assistance?

2 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Grant programs

4 you're talking about?

5 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Yeah. I
6 mean, you're carrying all the water, right?

7 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Well, the
8 ratepayers are carrying the water --

9 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Or seen by
10 the DEM to come up to speed. It's just a
11 question. I don't know if there's an answer
12 there.

13 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Well, the only
14 thing that we've been talking about, we started
15 speaking with the General Assembly last year,
16 and I mentioned it to the Governor early on was
17 whether or not we might be a part of the budget,
18 the state budget, and get some appropriation
19 from the state to mitigate some of the rate
20 impacts for the ratepayers that basically all
21 the work that's being done by the Narragansett
22 Bay Commission, everything north of Cranston,
23 for instance, all the benefits are being
24 realized south of Cranston that I thought that
25 the state should step up and get some kind of

43

1 appropriation in the general budget to mitigate
2 rate agencies. That's an ongoing discussion I'm
3 having with the speaker of the house and with

4 their president and intend to have it with the
5 Governor's office, as well, for this budget
6 year. Okay, Commissioner Worrell.

7 COMMISSIONER WORRELL: At the
8 committee hearing, we held on this issue. There
9 was a question raised as to whether we would
10 could be in a position of kind of negotiate a
11 little more forcefully with them, MWH, to see if
12 we could get the cost of this down under where
13 it is right now. And I think the committee came
14 to a general conclusion that our engineers,
15 NBC's engineers, as well as the Executive
16 Director had been very aggressive and had been
17 pushing as hard as possible to keep the cost
18 under control. But that we wanted to be in a
19 position where MWH was adequately compensated
20 for doing an excellent job that we are going to
21 be required to go forward with this huge
22 project, and that the committee seemed generally
23 quite satisfied with the fact that that has been
24 done so far.

25 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Thank you.

1 All right. I had a motion and second. Further
2 discussion?

3 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Second. Thank

5 you, Commissioner Nathan seconds the motion.

6 All in favor? Any opposed? There are none

7 opposed, that motion carries. Further report,

8 thank you, very much.

9 (UNANIMOUS VOTE)

10 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: I have a

11 question now that we've finished that. I assume

12 there are very few drillers in the country.

13 MR. MARSHALL: In terms of

14 tunnelers?

15 COMMISSIONER NATHAN: Yes. And

16 there's work going on in other parts of the

17 country, in the west, particularly. Does that

18 marketplace know that we're coming to a point

19 where we're going to go out for bid in a few

20 years? The reason I ask is could they be saying

21 to us no bid because you have a schedule that

22 we're booked for the next three years, or

23 something like that?

24 MR. MARSHALL: I have no way of

25 knowing that. I mean, where there's work you

1 usually find contractors. You're right.

2 There's not a lot of folks that do the tunneling

3 work, but there seem to be enough of them out
4 there that if their current operation is maxed
5 out that they're probably considering expansion
6 because I know that there are a number of other
7 entities like ours that are moving in the same
8 direction in terms of tunneling, so generally
9 where there's money to be made, you usually find
10 someone willing to do the work.

11 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Okay, all
12 right. Next Committee reporting, Finance
13 Committee. Commissioner Andrade, do you have a
14 report?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: Yes, I do,
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Proceed.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDRADE: The
19 committee reviewed and approved Resolution
20 2016:02; The Adoption of the Fiscal
21 Sustainability Plan Policy, and I move approval
22 of that resolution.

23 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: We have a
24 motion to approve Resolution 2016:02, seconded
25 by Commissioner MacQueen. Discussion on

1 Resolution 2016:02? A basically very simple

2 explanation of this is we're being required to,
3 the NBC's being required to adopt a fiscal
4 sustainability plan policy. This is basically a
5 codification of practices that we've implemented
6 throughout the years. So we'll just formalize
7 it. I think that is pretty much it. Any
8 questions regarding that? Hearing none. All of
9 those that are in favor of approval of
10 resolution 2016:02 will say aye. Are there any
11 opposed? There are none opposed, and the motion
12 carries. Personnel Committee did meet,
13 Commissioner Campbell.

14 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: We met and
15 approved some changes to the organizational plan
16 but, no, I don't think they require board
17 approval.

18 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Okay, thank
19 you, very much. No budget impacts?

20 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: No budget
21 impacts.

22 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: No budget
23 impacts. That's the most important thing. Long
24 Range Planning Committee. No meeting.
25 Rules and Regulations Committee, there was no

1 meeting. Ad Hoc Committee on Internal Ethnic,

2 no meeting. The Executive Committee did not
3 meet yet this year, nor did the Compensation
4 Committee. Legislative Report, Joanne, you're
5 on.

6 MS. MACERONI: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman. I have a very short report today
8 because it is the beginning of Session and I am
9 still going through legislation. The report
10 that you have before you only contains four
11 bills, three of those bills were reintroductions
12 of last year's bills and our position has
13 remained the same.

14 The one new bill on this report is
15 the second one S-2007. It would require the
16 public Finance Management Board, which is an
17 existing board to establish a debt limit for the
18 entire state, including state agencies,
19 quasi-publics and municipalities. Once the
20 limit is reached, they can deny additional
21 borrowing until the debt limit is either
22 increased or approved by the General Assembly.

23 As you see, we opposed this
24 legislation and I've outlined many of the
25 reasons. Basically, NBC relies on debt issuance

1 to finance our mandated improvements, and the
2 passage of this bill would be a hindrance to our
3 process, especially given the fact of the
4 process that we already have to go through with
5 the Division of Public Utilities and Carriers
6 and the Department of Public Utilities. So
7 we'll be speaking with the sponsor, as well as
8 with the quasi-public agencies with the cities
9 and towns to try to work on this issue.

10 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Thank you,
11 very much, Joanne. Next committee. We have the
12 Citizens Advisory Report. Howard, do you have a
13 report for us today?

14 MR. SCHACTER: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman. Yes, brief, but you know a little bit
16 about it. We had the privilege of having
17 Elizabeth Scott from the DEM make a presentation
18 to us on the stormwater issue. It was our first
19 look at it. I'd call it more of a -- it was a
20 mechanical and overview and survey of what's
21 going on, it was a good Powerpoint presentation,
22 however, she left us with quite a few more
23 questions than answers.

24 We did have the advantage at the
25 time, however, of cross examination, discussion

1 and we were privileged also to have Ray and Tom,
2 Jamie and Ames present who were active on NBC's
3 behalf, our behalf, with good cross
4 communication between them. The bottom line
5 from our standpoint was that she was drawing on
6 the skill sets of NBC and the CSO progress made
7 to date over the years, will probably put NBC in
8 the best position to take on and take over that
9 which was lacking in the stormwater remediation
10 situation. She struggled with giving us towns
11 that were cooperating. Obviously, the DOT not
12 cooperating.

13 And this lack of cooperation played
14 out, Ray and Tom were very, very good in their
15 questions, held her to task. Again, leaving us
16 with many more questions than we had answers,
17 but with their help, and Jamie and Ames also
18 participating, we were able to have a very good
19 balance of, let's say, communication with her.

20 Her presentation was good, but it was pretty
21 well sided toward the problems they're
22 experiencing, did not want to discuss ratepayer
23 responsibilities or obligations, which was very
24 primary.

25 Ray made some good points in that

1 direction. And at this point we became very
2 well-versed, I would call the mechanical
3 overview of the problem, and we're looking
4 forward to following up with her. She had about
5 an hour and a half of direct presentation which
6 is very good, but that is not a lot of time when
7 you're covering a topic of that nature.

8 However, she came away, I think, satisfied that
9 we have done some homework.

10 We had good cooperative experience
11 with the Board and with Ray and Tom being
12 present, and it worked well for us, and I think
13 she came away with a good impression of where we
14 stood. We're certainly not a decision making
15 group, but we were certainly a challenging
16 group, and that helped everything. It was good
17 for us to learn more about it.

18 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: Thank you,
19 very much. Okay. Chairman's Report. We've
20 already talked about today, a lot of things that
21 I was going to report on, our stormwater, so
22 there's no further report. Next item is New
23 Business. Any of our commissioners have any new
24 business they wish to discuss today, new
25 business, other business of any nature, any

1 business? Commissioner Rotella.

2 COMMISSIONER ROTELLA: Move

3 adjournment.

4 CHAIRMAN MESOLELLA: We have a

5 motion to adjourn by Commissioner Rotella,

6 seconded by Commissioner Farnum. Once again,

7 thank you, all for attending today. I

8 appreciate it very much. All in favor of

9 adjournment will say aye. Anybody opposed?

10 None opposed. The motion carries. One last

11 thing. Next board meeting is March 15. Okay,

12 thank you, very much.

13 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:10 A.M.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

2

3 I, PAULA J. CAMPAGNA, CSR, a Notary
4 Public, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
5 true, accurate, and complete transcript of my
6 notes taken at the above-entitled hearing.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my
hand this 25th day of February, 2016.

PAULA J. CAMPAGNA, CSR, NOTARY PUBLIC/CERTIFIED
COURT REPORTER

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: April 25, 2018

IN RE: Board of Commissioners' Meeting

DATE: January 26, 2016