MINUTES
NORTHEAST OHIO REGIONAL SEWER DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
APRIL 3, 2008

Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District was called to order at 12:35 p.m. by Mr. Brown.

I. Roll Call

PRESENT: D. Brown
G. Starr
T. Longo
R. Sulik
S. Kelly
D. DePiero

The Secretary informed the President a quorum was in attendance.

II. Approval of Minutes of March 20, 2008

MOTION – Mayor Starr moved and Mayor Longo seconded that the Minutes of March 20, 2008, be approved.

Mr. Liberatore entered the meeting at this point.

III. Public Session (no one registered to speak at the public session)

IV. Executive Director’s Report

Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that a full Executive Director’s report involving departmental matters will be presented at the April 17, 2008 Board meeting. He informed the Board that the process of resetting the District’s Strategic Plan is pending. A work plan has been included in the Board packets. Staff retreats will be held to develop a draft strategic plan. At least one, but perhaps two special Board meetings will be scheduled in June to present the draft plan to the Board for input and comments. The public will be properly notified of these Board meetings. After input from the Board, a final plan will be presented to the Board at the end of July 2008.
V. Consent Agenda

Mr. Brown advised the Board that there are no Consent Agenda items.

VI. Action Items

Request for Proposal (RFP) for Program Management Services

Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that Resolution 94-08 is requesting authorization to issue a Request for Proposal (hereinafter “RFP”) for a District Program Management services contract to implement the ongoing Capital Improvement Program (hereinafter “CIP”). He advised the Board that, with a substantial CSO program looming, in order for the District to move forward with a committed capital program, a Program Management contract was necessary. The presentation will address how the District has managed the program and identify available resources. Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that the District will need to access the bond market more significantly for funding and to manage its debt due to the loss of grant monies and a reduction in state revolving loan funds. As a result, the District will be required to make commitments to its bond holders relating to project delivery. Program Management will enable the District to modernize its project delivery methods, involving a significant degree of standardization regarding the handling of change orders, claims management and subcontracting. Large wastewater agencies are moving to a program management approach such as Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis.

At this point, Executive Director Ciaccia introduced the Director of Engineering and Construction Kellie Rotunno who presented the Program Management to the Board.

Program Management Drivers. Ms. Rotunno began discussion by listing the drivers for Program Management such as the Consent Decree compliance schedule, resource capacity to deliver future CIP’s, the need to validate and prioritize current CIP projects utilizing Asset Management principles, the need for improved project controls and standardization and specialized expertise.

District CIP Delivery

Referring to “District CIP Delivery – Past Performance and 5-Year Projection,” the value of planned construction projects listed in the CIP from 1998 to 2008 is indicated by red bars. The value of construction projects awarded from 1998 to 2008 for the CIP is indicated by green bars. The average of planned projects from 1998 to 2008 was $101 million, whereas District delivery was $49 million. There is a gap in the District’s historical performance in delivering the CIP value. The yellow bars indicate the average value of construction projects on the CIP for the next five (5) years which is $172
A potential CIP delivery deficit could occur in the next five (5) years if the District tried to deliver the CIP with existing resources.

Program Management Overview and Framework. Ms. Rotunno indicated that according to the Program Management Institute, Program Management is defined as "the centralized coordinated management of a specific program to achieve its strategic goals, objectives and benefits. She advised that the Program Manager will oversee the CIP and its multiple projects. In addition, the Program Manager would be responsible for delivering the District's benefits, objectives and goals.

Roles of Team Members on a Project. Ms. Rotunno described a typical life cycle of a Capital Improvement Project as follows: 1) Procurement; 2) Planning and Predesign; 3) Design; 4) Bid and Award; 5) Construction, Administration/Resident Inspection; and 5) Close-out. She informed the Board that the District, Program Manager and Design Consultant will be engaged in a collaborative effort of shared resources to deliver the CIP program. The Program Manager will be responsible for project and contract administration for the overall program.

Regional Program Management Models. Ms. Rotunno identified annual program administration costs for large entities using program management such as Indianapolis, Columbus, Cincinnati and Cleveland Water. The percentage of program costs for these entities fall between 5% (Indianapolis) and 17% (Columbus). The District's CIP value including construction and design is averaging $201 million from 2009 to 2013.

Range of Owner Involvement vs. Program Manager Costs. Ms. Rotunno identified that the approximate range for the District's Program Management costs to be between 5% and 10%.

Future Range of District CIP Administration Costs. Ms. Rotunno identified the District's 5-year CIP Total from 2009 to 2013 to be over a billion dollars. Therefore, over the next five years, the cost to administer the program at 5% would be $50 million and at 10% is over $100 million. The annual program cost at 5% would be $10 million and the current Engineering and Construction Department's contribution is estimated at $6 million indicating a $4 million gap. The annual program cost at 10% may require $14 million in services to augment District staff to deliver the program.

Ms. Rotunno moved discussion to proposed phasing of the development of Project Management.

Phase 1 - Program Needs Assessment Project Scope. Program Needs Assessment is to define and develop the processes, procedures and tools necessary to support the successful implementation of the District's CIP. This includes validating CIP project
cost and schedule, evaluation of staffing needs, staff training, project scheduling and cost estimating, standards for design and construction, including sustainable or green practices, and determining metrics to measure performance. Ms. Rotunno stressed that the goal is to develop sustainable programmatic processes for District staff to carry on after the five-year program is completed. Finally, the key component of the assessment phase is to identify roles for District and Program Manager staff during Phase 2, the implementation phase of the program.

Subcontracting Development Program. Ms. Rotunno explained that elements of the Subcontracting Development Program include program development, training and technical assistance, outreach, bonding, insurance, working capital assistance and workforce development.

Phase 2 - Program Implementation Project Scope. Program Implementation is to deploy and administer a program that results in the successful delivery of the District’s 2009 through 2013 CIP. The Program Manager’s role will include CIP execution, tracking and reporting financial data, cash flow, change order and claims management, dispute resolution and program/project status reports. In addition, the Program Manger’s responsibilities will include tracking and reporting on any subcontracting program developed as part of Phase 1.

Ms. Rotunno identified the following completion schedules for Phase 1 and 2:

Phase 1 Needs Assessment Schedule.

- Duration 6 months
- Issue RFP April 2008
- Proposals Due May 2008
- Phase 1 Contract July 2008
- Notice-to-Proceed July 2008
- Phase 1 Completion January 2009

Phase 2 Implementation Schedule.

- Duration 5 years
- Scope Definition January 2009
- Phase 2 Contract February 2009
- Notice-to Proceed February 2009
- Phase 2 Completion December 2013
In addition, Ms. Rotunno advised that both Phase 1 and 2 will utilize the same consultant but there will be two (2) separate contracts.

Ms. Rotunno indicated that Project Management will not eliminate change orders, displace existing staff, eliminate rate increases, or assume contract liability. However, it will validate current CIP estimates/projects, accurately track projects, provide performance and financial metrics, augment District engineering/construction staff, provide specialized expertise, develop standards for design/construction projects integrating Asset Management principles and provide opportunities for staff training.

At this point, Ms. Rotunno turned discussion to the Board for any questions and/or comments involving the proposed Program Management Program.

Mr. Brown stated that the District’s planned CIP projects between 1998 and 2008 was approximately $101 million; however, the District’s actual project delivery was $49 million. He then questioned if Program Management was intended to improve the District’s project delivery. He questioned if the District staff will be educated as to the development of a new project delivery system so they are able to carry out the functions involving this program.

Ms. Rotunno explained that the District is proposing a program that will be completely sustainable. The training component of District staff will be phased and is an integral part of Phase 1. Phase 1 will also incorporate a plan to transition from Program Manager to District staff.

Executive Director Ciaccia stated that the District has not been pressured to deliver at the planned project level. In the past, the District had access to federal funds and state revolving loan funds. There was no Consent Decree or commitments to bondholders driving the CIP. The District was able to plan aggressively and deliver what the resources allowed. From a performance standpoint, there is nothing wrong with the gap between planned and delivered projects in the past. Executive Director Ciaccia advised that the District is structuring Program Management to be sustainable after the 5-year period. He indicated that the District, for the duration of this project, will need to determine if it is prudent to budget for an additional $10 million to $14 million annually after 2013 to support this program.

Mr. Brown acknowledged Executive Director Ciaccia’s explanation. He was interested in the development of this program specifically the six (6) disciplines presented: procurement, planning/pre-design, design, bid/award, construction administration/resident inspection and closeout. He anticipated that the District intends to assess staff strengths and weaknesses. Upon its assessment, requisite training should
be implemented so the District, as an organization, becomes internally stronger rather than relying on a consultant.

Executive Director Ciaccia advised that the District’s goal is project delivery with less consulting requirements.

Mr. Brown indicated that the Subcontracting Development Program should follow industry standards and support local business opportunities in accordance with laws and regulations. Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that the District and Board will need to work concurrently on this issue. In addition, the Ethics Committee is currently being presented with the law relative to disparity studies, and will be looking at other subcontracting program alternatives for the District. Executive Director Ciaccia advised that the consultant could potentially be involved in shaping the Subcontracting Development Program.

Mayor Starr asked if the main goal of this program is to reign in the costs of projects and establish reasonable standards for change orders. Ms. Rotunno confirmed that this is one of the major components of Program Management, specifically the ability to validate CIP, review cost and phasing of projects, and implement processes that allow management and reporting on construction projects and change order processes.

Mayor Starr asked Ms. Rotunno if she is experienced in this area. Ms. Rotunno indicated that she does have some experience.

Mayor Starr asked Executive Director Ciaccia if he implemented Program Management with the Cleveland Water Department. Executive Director Ciaccia confirmed.

Mayor Starr questioned the success of Cleveland Water’s Program Management. Executive Director Ciaccia advised that the program has been successful. Based on the experience with a program initiated in the mid-90’s involving the Crown Plant in Westlake, Cleveland Water learned valuable lessons enabling them to establish a more successful Program Management Project in 1999 for the rehabilitation of the rest of the plants. He advised that change order management had improved and projects were consistent with the engineer’s estimates, as well as, projects being completed on time.

Mayor Starr referred to the Regional Program Management Models graph, incorporated in Ms. Rotunno’s presentation, which identified Indianapolis, Columbus, Cincinnati and Cleveland Water as example entities that currently have Program Management. He questioned how long these models have been in existence. Ms. Rotunno stated that Cleveland Water implemented Program Management ten (10) years ago. Executive Director Ciaccia indicated that Columbus implemented the program approximately one (1) year ago and Cincinnati roughly two (2) years ago.
Mayor Starr questioned why the District is moving forward with Program Management at this time. Executive Director Ciaccia informed the Board that there are different management philosophies due to the change in District leadership. In his opinion there is a heightened need for this program.

Mayor Starr referred to a memo he distributed dated March 15, 2007. He stated that he reviewed thirty (30) contracts provided to him by the District spanning an eight-year time frame from 1999 to 2006. Cost overruns on these projects ranged from 72% to 285%. Mayor Starr contacted various sources to identify industry standards to reduce the District’s costs. It was indicated that industry standards on new construction for contract overruns is 10% for new construction and 15% for underground renovation. He inquired if the 10% and 15% were reasonable standard goals for the District’s Program Management Program. Ms. Rotunno indicated that 10% and 15% are consistent with industry standards. Executive Director Ciaccia advised that the Governance Committee is currently reviewing the By-Laws and industry standards for allowances on above and below ground projects. In addition, the District is developing a Change Order Policy. He concluded by stating that 10% is acceptable, and that he is confident that the vast majority of projects can be delivered under 10%.

Mayor Starr referred to his correspondence dated March 15, 2007. He questioned if Program Management will address considerations when drawing up contracts, specifically risk and reward programs for contractors. Ms. Rotunno advised that in the Phase 1 assessment, District staff in conjunction with legal counsel will determine what kind of contracting terms will be appropriate for the program. Ms. Rotunno suggested including a metric associated with change order percentages as a one of the goals of the program.

Mayor Starr asked if best practices review will continue. Ms. Rotunno confirmed.

Mayor Starr indicated that previous staff identified communication breakdown as a problem. It was suggested to develop multi-department communications. Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that an Executive Committee, which includes all department heads involved with the CIP will be convened on a monthly basis, and the Program Manager will generate a monthly program report for the District and the Board on every aspect of the program, including costs, scope development and project delivery.

Mayor Starr identified that a key issue related to asset management is determining whether the program is a want or a need. Executive Director Ciaccia agreed and indicated the District’s current Asset Management Program will tie into Program Management and enable the District to assess wants, needs and risks associated with all projects.
Mayor Starr indicated that the District’s past practices did not include assessment of contractor and consultant performance. Executive Director Ciaccia agreed and stated that this is an additional program benefit, specifically the ability to set standards enabling performance comparisons of contractors and consultants.

Mayor Starr inquired if a contingency clause will be included and reminded the staff that information provided to the District was not correct because allowances were not being considered as part of the contingency fund. Executive Director Ciaccia confirmed and advised the Board that the Change Order Policy will define the District’s allowance policies. The District anticipates presenting the policy to the Board in June 2008.

Mayor Starr questioned if the six (6) firms receiving the RFP where national, regional or local. Executive Director Ciaccia indicated that each firm is national, but has local presence. Additional firms may be interested in the RFP and will be considered.

Mayor Starr questioned if joint ventures will be considered, or if one firm will be selected. Executive Director Ciaccia indicated there will most likely be teaming due to the project scope.

Mayor Starr questioned the potential conflict of interest stemming from selecting a firm currently under contract with the District that may partner with other firms as part of a joint venture. Executive Director Ciaccia indicated that the RFP precludes any selected program management firm or its major sub consultants from proposing on design work with the District for the next five (5) years. He indicated that any pending projects being handled by potential selected consultants will need to be completed.

Mayor DePiero stated that he was interested in the training of current staff allowing some aspects of Program Management to be handled internally. He asked if District staff had experience in this type of work. Ms. Rotunno acknowledged that Phase 1 will include a skills and resource assessment to identify what the District currently has and/or will need in the future to develop this program. She explained that it is the District’s intent to provide proper training and resources to District staff to eventually oversee Program Management, in the future, independent from a consultant.

Mayor DePiero questioned if there was an estimate of how much this program will cost the District over the next five (5) years. Ms. Rotunno indicated that if the District were to stay within the 5% - 10% range, it would cost the District between $4 million to $14 million annually.

Mr. Sulik commented that this program seems aggressive over the next five (5) years. He questioned if the District currently possesses staffing levels to manage this type of
project, and funding to support a program that requires approximately $860 million worth of construction. Ms. Demmerle explained that Program Management will facilitate cash flow projections and assist in determining when it will be necessary to go to the bond market to support this program. She indicated that rates are in place until 2011. However, the District will need to review the rate impact this program will create from 2011 and forward.

Executive Director Ciaccia explained that rates are in place through 2011 to support Program Management. After 2011, the District will need the Board’s approval for any additional rate increases. It is the District’s intent, at that time, to present the Board with the most affordable package which will include CSO commitments, and Program Management will enable the District to provide the Board with a realistic basis upon which to base future rate increases.

Ms. Kelly identified that her concern is what Project Management will not do, specifically the inability to eliminate change orders. She questioned if Project Management will assist in change order reduction. Ms. Rotunno indicated that if the District initiates a performance metric for the Program Manager consultant at the beginning of the project to effectively manage change orders, the District will be able to better assess funding for future rate increases.

Ms. Kelly further questioned how the District will determine reduction and/or need for rate increases. She stated that the goal is to minimize contract liabilities and questioned how this program will improve District performance. Ms. Rotunno identified that Ms. Kelly’s concerns will be addressed in the Phase I Needs Assessment. The $172 million annual cost projections could decrease which could affect rates and/or the need for additional funding.

Mayor Longo referred to Regional Program Management Models identified in Ms. Rotunno’s presentation. He questioned what impacted cost differences between 5% and 17%. Ms. Rotunno indicated that the Indianapolis model, which is in the 5% range, utilizes more internal staff. Conversely, the City of Columbus at 17% does not utilize the same amount of internal staffing for its program and relies more on consultants. Ms. Rotunno stated that it is reasonable to estimate the District’s range to fall within the 5% to 10% range due to its current staffing levels.

Mayor Longo questioned what percentage the District presently expends on the management of existing projects. Mr. Bucci indicated that the District currently averages $49 million in construction, and project management is approximately $6 million; therefore, the District is in the 11% to 12% range. Mayor Longo questioned if this estimate includes staff, engineers, lawyers and accountants involved with each project.
Mr. Bucci affirmed. Mayor Longo questioned if this is a formalization of District operations with a goal of decreasing project costs. Ms. Rotunno affirmed.

Mayor Longo indicated his interest, upon implementation of the program, is in the tracking of these projects and measurement of its success. Ms. Rotunno indicated that the phased approach specifies realistic goals and objectives in the implementation of this program.

Mr. Brown identified Program Management as a best practices tool used in the industry. He indicated that tools are only as effective as the organizations using them. Mr. Brown explained that this will enable the District to have the ability to measure project costs, strategies, and deliveries.

**MOTION** – Mayor Longo moved and Mr. Sulik seconded to adopt Resolution No. 94-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

**Request to Award Bid**

No discussion ensued on Resolution No. 95-08.

**MOTION** – Mr. Sulik moved and Ms. Kelly seconded to adopt Resolution No. 95-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order**

No discussion ensued on Resolution No. 96-08.

**MOTION** – Mr. Liberatore moved and Mr. Sulik seconded to adopt Resolution No. 96-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

**Professional Services**

Executive Director Ciaccia explained that Resolution 97-08 is to ratify the hiring of C&K Industries, Inc. (hereinafter “C&K”), to complete work in an amount not to exceed $630,000. He indicated that this is emergency work resulting in the water main break at Public Square in the City of Cleveland. Six (6) companies were asked to quote and the District received three (3) quotes.

Mr. Sulik asked if the District has been successful in attempting to pursue reimbursement from the Ohio Public Works Commission. Executive Director Ciaccia stated that in 2000, the City of Cleveland applied for emergency grant funds for the E. 9th Street water main break and recouped some of the costs.
Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that the Public Works Commission indicated that the Public Square emergency repairs do qualify for funding. Both the City of Cleveland and District intend to apply to recoup some of the costs.

Mr. Sulik questioned if the City of Cleveland is responsible for damages resulting in the Public Square water main break, and why the District is paying for the emergency repairs. Executive Director Ciaccia stated that the emergency repairs are necessary to alleviate further damage to District property. The District would need to file a claim proving negligence on behalf of the City of Cleveland.

Mayor DePiero asked if it would be appropriate for the District to file a claim against the City of Cleveland if negligence did occur. Executive Director Ciaccia indicated that if the District believed the City of Cleveland to have acted negligently, then the District would pursue a claim. At this point, the District does not believe this is the case.

Law Director Ms. Sundheimer advised the Board that if the City’s forensic investigation identifies a third party responsible for the water main break, then the District would seek damages against the third party.

Mayor DePiero asked if additional funds would require Board approval, if the contract exceeds $630,000. Executive Director Ciaccia affirmed.

Ms. Kelly questioned why 50% of the solicited contractors refused to bid on this project. Executive Director Ciaccia informed the Board that some bidders were intending to use C&K as a subcontractor, and the District felt it prudent to utilize C&K as a prime contractor rather than pay markup costs to another contractor that would use C&K as a subcontractor.

Tim Tigue, Director of Operations and Maintenance, stated that the District referred to the small emergency list and two (2) contractors refused to bid because they did not have the expertise and/or equipment to handle the scope of this job specifically the required work for the Easterly Interceptor.

MOTION – Mayor Longo moved and Ms. Kelly seconded to adopt Resolution No. 97-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.
Renewal of Subscription

No discussion ensued on Resolution No. 98-08.

MOTION – Mr. Sulik moved and Mr. Liberatore seconded to adopt Resolution No. 98-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

VII. Information Items

1. Pretreatment Legal Notice.

Executive Director Ciaccia advised the Board that the District is required to complete a Pretreatment Legal Notice which is a notice of all industrial users in significant non-compliance with the NPDES permits within the previous twelve (12) months.

Mr. Brown stated that he is concerned about the release of uncontrolled products and/or chemicals discharged into the system. Chemicals could potentially cause health and/or safety concerns. He indicated that compounds discharged into the sewer pipes from companies no longer operating have been responsible for infrastructure damage. He questioned if companies in significant non-compliance are being monitored for damage control.

Mr. Greenland, Director of Watershed Programs, stated that the District has taken enforcement measures such as administrative orders, hearings and fines against violators. The District has the authorization to stop unlawful discharges. Mr. Greenland advised that the District in conjunction with the local fire departments and the Ohio Environment Protective Agency (hereinafter “Ohio EPA”) work to facilitate remedies.

Mr. Bucci added that he is currently the District Hearing Officer, and he received a show cause hearing notice on a firm listed on the non-compliance list. He indicated that the penalties range from $16,000 and $200,000.

VIII. Open Session

Mr. Brown commented on articles published in The Plain Dealer regarding matters that took place at Board meetings. He advised the Board that he authored a Letter to the Editor in response to the negative published article alleging that the District held secret informational budget hearings. Mr. Brown stated that he received an email from The Plain Dealer requesting confirmation that he was author of the letter, and requesting permission for The Plain Dealer to publish it if they chose to do so. To date, the letter has not been published. Mr. Brown indicated that the intent of his letter was to challenge the “secret meeting issue.” He explained public notice was issued for the February 21,
2008 budget hearing which took place in the Board room with a full staff presentation. In addition, public notice was given for the March 20, 2008 Board meeting wherein the budget was adopted. He acknowledged that the March 4, 2008 budget review meeting did occur, and it was not the intention of the Board to hide anything or pass anything secretly that was not disclosed to the public. He affirmed that no budget modification took place at this meeting. The Board is entrusted with the protection of the rate payer’s money and takes this responsibility very seriously. The Board in conjunction with staff continues to make progress on improving performance of the District. Mr. Brown stated that he believes the goal of the Board and staff is to provide a high quality, low cost product to the public, and the District does so in an open and transparent manner.

Ms. Kelly stated to Mr. Brown that she appreciates his position and supports it 100%.

Mayor DePiero stated that he had the opportunity to visit Washington D.C. and to meet with Senator Voinovich, Senator Brown, Congressman Ryan and Congressman Kucinich to lobby on behalf of the City of Parma for earmarks. Infrastructure issues were discussed, specifically proposed bills related to infrastructure. Senator Voinovich expressed an interest in the District’s Consent Decree and offered to assist with dealings with Ohio EPA in any way that he can. Senator Voinovich indicated that he is considering legislation urging a moratorium on these types of consent decrees from the federal government. Mayor DePiero further advised Senator Voinovich requested that the District and he continue to correspond with him when appropriate.

Executive Director Ciaccia informed the Board that NACWA will host a Clean Water Policy Forum May 4, 2008 through May 7, 2008 in Washington D.C. The District will be represented at this forum. In addition, Ms. Darnella Robertson is currently scheduling meetings with delegation and Board members to encourage attendance.

Mr. Brown indicated that this is an opportunity to provide leadership. Representatives in Washington D.C. need to be held accountable for the lack of funding rather than the rate payers continuing to bear the burden for these costs.

IX. Public Session (no requests from the public)

X. Executive Session

Mr. Brown indicated there were personnel and litigation matters for discussion at Executive Session.
MOTION – Ms. Kelly moved and Mr. Liberatore seconded the motion to go into Executive Session. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

Board met in Executive Session from 1:47 p.m. until 2:15 p.m.

XI. Approval of Items From Executive Session

Add-On Resolutions:

No discussion ensued on Resolution No. 99-08.

MOTION – Mr. Sulik moved and Mr. Liberatore seconded to adopt Resolution No. 99-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

No discussion ensued on Resolution No. 100-08.

MOTION – Mr. Sulik moved and Mr. Liberatore seconded to adopt Resolution No. 100-08. Without objection, the motion carried unanimously.

XI. Adjournment

MOTION – Mr. Brown stated business having been concluded, the Board of Trustees meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

[Signatures]

Dean E. DePiero, Secretary
Board of Trustees
Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District

Darnell Brown, President
Board of Trustees
Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District