



STAFF REPORT

TO: Council
FROM: Trudy Payne, CAO and Dan Vincent, Public Works Operator
APPROVED BY: Trudy Payne, Chief Administrative Officer
DATE: September 14, 2020
SUBJECT: Sewage Treatment Plant Biosolids Remediation

ORIGIN:

The Audit and Control Committee and Council requested that staff seek a second opinion (professional assessment) of the Sewage Treatment Plant pertaining to the septage being received, the expected lifespan of the plant, and remediation options because of concerns raised by the Public Works Operator pertaining to the quantities of septage received since the Plant's inception.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT, Council of the Municipality of the District of Shelburne award the Sewage Treatment Plant Biosolids contract to CBCL at a cost of \$16,420 plus HST, with the funds to come from the gas tax reserve.

BACKGROUND:

The Municipality of Shelburne Sewage Treatment Plant (507 Sandy Point Road) is an Extended Aeration Sewage Lagoon which is utilized by residents and businesses from the County of Shelburne and the Municipality of the District of Shelburne. The purpose of this site is to offer Wastewater Treatment to the clients connected to the system as well as septage receiving from 2 designated septage haulers in the County of Shelburne. The site receives approximately 2000 m³ of septage every year and processes approximately 110,000 m³ of domestic sewage every year.

The Municipality of Shelburne Sewage Treatment Plant was constructed in 2012 and has been receiving domestic waste and septage since then. There has never been a biosolids remediation undertaken since the construction of the system.

DISCUSSION:

A total of four proposals were submitted. These proposals came from CBCL, ABLE Engineering, Dillion Consulting, and R.V. Anderson Associates Limited.

The proposal was scored by two staff based on the following criteria for a possible total score of 100:

- a) Understanding of required services, scope of work (10)
- b) Approach/methodology (10)
- c) Work plan (10)
- d) Experience (30)
- e) Price – ability to complete the project within the allotted budget (40)

Proponent	Proposed Cost (before HST)	Scoring Averages					Total (100)
		A (10)	B (10)	C (10)	D (30)	E (40)	
CBCL	\$16,420	9	10	10	30	38	97
ABLE	\$19,990	10	10	10	28	35	93
R.V. Anderson Associates Limited	\$24,830	10	7	10	30	32	89
Dillon Consulting	\$31,100	9	10	10	30	29	88

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

Funds were not allocated in the budget for this specific project; however, funds were allocated for professional services, including engineering services, in the amount of \$30,500. Inquiries were made with the Province concerning using gas tax for this RFP. Staff were informed that gas tax could be used as the intent is to lead to a capital project. If for some reason a capital project does not result from this assessment, if gas tax funds are used to pay the consultant for this RFP, the funds would need to be replaced in our gas tax reserve.

ATTACHMENTS:

None.