SCHEDULE G

Form of Project Completion Report

Part 1 - Instructions

REQUIREMENT: You must submit a Project Completion Report as a condition of the Final Loan Disbursement.

PURPOSE: Your Project Completion Report has three purposes:

- 1. **Project tracking:** This report enables FCM to confirm that your project was completed as described in the Agreement.
- 2. Reporting on the impacts and lessons learned <u>during the construction</u> of the project: This report includes any environmental, social and economic results as well as lessons learned during the *planning, design and construction of the project*. Ensure that you include in the report any processes or techniques that were implemented at these stages to address triple bottom line impacts. This could include dust minimization measures or the onsite use of electric vehicles instead of gas powered. All environmental, social and economic results *from the operation* of the project will be reported under a separate Environmental Results Report in the form set out in one of the schedules to the Agreement.
- 3. Knowledge sharing: FCM shares the lessons and expertise gained through GMF-funded initiatives with other communities across Canada. The findings and lessons learned documented in your Project Completion Report could be valuable for other municipal governments that are seeking to address sustainability issues in their own communities. FCM will post your reports on its website at the approved projects database¹. This is the part of the GMF website which is most frequently visited. Your report will assist FCM in producing other materials related to your project, including a GMF case study. In addition, other municipalities may view your project completion report to improve the success of their project.

COPYRIGHT: You must hold the copyright to the reports that you submit to us and provide FCM with rights to reproduce and distribute it as set out in the Agreement.

CONFIDENTIALITY: If your report contains any confidential information that you would prefer not be made available to the public (e.g. through a case study or other materials produced by FCM that relate to your project), please submit two versions of the report:

- 1. **Complete report including confidential information:** Please clearly label this report with the word "**Confidential**". FCM will treat it as confidential.
- 2. **Abridged report excluding confidential information:** This report may be posted on the FCM website and otherwise made available to interested third parties.

CONTENT OUTLINE: Your Project Completion Report should be approximately **9 to 15 pages long**; some reports may be longer or shorter depending on the complexity of the Project. While there are no

¹ http://www.fcm.ca/home/programs/green-municipal-fund/funded-initiatives.htm

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

maximum word counts for each section, the most pertinent section of the report — Lessons Learned — should be given more weight.

Because your report may be read by non-technical municipal staff and similar readers, please assume a low to moderate level of technical knowledge and a preference for clear, direct and focused writing. Use simple language, and explain any highly technical terms or acronyms that are used.

REPORT FORMAT: Please request an electronic Form of Project Completion Report from the GMF Project Officer and submit your report in either .doc or .pdf (searchable) format. A scanned copy of the Project Completion Report will not be accepted. FCM endeavors to collect the most relevant project information and as such may amend the Form of Project Completion Report from time to time. If so, FCM will provide you with the latest Form of Project Completion Report.

Part 2 – Project Completion Report Form

Project information

GMF number:	15047			
Name of funding 1	ecipient: _T	Town of Montague		
Project title:Mo	ntague Slud	lge Dewatering System		
Date of Project Co	ompletion Re	Report:Feb. 3, 2017		
Project Construction Start Date (MM/DD/YYYY): 05/20/2016				
Project Substantial Completion Date (MM/DD/YYYY):11/15/2016				
Total Project Cost	(Actual):	\$478,888		

QUESTIONS:

Project implementation

1. Was the Project implemented as outlined in the contract (or as amended)? Please identify any substantial changes , explaining why they happened (e.g. getting a new system to operate correctly, delays due bad weather, labour availability, etc.) and their impact on the project (e.g. higher overall costs, more staff training required, etc.).

The project was implemented as outlined in the contract. There were no substantial changes and the project went smoothly with completion of installation only about a week off the projected timeline due to the availability of an electrical junction box.

Lessons learned

INSTRUCTIONS:

Lessons learned refer to knowledge gained from the Project that can be applied to other situations. For this report, GMF is interested in the lessons learned from the **design**, **planning and construction phases** of the project.

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

Answers in this section may refer to **positive** experiences (i.e. what worked or went well, and could serve as a model for future projects) or **negative** experiences (i.e. what didn't work, or went poorly, and should be avoided in future projects).

Overall, the project went very well. Contrary to what we thought would happen, our engineers did not tender the equipment in the project as a complete package but instead divided it up into parts and tendered them separately. We had been working with a company that supplies a complete dewatering equipment package including pumps, polymer mixing and injection equipment and dewatering membrane bags. We originally thought it would make more sense to get the package as one unit, but the engineers thought we would get a better price by tendering the project with the different elements being able to be supplied by different companies. The specs were drawn such that the equipment was compatible and, in the end, we got a better price than we would have if we tendered as a package as the contractors had the option of going to different suppliers for pricing for each element (sludge pumps for example). It will remain to be seen if this works out to be a better policy in the end, but for now it appears to have gotten us what we want at a better price. One of the only issues we ran into when carrying out the project had to do with excavating the area for the concrete pads. The construction company found the remains of an old buried building which required the removal of more soil than originally calculated. This was more an engineering related matter than a project related matter, but it did increase the cost of construction. There was also some equipment that needed to be special ordered, in particular an explosion proof electrical junction box, that caused some delay in the project completion.

- 2. Describe what worked well and what did not work well, and why, for the project elements below, include a description of any solutions implemented to address challenges?
 - a. Design, procurement and contracting:

There were no issues with this element of the project except that the engineers did not take into consideration the existence of the remains of an old building under the soil in the construction site. This required the removal of about 30% more soil than anticipated but did not drastically effect the overall project. Our engineers understood the project and developed the specifications for it and tendered the project. The only other issue, due the relative small and isolated nature of the area, was that we only received two bids for the project.

b. Consultation and community engagement (prior to and during construction):

There were no issues with this aspect of the project. Being that this is part of our wastewater treatment plant which is behind a fence, there didn't appear to be much concern (or even interest) in this project. Those that expressed any interest were mostly interested in any cost savings that may be realized as a result of the project. As the project is new and most cost savings will be realized during the warmer months, actual cost savings have yet to be determined but early indications are promising.

c. Construction of the project

Construction was hampered early on when it was discovered that there was the remains of an old building under the construction area. This required the removal of substantially more soil than originally anticipated, but in the end it only slowed the construction by a few days. Other than this realatively minor glitch (financially

^{© 2016,} Town of Montague. All Rights Reserved.

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

speaking), the construction went smoothly. The only other issue we found was the ordering of a special explosion proof electrical junction box which took a while to have made and sent to us.

d. Completing the project on time and on budget.

The project was delayed in completion by about 2 weeks, which wasn't really that bad given the scope of the project. Most of the delay was credited to the necessitated removal of extra material from the construction site and having to wait for the arrival of a special piece of equipment (explosion proof electrical junction box). The construction came in slightly above budget due to the extra soil removal and replacement with approved material and other incidental items and changes made during construction.

3. Describe your experience (e.g. trade-offs, surprises) when choosing a particular approach, technology or solution for this project. What would you do differently?

If asked to do it again, I would specify a greenhouse to cover at least one of the dewatering pads to make winter use easier. Our engineers were not convinced that we would need a greenhouse for winter operation, but we have found that it necessary to keep the bag defrosted to allow for dewatering. Although it appears to have worked out tendering out different pieces of the equipment, I would also consider doing a "equipment package" to get everything from one supplier to have a package that was out of the box compatible and functional.

4. Has the business case associated with the project changed since the planning stage (e.g. change in the level of service delivered by the project, expected revenues, capital or operating costs or payback, etc.)? Could anything have been done to better understand the business case at the application stage?

The business case was strong and appears to have been accurate with the exception of not being able to dewater as much during the winter months. The system was operational for a month or so after construction and our sludge was reduced to optimal levels and the dewatering was working well. We are looking at installing a greenhouse for next winter to allow for 12-month operation. This should allow for savings equal to or greater than those projected in the business case.

5. Did you use any approach(es), that are not business as usual over the course of the Project (e.g. decision making approach, consultation methodology, non-typical procurement, full-cost accounting)? Were there any benefits or drawbacks of this approach?

No approaches were used that were not business as usual.

Sustainable Design and Construction:

6. In your GMF application, you noted that the project would have sustainable design and construction measures as set out in column B of the table below.

^{© 2016,} Town of Montague. All Rights Reserved.

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

Please complete the table below by inserting into column C the following information:

- Did the project implement the measures as described?
- Describe the effectiveness of the measures?
- Please provide reasons for any changes to the measures?
- Please include any measures that were taken beyond what you committed to in the application form.

A	В	С		
Sustainable Design and Construction	As described in your GMF	Describe the Implementation of the		
Element	Application	Measure (one paragraph)		
Sustainable Design and procurement				
Environmental considerations				
integrated at the design stage				
Green procurement				
Site Characteristics				
A remediated brownfield or				
underutilized site (i.e. is not a green				
field).				

Existing buildings/ infrastructure /	The project will be constructed	The project implemented the	
equipment is used	within the confines of the	measures as outlined in the	
	existing WWTP.	application. Dewatered material is	
		held onsight and will be trucked	
	Pumps from the plant will be	once the bag has been filled and	
	used to divert the waste (through valving) to the dewatering	allowed to sit, dewater and compost for a year. The system appears to be	
	system. The material created	working exactly as anticipated	
	will be composted on site in the	except that we have realized that	
	bags that are used to dewater.	we need a greenhouse to improve	
	Once it has dewatered and	year round operations. The cold	
	composted for about a year, the	winter months can lead to freezing	
	material will be used as a	in the bags and either reduce or stop	
	nutrient additive to sod fields	the dewatering abilities of the	
	within 1 km of the WWTP. The	membrane bags. This is an	
	actual bags used to dewater the sludge can be reused after they	inconvenience and we are still very pleased with the operation of the	
	have served their purpose for	system so far. The material going	
	such purposes as landscaping,	into the bags is sludge and has the	
	erosion control, and weed	appearance of very dirty puddle	
	control. We currently land	water. The water leaving the bags	
	spread the waste but expect that	looks like brook water.	
	that method of dealing with		
	waste will be discontinued in the near future as there have been		
	complaints about odour and		
	health concerns from those in		
	the area where the land		
	spreading occurs. This treatment		
	method gives us a usable		
	product at the end of the process		
	with the possibility of		
	developing it into a salable product. It significantly		
	improves the performance of our		
	WWTP by controlling our		
	MLSS, thereby increasing the		
	plants capacity without making		
	major capital expenditures or		
	changing the footprint. It also		
	reduces the amount of trucking		
	we will need to do (reducing GHG emissions) and optimizes		
	the WWTP treatment capability.		
Avoids, protects or enhances			
sensitive environmental areas			
Utilize natural systems to provide			
environmental benefits within the project (e.g. wetlands)			
Does not contribute to urban sprawl			

© 2016, **Town of Montague**. All Rights Reserved. The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

Part of the urban transport network	
and encourages the use of	
sustainable transportation	
Construction activities:	
Reuse of available construction	
material on-site	
Use of construction materials with	
recycled content	
Construction Waste management	
including diverting construction	
waste from the landfill through	
recycling and re-use (off-site)	
Minimize expected impacts of	
construction activities (e.g. dust	
minimization, minimise soil erosion)	
Biodiversity and ecosystem	
protection	
Other (Please specify)	

Environmental, Social and Economic Outcomes:

7. Please describe any additional environmental, social and economic outcomes your Project has achieved during the design, procurement and construction phases.

Now that the project has been completed, it will somewhat help with negotiations to join communities together. Amalgamation talks have been ongoing for some time and this project allows the community to expand the wastewater treatment line to more customers without having to complete major upgrades to the WWTP.

Project Champion:

8. Do you have a Project champion who has been instrumental to the Project to date (design, procurement, construction)? If so, please include his or her name, title and contact information, and describe his or her role in the Project.

Next steps

9. Please describe any steps you have taken or plan to take to ensure that the people, internal groups or other key stakeholders that are important to the operation of the project adopt the necessary behaviours and other practices to ensure successful performance?

The Water & Sewer Corporation is briefed on the operations of the Wastewater Treatment Plant on a regular basis and the plant maintenance staff are developing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the plant operations which include dewatering. This will ensure consistent and efficient operations of the plant and the dewatering system.

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.

10. Have the systems and technologies been established for measuring and monitoring the performance of the project during operation

Yes. The systems for measuring and monitoring the operations were already established in that the operators have to test many parameters of operation on a regular basis. The composition of the Waste Activated Sludge (WAS) is tested monthly to ensure that it is staying in acceptable operational ranges. With the dewatering system in place, we can now waste sludge on a more efficient basis and get the plant operating at optimal levels, not just acceptable ones. Due to the associated costs of trucking sludge, we used to waste just enough to stay within environmental guidelines. With the dewatering system in place, we will be able to waste on a regular basis and keep the solids in the treatment plant at optimal levels. We have found that keeping the solids at optimal levels also has the side benefit of lowering our energy consumption as the air pumps that feed the plant do not need to run as hard to maintain treatment levels.

Publicity

11. Briefly describe any recognition, media coverage, awards, or public support the Project has received to date.

The system is new and operations are still being tweaked to obtain the best results. Once we are sure of treatment and energy levels, and can verify results, we will broadcast more widely the extent and efficiency of the treatment system.

Photos and materials

FCM includes project photos and links to project materials in GMF case studies, website content, and other communication vehicles.

1. Identify and attach any materials resulting from the Project that would be useful to share with other communities, such as checklists, toolkits, guidelines, bylaws, videos or information brochures. If the material is available on your website, simply include the link to it.

For example, a water conservation project might result in a new municipal water use bylaw, or a series of householder information brochures or online video clips on ways to reduce water use.

2. Attach five high-quality photographs of the Project. Where possible, include photos that feature people in action, illustrate the progress of the project, or feature "before" and "after" perspectives. The photos must be in jpeg or tiff format and at least 300 dpi (up to 10 MB/10,000 KB but no smaller than 1 MB/1,000 KB in file size).

For each photo, please include:

- a) A caption describing what is featured in the photo.
- b) A photo credit that indicates who owns the copyright to the photo and the photographer (e.g. © 2010, City of Ottawa/Madison Brown).

c) A written release signed by the individuals depicted in the photo granting FCM permission to use the images. Please request an FCM Photo Consent Form from the GMF Project Officer.

The preparation of this project was carried out with assistance from the Green Municipal Fund, a Fund financed by the Government of Canada and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. Notwithstanding this support, the views expressed are the personal views of the authors, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Government of Canada accept no responsibility for them.