

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Transamerica Building
Pima Association of Governments' 5th Floor Conference Room
177 North Church Avenue
Thursday, May 20, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

Committee Members Present:

Jeff Biggs	Mike Gritzuk	Rob Kulakofsky	Mark Stratton (phone)
Sheila Bowen	Barbee Hanson	John Lynch	
John Carlson	Kendall Kroesen	Armando Membria (phone)	

Committee Members Absent:

Brad DeSpain	Bill Katzel	Corey Smith	Ann Marie Wolf
--------------	-------------	-------------	----------------

Staff Present:

Ed Curley	Jackson Jenkins	Gregg Hitt	Tom Burke
Diana St. John	Kristin Borer	Matt Matthewson	Charles Wesselhoft
Jackson Jenkins	Sandy Current	Lorraine Simon	
Eric Wieduwilt	Laura Fairbanks	Lillian Von Rago	

Others:

Nicole Ewing-Gavin	Jesse Lugo	Linda Smith, COT	Claire Zucker, PAG
--------------------	------------	------------------	--------------------

I. CALL TO ORDER. Chair Sheila Bowen called the meeting of the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) to order at 7:54 a.m.

II. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE. There were no comments from the audience.

New RWRAC member Kendall Kroesen was introduced.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. The minutes of the April 15, 2010 meeting were approved.

IV. Committee/Sub Committee Reports

A. Citizens' Water Advisory Committee Update. No update was given.

V. Discussion

A. Old Items/Updates

- 1. Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study.** Melaney Seacat and Nicole Ewing-Gavin gave a PowerPoint presentation. During the presentation, John Carlson asked who would be in charge of the integrated regional planning. Ms. Seacat said that she attended a meeting of the Southern Arizona Water User's Association (SAWUA) recently where this was discussed. Mike Gritzuk said that SAWUA has formed a committee to discuss what their involvement would be in a regional planning effort. Ms. Seacat said that the ad hoc subcommittee is looking at five of the Water Study recommendations that they identified as regional and germane to water resource. Mr. Carlson said that there should be more involvement from outlying jurisdictions.
- 2. Regional Optimization Master Plan Update.** Mike Gritzuk gave a PowerPoint presentation. No questions were asked during the presentation.
- 3. Odor Control Update.** Dennis Froehlich distributed a handout and gave the Odor Control Program update. This quarter (January through March) was the best ever in terms of odor control. There were only 46 odor complaints in three months. Normally, there is one per day. Of the 46 complaints, 72%, or 33 of the 46, were related to problems in homes (for example, a back up). Only 13 were related to the public system.

Since then, in April and May, there have been over 30 flow management-related complaints. This is construction related. The current scale of construction is larger than normal. Odor control has learned that they need to become involved early in the process to work with flow management planning to prepare for odor abatement on the projects.

Ms. Bowen asked if the problems were specific to the Ina and Roger Road projects. Mr. Froehlich said that the problems were all over. There is preparation that can be done in advance, such as lateral lines. RWRD had identified most of what they can do to eliminate odors and are engaging constructively with engineering.

Mr. Lynch asked if they were looking at flow management as a contractor responsibility or a RWRD responsibility. Mr. Froehlich said that much of the work can be done by RWRD in advance to minimize the burden on the contractor. For example, RWRD will bring in portable equipment and the contractor is responsible for running the generator. Ultimately the public pays for it, so RWRD is working on completing these projects in the most judicious and cost-effective manner possible.

Odor Control has been invited into the design process of the projects underway. The integration of odor control into Departmental activities is working well. They are meeting odor control objectives at the outlying facilities. Odor is barely detectable at the fence line. The only place with inconsistent success is in Green Valley due to excess rain and the sludge drying beds. This has been identified as a future Capital Improvement Project (CIP).

There have been no complaints at Roger Road, but there have been complaints in the surrounding area. This is due to flow management. Most of the odor control equipment, originally intended to be temporary, has needed to be rebuilt to be permanent for the remaining life of the Roger Road facility. There are plumes getting off the property, but mostly in unpopulated areas. The worst offender at Roger Road is the uncontrolled biogas emissions. RWRD has just received equipment to take care of that odor source.

4. **Financial Update.** Ron Meck, Finance and Risk Management, gave the financial update. The contract for the revenue obligations sale is being finalized. As they will be soliciting on a regular basis, they are trying to make a template that only needs the date changed. They anticipate a sale by the middle of June and are hoping for an interest rate of 4.5 percent or less.

RWRD revenues are less than anticipated. The area with the greatest shortfall appears to be growth-related. Mr. Gritzuk is doing an excellent job of controlling costs as his operating costs are down.

Mr. Lynch asked what the percentage revenues were down. Mr. Meck said that they were down approximately \$18 million, or about 4 percent. Revenues were anticipated at \$147 million but only \$129 million are projected. The City of Tucson Water is the largest contributor. They accrue revenue once per year. That process takes until November.

Mr. Gritzuk asked about the process to sell the revenue obligations. Mr. Meck said that a company has been hired to market the bonds to large institutional investors.

Mr. Gritzuk said that the lower than projected revenue from connection fees is growth related. There is also a shortfall in the user charge revenue. RWRD has just over 260,000 customers. User charges are determined by a fixed fee and a variable usage component. The variable component is based on December, January and February water usage. The shortage in fees is being compared to the water conservation efforts in the City of Tucson. At this point there is no direct correlation.

Jeff Biggs said that the City of Tucson water revenues are \$300,000 below planned revenue expectation through April. It is a combination of water sales and impact fee. Their expenditures are down \$3.5 million. Like RWRD, Tucson Water is being efficient in operations. Water usage is has dropped five to seven percent in the last two years. Much of this is from conservation efforts. It can also be attributed to numerous vacant houses.

Mr. Lynch asked if there are a greater number of homeowners in arrears. Mr. Biggs said yes, there are more payment plans being set up than in the past. Tucson Water usually writes off \$1 million per year in bad debt.

5. **RWRAC Roles and Responsibilities.** Ms. Bowen said that this has been kept on the agenda in case questions arose. She would like to table this until the fall and revisit it then if necessary.

B. New Items

1. **Biosolids Presentation.** Jeff Prevatt gave a PowerPoint presentation. During the presentation, Mr. Carlson asked if farms could get the dry biosolids fertilizer produced for free. Mr. Prevatt said yes. It is a cost savings to a department as otherwise it would have to be stored, sent to a land fill or marketed. Barbee Hanson asked if anyone besides farmers would be interested in it. Mr. Prevatt said not yet as RWRD currently produces class B. When our biosolids go to a class A product, there will be a much larger market.

Mr. Kroesen asked what the origin of the metals in biosolids is from. Mr. Prevatt said copper comes from copper

plumbing pipes, but most metals come from commercial operations.

Mr. Lynch asked if biosolids management is part of the ROMP program. Mr. Gritzuk said that \$21 million is being spent for planning, engineering and capital costs. Mr. Carlson asked if pharmaceuticals are also being addressed. Mr. Gritzuk said that the Bardenpho® treatment process was chosen as it does reduce pharmaceuticals. When regulations address pharmaceuticals, the Bardenpho® process can be modified to comply. RWRD is planning for the future.

Rob Kulakofsky asked if, as new regulations are imposed to remove pharmaceuticals and personal care products and our biosolids product becomes class A, RWRD is considering composting as a way to reduce odor. Mr. Gritzuk said that RWRD is looking at all conceivable options: composting is one of the options. He is not sure if it could be odor free as there is odor until it becomes inert. Mr. Prevatt said that the method used today – injection – is vastly different than what was used ten years ago. It used to be sprayed in liquid form on fields, and then a tractor would till it into the soil. Now the liquid is injected 12-18 inches into the ground.

Mr. Lynch asked if incineration is an option. Mr. Gritzuk said that the State does not allow for incineration.

2. **Nominating Committee.** Mr. Carlson and Mr. Kulakofsky volunteered to be on the nominating committee. Mr. Stratton will be asked if he would also like to participate. Members were asked to contact the nominating committee if they were interested in serving as Chair and Vice-Chair.
3. **Board of Supervisors Annual Report.** Ed Curley said that themes are needed for the 2009-2010 Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors. Ideas presented were the Water Study and the regional effort for the Pharmaceutical Take-Back Program.

VI.FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS. Items discussed were a tour of the Ina Road facilities in October, a Pharmaceutical update and the City of Tucson Sentry program.

VII.CALL TO THE AUDIENCE. There were no comments from the audience.

VIII.ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

DRAFT