

**WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
January 17, 2008

**Committee Members Present:**

|               |                 |                  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| John Carlson  | Brad DeSpain    | Marcelino Flores |
| Barbee Hanson | Michael Gritzuk |                  |

**Committee Members Absent:**

|                 |                |                   |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Adam Bliven     | Sheila Bowen   | John Carhuff      |
| Steve Halverson | Rob Kulakofsky | Armando Membriila |
| John Sawyer     | Mark Stratton  | Ann Marie Wolf    |

**Staff Present:**

|                |                 |               |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Ed Curley      | Laura Fairbanks | Mary Hamilton |
| Suzy Hunt      | Jeff Nichols    | David Smith   |
| Lorraine Simon | John Warner     |               |

**Other County Staff Present:**

Chuck Wesselhoff  
County Attorney's Office

- I. **CALL TO ORDER.** Interim Chair, John Carlson, called the meeting of the Wastewater Management Advisory Committee (WMAC) to order at 8:05 A.M.
- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** As a quorum of the Committee members was not present, approval of the minutes of the December 20, 2007 WMAC meeting was continued to the next regularly scheduled WMAC meeting.
- III. **COMMITTEE/SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS.**
  - A. **Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update.** A CWAC Update was not presented.
- IV. **DISCUSSION.**
  - A. **Old Items/Updates.**

1. **FY 2007/08 Financial Plan and 2008/09 Bond Issue Planning Update.** Mr. Jeff Nichols presented the FY 2007/08 Financial Plan and 2008/09 Bond Issue Planning Update. This included:

- **FY 2007/08 Financial Plan.** On December 11, 2007, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Department's FY 2007/08 Financial Plan as presented. Staff has begun the process of preparing another financial plan. Mr. Nichols anticipated completion of this financial plan by fall 2008.

The Department is preparing the Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/09 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget. Mr. Nichols informed Committee members that the County Administrator has directed all County departments to prepare two budget reduction submittal packages of two percent and five percent for the upcoming FY

2008/09. A two percent reduction would mean an approximate \$1.6 million cut in the Department's O&M budget, and a five percent reduction would mean an approximate \$3.6 million cut in the O&M budget. The Department's proposed FY 2008/09 O&M budget will be presented to the Deputy County Administrator for Public Works on January 28, 2008 and to the County Administrator in February 2008.

The Department has made progress on several programs during the last two years. This includes implementation of the Capacity, Management, Operations, and Maintenance Program, application for the International Standards Organization and Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series certifications for the conveyance system, computerization of the maintenance system at the Ina Road Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF), and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) planning efforts.

Mr. Nichols felt that, under the present circumstances, the Department does not have the ability financially to complete the Regional Optimization Master Plan (ROMP) and do everything at 100 percent. He expressed that if the Department is going to roll out all of these programs, it needs to determine how projects should be rolled out just a little bit slower so the ROMP can be funded. The Department's management team is meeting today to prioritize its most critical needs.

Mr. John Carlson asked if the Department is directed to cut back on its expenses, what would be done with those funds. Mr. Nichols responded, if the two percent cut is implemented, those dollars would flow through to the Systems Development Fund and could be used to fund the Department's CIP program.

Mr. Michael Gritzuk reminded Committee members that the major components of the Department's budget consist of staffing and utility costs. He felt it would not be easy to cut two percent (\$1.6 million) from the FY 2008/09 O&M budget as the Department was already staffed "lean and mean." If directed to reduce its O&M budget by five percent, Mr. Gritzuk felt that would be a "melt down" situation for the Department.

- **2008/09 Bond Issue Planning Update** Mr. Nichols informed the members that the Department has reconfigured its 2008/09 bond request. The request still remains at \$565 million, but the proposed 2008/09 bond questions have been rewritten to give the Department more flexibility to react to changes in the County's population growth and development – especially at the sub-regional treatment facilities. The proposed bond request includes four questions. These are \$445 million for the ROMP, \$50 million for outlying treatment facilities, \$35 million for conveyance rehabilitation and \$30 million for the Park to Euclid Interceptor project. The Bond Advisory Committee has approved the revised bond questions.

Ms. Barbee Hanson said she would talk with Arlan Colton of Development Services to get projections on when/where they think growth is going to come back. She felt that the Board of Supervisors has a plan where they would like to see growth go. Mr. Nichols responded that Ms. Hanson's assistance would be appreciated by the Department.

Mr. Marcelino Flores asked if the Department has had the opportunity to meet with City of Tucson Water Department staff regarding its projections for the Water Department's FY 2008/09 Financial Plan. Mr. Nichols responded in the affirmative. He reminded Committee members that at the previous meeting, Mr. Carhuff had informed the members that Tucson Water's FY 2007/08 Financial Plan was based on a certain amount of growth within the system, and that growth is not happening. However, the

City still wants to move forward with accepting its entire portion of Central Arizona Project (CAP) water. Tucson Water is finding that its base consumption is not growing as much as it thought so it is requesting increased rates as a part of its FY2008/09 Financial Plan.

Mr. Nichols informed the members that the Department is seeing a substantial decrease in residential connection fee revenues, but commercial connection fee revenues have remained fairly steady. Internally, the Department to-date has received requests of approximately \$800,000 from developers asking for refunds of their connection permits as they are not going forward with building. As a result, the Department has budgeted \$500,000 in FY2008/09 for projected refunds.

2. **FY 2008/09 O&M and Capital Improvement Budget.** This item was discussed under Agenda Item IV.A.1.
3. **System Wide Odor Control Program.** Committee members viewed portions of the videotaped recording of the Board of Supervisors December 11, 2007 meeting. This included Mr. Gritzuk's presentation of the System Wide Odor Control Program Status Report and a presentation by members of the Citizens Involvement Committee (CIC).

Mr. Gritzuk then informed Committee members that the direction the Department received from the Board of Supervisors (at the December 11 Board meeting) was to take into consideration the presentation made by the CIC and the recommendations they made, and bring them to the WMAC for discussion and a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

- **WMAC Review of December 11, 2007 Presentations by the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC) and Department Staff to the Board of Supervisors.** Mr. Gritzuk suggested that the Committee enter into a discussion on the five recommendations made by the CIC.

Mr. Carlson said the Committee could begin the discussion but not make recommendations until a quorum of WMAC members was present at a future meeting. Discussion followed.

CIC member, Vin Allen, addressed the Committee. He felt Mr. Gritzuk was very "pro odor control." He said one of the comments made by Mr. Gritzuk at the December 11, 2007 Board of Supervisors meeting was that the culture of the Department and perhaps the WMAC needs to change and recognize that odor control is an integral part of the quality of life, and it has not been that way in the past. Mr. Allen felt that the 1997 and 2004 Voter Authorized Bonds had not been implemented the way the citizens wanted. He expressed that it was the WMAC's responsibility to face the fact that odor control is a very important issue to the citizens and it affects their quality of life. He added that his "bottom line recommendation" would be that the WMAC recommend actions that will enforce the culture change, on both the Committee and the Department so that odor control is addressed as an on-going item.

Mr. Gritzuk responded as a part of its efforts to change the Department's culture with regard to odor control, the Department is in the process of creating an Odor Control Management Plan. The Odor Control Management Plan will include dedicated staffing and training for the operational staff to stress that odor control is a priority. In addition, the Odor Control Management Plan will include more sophisticated continuous monitoring of odor complaint responses. Once complete, the Department will present

the Odor Control Management Plan to the WMAC. Mr. Gritzuk anticipated this plan would be completed in approximately three months.

Mr. Carlson noted that the County Administrator's recommendations on odor control indicate that County Administration is not prepared to recommend a line item budget. Mr. Nichols responded it would be difficult to set up a line item budget for odor control. The Department has separate operating cost centers so that it knows what it costs to operate certain facilities and there is odor control throughout all of these cost centers. The Department is putting \$600,000 into the budget at the Roger Road facility that has only to do with odor control with the granular activated carbon units at that facility. He felt all of the Department's centers at the metropolitan and sub-regional facilities contain odor control items, so that might be what the County Administrator meant. He felt the Department would be able to capture costs using the County's Synergen program and setting up work orders related to odor control. Mr. Nichols added that the Department now has an engineer that is dedicated to odor control within its facilities.

Mr. Carlson asked if the CIC recognized what the Department is doing. CIC member, Vin Allen, responded that the CIC recognizes that there are current expenses and perhaps capital items that deal with odor control, but they have not been recognized as such and consequently, the community's take is that (essentially) before Mr. Gritzuk becoming Director of the Department, there was a presumption that nothing was being done for odor control to mitigate their problems. He felt the CIC wants odor control to have its own budget, because it demonstrates that effort is being made and where the effort is being applied and whether the effort is growing or diminishing. For those reasons, the CIC would like to see a separate line item or a separate budget, and clearly, measuring and monitoring of odor control expenses are very important. He commented further, to go back to the way the culture had been prior to Mr. Gritzuk is wrong. You cannot effectively treat odor control with a culture that says it is not important.

Mr. Carlson felt the difference of opinion was about the term "budget line item."

Mr. Flores asked if it is challenging for the Department to keep track of odor control measures on the expense side, perhaps on the revenue side there could be a fee collected up front and projects developed based on how they present the odor control measures or monitoring plan. He suggested that there could be adoption of a "green" fund that could be shown separately on the sewer bill, and the projects that were specifically accessing those funds would have a monitoring plan or some other component.

Mr. Nichols responded the Department can capture the expenses; the issue is that - in the budgeting world - a line item budget is a specific instruction on how you set up funding. He reiterated that the Department sets up funding for odor control throughout its line item budget in various cost centers. It can capture odor-related budgets from the cost centers in a summary and report this data if that is what the CIC would like to see.

Mr. Brad DeSpain, commented that he has been a member of the Committee for quite some time. During his tenure on the Committee, he felt the members had been aware (and discussed) the odor control issue. He felt that the record now shows that there is action being taken to deal with the odor control issues. He said if it is important enough that the WMAC battle to get a line item on the budget, the community needs to understand that the Committee makes recommendations that do not always get

approved by the Board of Supervisors. He noted that the Committee has “wrestled” with the connection fee and user fee rates and this is the first year that the Board of Supervisors had adopted what was recommended by the WMAC. In addition, he felt the Committee knew that the Department had really been strapped because of that. He also felt if the community does not get a line item, the CIC needs to understand that the WMAC is willing to do what is necessary and continue to work on this issue. He felt that within the Department’s current administration odor control is as important as any other issue.

Mr. Allen said as he understood it, the Board of Supervisors is looking for the WMAC to respond with its recommendations as to how the CIC recommendations should be handled. He felt if the WMAC recommends that the odor control becomes a line item, he felt it would be a done deal.

Mr. Carlson responded that he had some problems with that in light of what Mr. Nichols had previously said. He added that the Committee is strongly in support of strong financing of odor control and how you account for it, but this has to fit in the system budget.

Mr. Gritzuk responded that the Department will be budgeting for odor control, and through the Odor Control Management Plan, the Department will be able to identify the overall budget that it has for odor control at the various treatment facilities. If the Department does not use line item budgeting, it will achieve what everyone is attempting to achieve.

Mr. DeSpain encouraged Mr. Allen and the other CIC members to continue attending the WMAC meetings. He felt the CIC members staying in touch if things do not continue to move forward in areas they have talked about – the Committee needs that feedback.

Ms. Laura Fairbanks, the Department’s Community Relations Program Manager, asked because so much of this is part of the conveyance system and the treatment division and they have separate budgets, if there was a way to do a “line item budget” that represents the money spent in those areas but is not within Director’s budget.

Mr. Nichols responded his only concern in setting up a budget in that manner would be who is responsible for the budget. If you have multiple people looking at the same center for funding, it is first come first served. When the funding runs out, what do you do when someone says we do not have any more funding? He felt that in the centers of responsibility (i.e., the superintendents of the Roger Road and the Ina Road facilities and the other facilities, each have control of their total budgets.) Mr. Nichols felt it would be more effective to capture these expenses in a report.

Mr. Allen responded he felt this type of reporting would satisfy what the CIC wanted.

Mr. Flores said he liked the idea of reporting, and also felt maybe the Odor Control Management Planning document could be a little more proactive in projecting where the odor control components fit in within the conveyance or operations plan.

Mr. Carlson said when you put in a new sewer line to replace an old line and have a different set of manholes and a different size and a different slope, there are odor control aspects there, but he felt the mechanics of presenting that information would be difficult. He referred to the CIC report, which stated “it is imperative that the odor

control budget not be cut back during times of budgetary shortfall.” He felt that might be a goal, but if there was an emerging need, some things might have to fall to the wayside. He objected to those particular words in the CIC Report.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Carlson and responded when the CIC was meeting, members could get emotional because people had been living with these odors on a daily basis. He felt what the CIC really wants is to have a continued focus on odor control. He said there needs to be an emphasis and recognition that odor control is probably the most visible – “smellable” – aspect of wastewater management. He said people do not understand other aspects. He felt it was to everyone’s benefit if the Department diminishes the effects of odor.

Ms. Barbee Hanson said one thing that has been clearly outlined to her on her short time on the Committee, by Mr. Gritzuk and Department staff, is that odor control is a serious consideration on the Department’s part. She commented further that all of the elements that have just been funded through the Department’s recently adopted FY 2007/08 Financial Plan are all going to contribute greatly towards odor control. She said she was concerned that this was the first time the Board of Supervisors had ever approved the recommended Plan without any modifications. She said the Committee had to fight for it. She said the Board of Supervisors needs to understand that if all of these bonds and this funding does not happen, then the entire community is going to have a serious problem. She felt that the Committee needs to stay focused on informing the Board that without this funding we are all going to really suffer.

Mr. Carlson said that he understood that when the odors go up into the air, they have a tendency to accumulate, increase in concentration and spread out. He asked if the Department would continue to take readings and make them available to the community. Mr. Gritzuk responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Hanson asked about completion of the two bio-tower projects at the Roger Road Wastewater Treatment Plant and whether both bio-towers were going to be modified. Mr. Gritzuk responded the Department is moving ahead with two specific projects on the bio-towers and taking each one of them individually. The first bio-tower project is under \$1 million and under contract. Completion of this project is scheduled for March of 2008. The Department was then going to pause to see what progress had been made with the first project. In further discussion with the consultants, there was a feeling that the second bio-tower would continue to emit odors to the community. With concurrence of the County Administrator, the Department received approval to move ahead with the second bio-tower project. The Department has negotiated a contract with the same contractor for this project.

Mr. Gritzuk reviewed the five CIC recommendations. These include:

- 1) Both bio-towers should be completed as soon as possible. As previously stated, the bio-tower projects are under contract and underway. Mr. Gritzuk felt the Department will fulfill this recommendation.
- 2) There must be a constant oversight and evaluation of all of the odor control projects that have been implemented as part of this project. This includes proper operation and maintenance with no skimping during times of budgetary shortfalls. The Department is developing an Odor Control Management Plan. That plan will include staffing, budgeting and methods of managing the overall Odor Control Management Program. Mr. Gritzuk felt the Department will fulfill most of this recommendation.

- 3) Odor control funding should be a separate line item in the Department's budget and should never be cut. Mr. Gritzuk informed Committee members that in the Department's future budgeting, odor control will be a separate line item in various facility budgets. Mr. Gritzuk felt the WMAC needed to discuss this recommendation concerning "never be cut."
- 4) As both the Ina Road and Roger Road facilities are designed and constructed, there can be no skimping on odor control technology. Mr. Gritzuk stressed that the Department's approach in ROMP is that odor control (in ROMP) is as important as complying with the other new Arizona Department of Environmental Quality requirements. As the Department moves ahead with the design of these facilities, odor control is a very important ingredient in the design. The first contract let in ROMP is the Plant Interconnect, which is basically a gravity sewer line. If the line is not designed properly it could smell. In initial meetings with the design consultant, the Department stressed that odor control is an integral part of that design. If there is a need for scrubbing devices, they will be constructed as a part of the Interconnect Project. There again, as the Department gets into contract negotiations, odor control is an ingredient in the design. He felt the Department will fulfill all of this recommendation.
- 5) The Board of Supervisors should convene a new committee to specifically look at how the Department runs odor control infrastructure and operations and maintenance. The new committee should be charged with developing funding mechanisms that will assure odor control is never sacrificed to future budgetary shortfalls. Mr. Gritzuk felt the Committee needed to discuss this recommendation. Discussion followed.

Mr. Carlson felt that with odor control you can never get to 100 percent – he asked how do you measure what you can do and what you are willing to pay for? He felt if it cost another \$5 million, he did not think the Committee would vote for it. He felt there was a limit to what can be done. How do you define it?

Mr. Allen responded that maybe there is some measure of odor complaint as example. Another way is monitoring and checking levels. He felt it was a mistake that there was not an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) group in the County, for instance, that has any responsibility to measure odors. He felt the Pima County Department of Environmental Quality should have a stake – role – in monitoring. He expressed that nobody believes the Department will get totally odor free, but it has to monitor compliance levels and air quality.

Mr. Flores asked who the stakeholders are for the Odor Control Management Plan and will it be presented to the WMAC. Mr. Gritzuk responded the Odor Control Management Plan is being developed within the Department and it will be presented to the WMAC. It was not going to be presented to the CIC because that committee was temporary in nature and was sun-setted. He added if another committee is created or the WMAC takes on that function, the Department would involve whomever the WMAC wants involved.

CIC member, Mr. Chet Kozna, said not only does this impact the residents and businesses in the area, he felt it impacts the city of Tucson as a whole. He felt it would be beneficial to resolve the odor issue.

- **WMAC Discussion of CIC Recommendations.** This agenda item was continued to the next regular Committee meeting.

- **WMAC Report to Board of Supervisors.** This agenda item was continued to the next regular Committee meeting.

4. **Regional Optimization Master Plan (ROMP) Update.** Mr. Gritzuk provided the ROMP Update. There are three major components of the ROMP Program. They are the upgrade and expansion of the Ina Road WPCF, the Plant Interconnect and the new Water Reclamation Campus at the Roger Road site.

The Department is moving rapidly in the area of consultant selection for design work at the Ina Road WPCF. The design for the Plant Interconnect, which is the most critical time component of ROMP is underway. The \$244 million Ina Road WPCF upgrade and expansion, which is the largest component of the ROMP Program, with another \$30 million for electrical upgrades. The Department has interviewed the shortlist of design consultant firms. The consultant will be selected the week of January 21, 2008. The Department will proceed in negotiating the design contract with the highest scored consultant. The Ina Road contract is the most complex contract of all of ROMP. Because of the complex nature of this project, the Department has selected the Construction-Manager-At-Risk project delivery method. When advertised, the Department indicated that the design was in the range of \$12 to \$18 million, which would be the largest design contract ever let by Pima County. The Department will use the design-build procurement method (or some ramification thereof) for the new water reclamation campus. Mr. Gritzuk anticipated the Department would confirm that procurement method later in 2008.

5. **2008 Work Plan.** Mr. Curley referred Committee members to the draft 2008 Work Plan which they received prior to the meeting. Discussion of this agenda item was continued to the next regular WMAC meeting.

**New Items.** No new agenda items were discussed.

- V. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.** FY 2007/08 Financial Plan Update; Capital Improvement Program Update; FY 2008/09 Budget; Approval of 2008 Work Plan; Regional Optimization Master Plan and Odor Control Plan Update and Recommendations to Board of Supervisors on Citizen Involvement Committee Recommendations; and Graywater Presentation.

Mr. Curley informed Committee members that staff would provide copies of the December 11, 2007 Board of Supervisors meeting and the Board's discussion of the Odor Control issue along with a copy of the audiotape of this meeting to all Committee members.

- VI. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE.** There being no response from the audience, Mr. Carlson adjourned the meeting.
- VII. **ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting adjourned at 9:48 A.M.