

**WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
February 21, 2008

**Committee Members Present:**

Sheila Bowen	John Carlson	John Carhuff
Brad DeSpain	Marcelino Flores	Barbee Hanson
Rob Kulakofsky	Mark Stratton	Ann Marie Wolf
Michael Gritzuk		

**Committee Members Absent:**

Adam Bliven	Steve Halverson	Armando Membriila
John Sawyer		

**Staff Present:**

Ed Curley	Laura Fairbanks	Jackson Jenkins
Jeff Nichols	David Smith	Lorraine Simon
John Warner	Eric Wieduwilt	

**Other County Staff Present:**

Chuck Wesselhoff  
County Attorney's Office

- I. **CALL TO ORDER.** Vice Chair Sheila Bowen called the meeting of the Wastewater Management Advisory Committee (WMAC) to order at 7:52 A.M.
- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** The Committee approved the minutes of the December 20, 2007 and January 17, 2008, WMAC meetings.
- III. **COMMITTEE/SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS.**

- A. **Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update.** Mr. John Carhuff presented the CWAC Update. The CWAC Finance Subcommittee met on February 20, 2008 to discuss allocating the expected eight percent rate increase to each rate block. Mr. Carhuff said he would provide a more detailed report on what those rates look like by block at the next WMAC meeting.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Michael Gritzuk presented Mr. Carhuff with a personalized glass art piece in recognition of his time and effort on behalf of the Department and the County. He conveyed the County Administrator's appreciation to Mr. Carhuff for his participation on the Committee.

In addition, Mr. Gritzuk introduced Mr. John Warner as the new Deputy Director of the Conveyance Division. He also informed Committee members that Mr. Mike Bunch has accepted a position with a mining company to manage a mine in Bolivia. Mr. Eric Weiduwilt was introduced as the Acting Deputy Director for the Planning and Engineering Division.

Mr. Gritzuk then reviewed a February 14, 2008 joint memo to the Board of Supervisors and the City of Tucson Mayor and Council from the County Administrator, Mr. Chuck Huckleberry, and the City Manager, Mr. Mike Hein, regarding a proposed water infrastructure, supply and planning study. (Members received copies of the memo.)

Mr. Hein and Mr. Huckelberry propose two initial phases to the study. During Phase I, the City and County will inventory available infrastructure, water, wastewater, and reclaimed water resources, and future service needs; during Phase II, the City and County will develop a common set of goals to guide the process.

The proposed study process would include independent review by an oversight committee of WMAC/CWAC members. The WMAC and CWAC would each appoint four members to the Oversight Committee that would provide oversight during Phase I of the Study. The City Manager and County Administrator would appoint a ninth person to serve as chair of the joint Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee will meet at least monthly and more frequently as it deems necessary. It will receive briefings and regular updates from City of Tucson Water Department and Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department staff working on data collection and analysis during Phases I and II. The Oversight Committee will report to the City Manager and County Administrator. The Oversight Committee members will also report to their respective advisory committees. The Oversight Committee will prepare a final report to the City Manager and County Administrator to accompany transmission of the final work product of the joint staff efforts.

The deadline for completion of Phase I of the proposed study is December 2008. This would include a report to the City Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors. The deadline for completion of Phase II of the proposed study is July 2009.

Mr. Gritzuk informed the members that Phase III of the Study would shift to assessing infrastructure and resources for the metropolitan area. After completion of Phases I and II, the City Manager and County Administrator would propose that Phase III engage the entire greater metropolitan area in an expanded infrastructure and resource review. This would include all of the other jurisdictions and utilities in Pima County. Discussion followed.

Mr. John Carlson noted two years prior he had addressed the Board of Supervisors and expressed that he felt this type of effort was necessary.

Mr. Mark Stratton said that at the City Council's February 20, 2008 study session, there was a recommendation from Council members that the Study's Phase III Outreach be done concurrently with Phases I and II. He asked if the Board of Supervisors had looked at that recommendation. Mr. Gritzuk responded he attended the City Council's February 20 study session and what some of the Council members recommended was that the other utilities initiate Phase I and Phase II concurrently with the City/County study so that by the time we get to Phase III, all the utilities are all at kind of the same level with the information background.

Mr. Carlson felt the City/County working group could not submit a definitive report with as much backing until they get the data from the other utilities - the Oversight Committee would need to reflect on this data when it made its recommendations to the Mayor and Council and Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gritzuk said the Department has been directed to move ahead with this intensive effort. He informed the members that he intended to meet with Tucson Water Director, David Modeer, as quickly as possible to start plotting this assignment. He requested that this item be included on the Committee's next regular meeting agenda and added that the Department would present a more detailed presentation on the study's entire scope of work if the Committee so desired.

Ms. Bowen asked Committee members interested in volunteering for the Oversight Committee to contact Mr. Ed Curley. (Note: On February 25, 2008, staff forwarded electronic copies of the February 14, 2008 memo regarding the proposed study to members not present at the meeting and requested that WMAC members interested in volunteering to serve on the Oversight Committee contact the Department.)

#### IV. DISCUSSION.

##### A. Old Items/Updates.

1. **FY 2008/09 Budget and 2008/09 Bond Issue Update.** Mr. Jeff Nichols presented the FY 2008/09 Budget and 2008/09 Bond Issue Update. This included.

- **FY 2008/09 Budget.** On February 14, 2008, the Department submitted its FY 2008/09 proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget to County Administration. Department staff met with the County Administrator and reviewed the various projects that the Department wanted included in the CIP. Only the Green Valley Wastewater Reclamation Facility (WRF) 2.0 million gallons per day (MGD) capacity expansion project was deferred from the FY 2008/09 CIP.

Mr. Nichols felt County Administration would approve the Department's proposed FY 2008/09 CIP Budget at approximately \$117 million. The vast majority of the budget is being funded with bonds; however, \$26 million of System Development Funds will be used to fund a number of projects in FY 2008/09.

On February 20, 2008, Department staff met with the County Administrator to discuss when a 2008/09 Voter Bond Election might be held. Recently, the County received an opinion from the County Attorney's Office, that sewer bond or general obligation bond elections can only be held in a November general election. In order to meet the timelines for the Regional Optimization Master Plan (ROMP), the Department needs the bond election held in November 2008. As a result, the Department is going to be working with the County Administrator's Office and the Citizen's Bond Advisory Committee to determine what it would take to move forward with a bond authorization election in November 2008. The Department's bond proposal would be for \$565 million. Many of the Department's CIP programs (especially the ROMP) hinge on this bond funding.

On February 5, 2008, the Department submitted its proposed FY 2008/09 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget of approximately \$81.4 million to County Administration. The budget includes approximately \$3.1 million for several studies. These studies include continuation of the Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP) and Southwest Area Studies, and a new Green Valley/Sahuarita Study.

Mr. Nichols reminded the members that the Department was asked 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 \$1.5 million cut in the Department's O&M budget, and a five percent reduction would mean an approximate \$3.7 million cut in the O&M budget. The Department's management team met and prioritized its most critical O&M needs. The Department's suggested two percent budget reduction package included cutting the Summer Youth Program by one-third and trimming back on travel and training. In addition, the Department is looking at possibly using in-house staff to perform conveyance system inspections and

reducing its contracted services. The Department is also looking at cutting back some on programs (e.g., the repair and rehabilitation of manholes).

Mr. Nichols informed the members that, when evaluating/preparing a five percent budget reduction package, it got much more difficult. The Department recommended eliminating the Summer Youth Program, the Vector Control Program and cutbacks to repair and maintenance on building and grounds. This would include the rehabilitation of the sewer system. Discussion followed.

Mr. Carlson asked if this was a wise planning move in case revenues do not come in at the anticipated rate. Mr. Nichols responded the Department is pretty much on target with revenues from Connection Fees and User Fees. However, there are some County departments that are looking at employee layoffs.

- **2008/09 Bond Issue Planning Update.** This Agenda Item was addressed under the FY 2008/09 Budget discussion.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Gritzuk informed Committee members that he just had spoken with the Deputy County Administrator for Public Works, Mr. John Bernal, who had received information about the Joint Committee from County Administrator, Mr. Chuck Huckelberry. Mr. Bernal relayed to Mr. Gritzuk that CWAC is moving ahead with the appointment of their four members for the Joint Committee. Those four members will be chosen before CWAC's next meeting which is scheduled for March 18, 2008. CWAC is requesting that the four WMAC representatives attend the March 18 CWAC meeting. By that time, Mr. Huckelberry and City Manager, Mr. Hein, will select the ninth member of the Joint Committee. Mr. Gritzuk informed the members that Mr. Huckelberry would like the WMAC to select their four members now.

Deputy County Attorney, Chuck Wesselhoft, advised that the WMAC could ask for four volunteers to represent the WMAC at the March 18, 2008 CWAC meeting. The four official joint City/County Oversight Committee members would then be ratified at the next regularly scheduled WMAC meeting. Discussion followed.

Committee members were asked to notify staff if interested in volunteering to attend the CWAC meeting. Mr. Carlson suggested that if there are more than four volunteers the additional volunteers could act as alternates. Ms. Bowen said she would review this with WMAC Chair Adam Bliven who would select the four volunteers to represent the WMAC at the CWAC meeting.

2. **System Wide Odor Control Program.** Mr. Gritzuk presented an update on the System Wide Odor Control Program.
  - **January 2008 Odor Monitoring Report.** From actual monitoring data, there is very significant reduction in odor levels as measured around the fence line of the treatment facilities. In addition, the odor control in the conveyance system is working very effectively. The Odor Control Program which is in place, but not completed yet, is working very effectively. There are still some "breakthrough" odors. Mr. Gritzuk was hopeful that these breakthroughs would be resolved once the two bio-tower projects were completed.
  - **WMAC Discussion of Department Staff Report and Citizens Involvement Committee Recommendations.** Mr. Gritzuk reminded the members that on December 11, 2007, the Board of Supervisors received a status report on the Department's Odor Control Program and its work to mitigate odors system-wide.

The Board also received a report by representatives of the Citizens Involvement Committee (CIC). After these presentations, the Board of Supervisors requested that the WMAC review both the Status Report and the CIC recommendations and forward recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on this issue.

- **System Wide Odor Control Program. WMAC Discussion of CIC Recommendations.** Mr. Gritzuk suggested that the members go through each of the five CIC recommendations and the members could develop a position on each recommendation, and prepare a reply to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Gritzuk referred members to information they received prior to the meeting.

- 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 informed Committee members that both bio-tower projects are under contract. Completion of the first bio-tower project is expected by the end of March 2008. Completion of the second bio-tower project is anticipated by July 2008.
- 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. Mr. Nichols reminded the members that the Department is putting \$600,000 into the annual budget for the Roger Road WRF that has only to do with odor control with the granular activated carbon units at that facility. If the Department is directed to reduce its O&M budget by five percent, it would mean cuts in the odor control program. Discussion followed.

Mr. Marcelino Flores suggested that oversight of the odor control program be a standing item on future WMAC agendas.

Mr. Gritzuk responded that, internally, the Department is creating an organizational structure - Odor Control Management Plan - within the Department for odor control management. The Department is fine tuning this draft structure and dedicating staff just for this effort. A high level staff member will oversee this system odor control program. Mr. Gritzuk felt this structure could be presented for the Committee's review at the next regular meeting. Within the Odor Control Management Plan, the Department is identifying budgets for odor control within the various divisions and elements where there is odor control equipment. The Department can summarize those individual budgets to identify where they are and provide a bottom line.

Mr. Gritzuk felt the Department will fulfill most of this recommendation. However the Department would have difficulty complying with the last part of this recommendation – “not skimping during times of budgetary shortfalls.” Discussion followed.

Members felt that the Committee should respond by acknowledging that while odor control is of primary importance, during budgetary shortfalls, regulatory compliance should take precedence. Mr. Gritzuk responded the highest priorities in the Department are regulatory compliance, rehabilitation, and the ROMP (and an extensive amount of the ROMP is for odor control).

Mr. Flores felt, in addition to addressing the CIC recommendations, it was important to address some of the issues in the body of the CIC report,

specifically the CIC's concerns that the odors are a health/safety issue. He felt it was important to convey that the Department is meeting its mandate.

Mr. Gritzuk responded this was brought up a few times during the meetings of the CIC. He informed the WMAC members that the Department did bring in a professor from the University of Arizona who was an expert in areas of wastewater odors and who had specifically reviewed a history of research that was conducted in the area of health impacts of wastewater odors. This expert's findings indicate there is not a connection. Mr. Gritzuk stressed however that odors are a social and an aesthetic issue which is very serious in itself. The primary source of odors is hydrogen sulphide gas. At the levels emitted by the treatment facilities and conveyance system (without odor control), those are not health impact levels. With odor control in place, we are way beyond anything that could be considered a health impact.

Mr. Ed Curley noted that the focus of the request received from the Board of Supervisors was that the WMAC look at the CIC recommendations and come back with its own set of recommendations about the issues.

- 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." Mr. Kulakofsky felt odor control funding should be a separate line item in the budget of each of the treatment facilities and other facilities because the Department is going to have money that has to spend on odor control. This would give the community information that we are spending money on odor control.

Mr. Gritzuk responded that is the way the Department currently does its budgets - there are budgets for odor control treatment facilities and operation and maintenance of the conveyance system. He reminded Committee members that the Department can consolidate all of those budgets in a report in the Odor Control Management Plan to indicate where they are and what the amounts are and give a bottom line.

Ms. Wolf felt the issue was the same for CIC recommendations two through four. She felt a statement was necessary to indicate that odor control is a high priority, it needs constant oversight/evaluation, but there are other items such as regulatory mandates that are a higher priority.

Mr. Gritzuk referred to CIC recommendations one and five and noted that the Department already has oversight - very high focus and high visibility publically - with the Odor Control Management Program. In addition, the Department prepares a quarterly odor control monitoring summary report, which is received by both the Board of Supervisors and the WMAC. He added that the Department is a firm believer that this type of program needs to have oversight.

- 4) As both the Roger Road and Ina Road Facilities are designed and constructed, there can be no skimping on odor control technology. Mr. Gritzuk said the Department agrees with the recommendation. As the Department moves ahead with ROMP, the Department has committed to

state-of-the-art, cost effective, odor control equipment and programs with the upgrade/expansion of the Ina Road WRF and incorporation into the new Water Reclamation Campus at the Roger Road site.

- 5) The Board of Supervisors should convene a new committee to specifically look at how the Department funds odor control infrastructure and Operations and Maintenance. Members felt the WMAC or a WMAC subcommittee could be utilized to act as an oversight committee.

- **WMAC Report to Board of Supervisors.** Mr. Gritzuk said staff would prepare a preliminary draft response for members to review in advance of the next regularly scheduled WMAC meeting. (Note: On March 11, 2008, staff sent electronic copies of the draft letter to Committee members.)

3. **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 WRF, the Plant Interconnect and the new Water Reclamation Campus at the Roger Road site.

The Department is under contract with the design consultant and the contractor for the Plant Interconnect. The Department is currently concentrating on the \$244 million Ina Road WRF expansion/upgrade project. The Department is in contract negotiations with the selected design consultants. This will be the largest design/engineering contract that Pima County will have to-date – in the range of \$12 to \$18 million. The Department hopes to have the scope of work finalized within the next two weeks.

Culture resources is one of the major issues within the ROMP. The County Cultural Resources Department has advertised for a consultant to perform the cultural resources evaluation on the Plant Interconnect. Contract award will occur within the next two weeks. Cultural Resources is also taking Qualification Statements for the cultural resource evaluation at the Ina Road WRF, which it is anticipated will be rather intensive. As the Department moves ahead with the Water Reclamation Campus project, which will be located on the banks of the Santa Cruz River, a number of cultural resource issues have already been identified.

The Department has shortlisted the contractor for the Ina Road WRF, and interviews will be held with these firms the week of February 25, 2008. Because of the complex nature of this project, the Department has selected the Construction-Manager-At-Risk project delivery method.

The Department will be evaluating the various procurement methods for the Water Reclamation Campus project. With the Water Reclamation Campus, the Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department has retained the University of Arizona to evaluate the sports complex concept surrounding the new Water Reclamation Campus. Parks and Recreation has received an initial report from the University which indicates that there is sufficient economic justification to move ahead with this type of complex.

4. **2008 Work Plan.** Mr. Curley referred Committee members to the draft 2008 Work Plan which they received prior to the meeting. Discussion followed. Members requested that the Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study Oversight Committee and Oversight of Odor Control be standing agenda items.

A motion to approve the Revised 2008 WMAC Work Plan was unanimously approved by the members.

Ms. Bowen turned the Chair over to Mr. Stratton as this point

**B. New Items.**

1. **Presentation/Discussion “Lower Flows” Program.** Mr. Gritzuk gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Department’s “Lower Flows” Pilot Program, and reviewed the background and the current status of the Program. (Members received copies of the “Lower Flows” Program PowerPoint). He introduced Val Little, manager of the Water Conservation Alliance of Southern Arizona (Water CASA), who was present at the meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Gritzuk outlined the following history/background of the “Lower Flows” Pilot Program:

The Department concluded a March 2006 study on the impacts of low-flow toilets and graywater systems on the community’s wastewater treatment facilities. The study indicated there would be no negative impacts on the treatment process due to strength of sewage. However, the study did not look at the impacts that lower flows would have on the sewage conveyance system. As a result of this study, the County Administrator instructed County staff in an April 11, 2006 memo to “Develop an implementation program for a toilet distribution program as well as a graywater program for water conservation purposes, and “The toilet distribution program is to be applied to existing, older communities, while the graywater program should only be applied to new construction.”

The Department was assigned the responsibility for the lower-flows program, which included low-flow toilets, showerheads and aerators. The Development Services Department is currently in the process of developing an incentive-based graywater stub-out program for new development.

Mr. Gritzuk informed Committee members that the goals of the Lower-Flows Retrofit Pilot Program are to gain knowledge of the effects of toilet distribution and other conservation efforts on the sewer system and identify issues and concerns to benefit future water conservation policies.

Pima County awarded a \$525,000 contract to Water CASA to administer a pilot lower-flows retrofit program that would include installation of approximately 1,000 toilets in an existing neighborhood. Graywater was not included in this contract. In early November 2006, Water CASA requested a meeting with the County to discuss the possible addition of a graywater component to the contract. That request (for a graywater component) was postponed while a study was conducted by the engineering consultant, EEC, to determine what effects water conservation efforts might have on the conveyance system and homeowners’ house connection sewers (HCS) of implementing graywater devices in existing neighborhoods.

In April 2007, EEC provided some initial study conclusions: toilet distribution and graywater programs are likely to impact sewer flows, and potential issues are greatest in terminal reaches and HCS with low slopes. The study concluded that many HCS may not meet the current slope requirements. HCS are the homeowner’s responsibility and County records do not include HCS slope information for older neighborhoods. EEC recommendations included: avoid graywater programs in older neighborhoods; avoid toilet distribution at terminal sewers; limit participation to between 60 percent to 75 percent of

households in targeted neighborhoods and distribution of information sheet about HCS slopes to homeowners. As a result, EEC concluded that the homeowners should be informed about the potential issues associated with HCS slope, especially since the HCS is the homeowner's responsibility.

At a December 18, 2007 meeting with Water CASA, Water CASA questioned the EEC study conclusions regarding the impact of lower-flows. Water CASA reported that some of the slopes identified as zero percent in the EEC study were incorrect. Mr. Gritzuk informed Committee members that Water CASA was correct in their findings. As a part of amending the errors in the report, the Department requested that EEC determine the number of houses on a terminal end sewer that should be avoided as a part of the toilet distribution program. (EEC subsequently calculated this to be the first 10 houses on the first and possibly some of the second segments of terminal end sewer lines.)

Mr. Gritzuk indicated that, as a result of a January 18, 2008 meeting with Water CASA officials, a consensus was reached that, since this is a pilot program (and somewhat of a learning experience for both parties), we should continue this contract in this or possibly another neighborhood through guidelines from EEC. The Department will meet with Water CASA and EEC to review their recommendations/comments for going forward. Discussion followed.

Mr. Stratton asked, as a water provider, how can we provide water efficiencies for our customers and how can they continue to reduce flows. We all know that water rates are going to continue to go up for a variety of reasons. Knowing that individuals will be looking at how they can reduce their water consumption through graywater use and additional low-flow plumbing devices, eventually it will come where people will voluntarily be doing retro-fitting to their homes. At that point in time, knowing the issue of terminal end sewers is still going to be an issue, are we headed in a direction where as a community we are going to have unintended consequences that are going to be difficult to manage for the Department?

Mr. Gritzuk responded that in existing neighborhoods, where there is already solids settling, the Department would like to see the incorporation of these EEC Study recommendations to try to minimize the impact on the sewer system. In those neighborhoods, the Department also has a flushing program where we see solids buildup.

The Department is suggesting that our design standards for sewer lines be enhanced. For example, the Department currently has a requirement for a certain slope/certain diameter sewer line. There are times when design engineers have gone to a larger diameter sewer line to take advantage of a shallower slope requirement, but in so doing, you encourage the settling out of solids. There now are industry recommendations that in addition to the slope requirements for sewer lines, we also have a minimum flow requirement for those sewer lines. Mr. Gritzuk felt that would go a long way in fixing that problem. The Department's bottom line is that we understand that there is a need, especially in an environment like Pima County's, to conserve. There are a lot of conservation requirements, plumbing requirements, etc. that are in effect to force conservation. We also need to accommodate that conservation in the sewer system.

Mr. Carlson asked about Water CASA's authority. Ms. Val Little responded Water CASA has no regulatory authority. Its members include Metro Water, Town of Marana, Town of Sahuarita and Pima County, who banded together to do collective water conservation research and public policy advocacy, not as a regulatory agency.

Ms. Hanson asked for further clarification on the County considering changing design criteria with regards to minimum flows and minimum slopes. Mr. Gritzuk responded we have a design requirement now in effect and it is a slope requirement per the size of the pipe. In addition to that, the Department is looking at incorporating a requirement for minimum in that pipe in addition to the flow that you get out of the slope.

Mr. Eric Wieduwilt responded the design standards now require you to design for two feet per second scour at a full pipe. What the Department does not do is hold the design engineers responsible for stating what the capacity is to be and adjust the slope accordingly. The pipe may never reach full pipe, it may only have one-half a pipe's worth of capacity in the system that they are developing for. The Department now needs to take that into account and steepen the slopes accordingly until they get the proper scour velocity. There has also been a revision to the American Society of Civil Engineers Sanitary Sewer Design Guidelines incorporating some newer design approaches based on lessons learned on how to design sewer slopes. The Department plans on incorporating those into the Department's standards as well. In addition, Mr. Wieduwilt pointed out that areas like the Town of Marana (that are farm fields and traditionally very flat) are going to have a difficult time meeting steeper sewer slope standards without the addition of numerous new pump stations. He felt the Department would have to evaluate the cost of additional pump stations to provide adequate scour velocity or may even move to a point of having to limit some of these water conservation efforts in areas you just cannot design a sewer with a slope needed for graywater.

Ms. Hanson asked if that meant when civil engineers prepare their sewer plans like there is a quantification of fixture units in residences. Mr. Wieduwilt responded in the affirmative. The Department currently has a standard per capita flow that it uses in design and it would have design engineers incorporate that into the full basin build-out and look at what is the full capacity demand on that pipe, not just a theoretical number.

Mr. Gritzuk added that the Department's approach is not to discourage water conservation and all of the plumbing that goes along with that, but we need to "tweak" the sewer system to accommodate that. There is a lot that has been accomplished in water conservation in Pima County to-date. The Department has to make sure the wastewater collection system can accommodate these lower flows. Using potable water to flush the sewer lines is not the solution, the Department needs additional measures in the conveyance system.

2. **FY 2008/09 Capital Improvement Program.** This agenda item was continued to the next regularly scheduled WMAC meeting.
3. **State Legislative Issues.** This agenda item was continued to the next regularly scheduled WMAC meeting.

**V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.** Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study - CWAC/WMAC Joint Committee; FY 2008/09 Budget; Regional Optimization Master Plan; Odor Control Plan Update and Recommendations to Board of Supervisors on Citizen Involvement Committee Recommendations; State/Regulatory Update; and Capital Improvement Program Update.

**VI. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE.** There being no response from the audience, Interim Chair, Mr. Stratton, adjourned the meeting.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting adjourned at 9:56 A.M.