

WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
April 17, 2008

Committee Members Present:

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

Committee Members Absent:

John Carhuff	Steve Halverson	Armando Membriila
--------------	-----------------	-------------------

Staff Present:

Ed Curley	Sandra Current	Laura Fairbanks
Mary Hamilton	Suzy Hunt	Mike Kostrzewski
Lorraine Simon	Jeff Nichols	Melaney Seacat
David Smith	Lilian Von Rago	John Warner
Eric Wieduwilt		

Other County Staff Present:

Chuck Wesselhoff
County Attorney's Office

- I. **CALL TO ORDER.** Chair Adam Bliven called the meeting of the Wastewater Management Advisory Committee (WMAC) to order at 7:54 A.M.
- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** The Committee approved the minutes of the March 20, 2008, WMAC meeting.
- III. **COMMITTEE/SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS.**
 - A. **Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update.** A CWAC Report was not presented.
- IV. **DISCUSSION.**
 - A. **Old Items/Updates.**

1. **Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study (Study).** Melaney Seacat, Pima County Project Coordinator for the Study, provided an update on the activities of the Study's Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee held its first meeting on April 9, 2008 and will meet again on April 18, 2008. The purpose of the April 18 meeting will be to solicit public comment on the process for the Study as a whole.

The Oversight Committee has two responsibilities. These include providing oversight on Phase I and Phase II of the Study. Phase I includes inventorying existing condition by Tucson Water and the Wastewater Reclamation Department of their infrastructure. Phase II includes development of a common set of water development and conservation goals.

Ms. Seacat informed the members that an estimated 2,000 individual letters of invitation were sent for the April 18 Oversight Committee meeting. Letters were sent to local jurisdictions, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, water providers,

business and environmental groups, civic organizations, neighborhood groups, professional groups and water interest groups.

Ms. Seacat then reviewed a timeline for Phase I of the Study which concludes in December 2008. The first report to the City Mayor and Council and the County Board of Supervisors is the recommended public involvement process for the Study. This recommended process is due to the City Mayor and Council and County Board of Supervisors by May 20, 2008.

The City/County Technical Team is also meeting and beginning to gather information to further define the scope of the infrastructure inventory. Staff are pulling together all of the basic information on the water and wastewater systems (including infrastructure and resources) to create a series of reports to the Committee - "Water/Wastewater 101" – which will detail the story of water and wastewater in a unified way so that we can have a common baseline of information as we go forward into the public dialogue. An analysis phase will follow Water/Wastewater 101 which will assess water and wastewater infrastructure and supplies to meet current and future populations.

The final report to the Mayor and Council and the Board of Supervisors will summarize the technical findings and public input received.

The City and County technical staff are meeting on a regular basis to map-out the reports that will be coming out and to review the documentation. Staff are also meeting internally to assemble the public input being received and to begin to map-out the public involvement process. As staff work on those two fronts, they are bringing that information to the Oversight Committee. Oversight Committee meetings will continue to be widely noticed and serve as public meetings so that this process continues to be open and transparent throughout. All reports will be posted on the Oversight Committee's website, which Ms. Seacat anticipated would be up within a couple of weeks.

WMAC members appointed to the Oversight Committee then gave their perspective on this committee's activities. Mark Stratton said one thing that impressed him was that the Oversight Committee members (with respect to the public participation process) seemed to want to have the public more involved in the process than perhaps the City Council and Board of Supervisors might have addressed in their formation of the Oversight Committee. He thought the April 18 Oversight Committee meeting would give a clear indication of just how much the public does want to be a part of this process. He commented further that the difficult point would be how to define who should really be included and how big that table is going to get. He observed that if you have a very large working committee, it is very difficult to reach consensus on issues. He expressed that there would be some need to look at how to separate public participation from the activities of the Oversight Committee, so that it is actually the Oversight Committee that is making the decisions based upon the input from those entities.

Mr. Stratton added that he looked forward to the April 18 Oversight Committee meeting, and thought there would be some fairly strong presentations of why certain groups should be part of the process, but he expressed that being part of the process does not necessarily mean that they should be a part of the decision making and recommendations back to the City Council and Board of Supervisors.

Rob Kulakofsky then provided his observations. Mr. Kulakofsky agreed with Mr. Stratton that large committees are too unruly – to have that many people making decisions would be just about impossible. However, having said that, he expressed that everyone in the

community (at least in the AMA) has a stake in how we deal with our water supply. As a committee, he felt the Oversight Committee would need to hear from everybody. He noted that the Oversight Committee may get facts/figures that conflict with each other, and the Oversight Committee will have to take that information and give it to staff (and also third party experts) to try to “hash out” what those differences are. He commented further that the Oversight Committee is going to have to come up with a reasonable answer to those conflicts in information. He expressed that there may be a lot of people who may not be able to attend the Oversight Committee meetings but will have real interest in the work of this committee.

Marcelino Flores expressed that community involvement has always been a challenge – but we want the community to have ownership of the public involvement plan developed by the Oversight Committee. He expressed that in the process he envisioned it more as a technical challenge that needs to be overcome – he hoped that City/County staff was prepared to receive comments in a manner that allows for maximum input. He also agreed with Mr. Stratton and Mr. Kulakofsky that the decision needs to come from those that have been tasked to make those decisions.

Ms. Seacat added that she has heard from individuals at the University of Arizona and other technical stakeholders within the community that are very interested in being involved in the Study.

Mike Gritzuk, Department Director, added that one of the major goals of the April 18 meeting of the Oversight Committee will be to get input from the various other entities in the County concerning this process (i.e., how do they want to be involved in the process). He expressed further that it was the Oversight Committee’s responsibility to develop a community involvement program. He added that the Oversight Committee has a 60-day deadline to develop this program. He then asked Ms. Seacat to outline some of the next steps after the Oversight Committee gets that input.

Ms. Seacat responded the immediate next steps are: to get the website up and running and provide an opportunity for people to comment; to be on the list serve; and to develop the stakeholder mailing list database, so that every Oversight Committee meeting that occurs is well noticed. Staff will then begin to assemble the public comments.

Ms. Seacat then informed WMAC members that the April 18 Oversight Committee meeting will not be the last meeting to get public input on what the process should look like. Ultimately, staff will assemble this input and put it together in a document that summarizes what steps were taken to gather public input, what the key themes are and what the Oversight Committee recommends as a public process. Parallel to that effort, the City and County technical staff are meeting. This includes Eric Wieduwilt, Ed Curley from Pima County, and Sandy Elder, Ralph Mara and Chris Avery from Tucson Water. This technical team is meeting twice a week to outline the report, the key topic areas, review the literature and put the technical inventory together. One of the questions to the Oversight Committee will be whether they want to breakup into separate subcommittees to accomplish the technical work and the public involvement development work rather than involve the entire Oversight Committee in both processes.

John Carlson then provided his observations. Mr. Carlson expressed that from the start he was concerned that just Pima County and the City of Tucson would be involved, and he was glad Mr. Stratton was on the Oversight Committee because he represented another sub stratum. Mr. Carlson commented further that he would claim to be the first person to say that the community ought to study a countywide utility district. He expressed that he

has always been bothered that approximately 30 percent of Tucson Water's customers cannot vote or participate in any meaningful way (from a legal standpoint). He said the infrastructure inventory has to be put into perspective and conclusions drawn (both on draw-down, who can share with whom, or who has to share with whom and who does not have to share). He commented further that we need somebody at the center directing traffic and putting things in the right "holes" to be analyzed by the right people and then brought back to the public participation. He added that he sensed a lot of interest on the part of the public.

Mr. Bliven said he would like to echo Mr. Kulakofsky's remark that we may not have a lot of people attending the Oversight Committee meetings; however, he thought people monitored events that are important to them either through list serves or through mailings. He expressed that this would help people be connected to the process if they see regular updates and a very transparent process.

Ms. Seacat added that the issue of peer review has been discussed by the Oversight Committee and by staff so that is something that will be considered further – who and when needs to look at the data.

Mr. Stratton informed the WMAC members that there was some discussion of looking elsewhere in the nation for similar models of where this type of study has been done in the past. He noted that Ms. Seacat has been looking into this as well. He expressed that this hopefully would help the Oversight Committee in maybe avoiding pitfalls that other areas have encountered when they have conducted a similar process.

2. **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 Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), the Roger Road to Ina Road Plant Interconnect and the new Water Reclamation Campus in the vicinity of the Roger Road site.

The Department has completed negotiations with the design consultant, CH2M Hill, for the Ina Road WRF expansion and upgrade. Mr. Gritzuk informed the members that CH2M Hill is the largest engineering firm in the United States and one of the largest in the world. The cost of this very complex six year contract is approximately \$18 million. Under the contract, CH2M Hill will provide preliminary and final engineering design, various engineering, and permitting functions, engineering services during the course of construction and commissioning and start-up services. Mr. Gritzuk was hopeful that the contract would be executed and the consultant would begin work within the week.

On April 1, 2008, the Board of supervisors approved the pre-construction contract with the contractor, Montgomery Watson and Harza (MWH) Constructors, as the Construction-Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) for the Ina Road WRF project. MWH is one of the largest construction firms in the world. The Department is in the process of negotiating the first phase of this contract with MWH. The CMAR will be involved with the design development from a contractor's perspective. MWH will be running a continuous cost model, a continuous project schedule and provide input into constructability and value engineering. Mr. Gritzuk was hopeful negotiations would be completed by mid-May 2008. After the design is completed on components of the project, the CMAR will give the Department pricing for various elements in the form of a guaranteed maximum price (GMP). How many of these GMPs the Department will have on this project is to be determined during the course of design. The estimated cost of this work in 2006 dollars is \$150 million. The Department estimates that with an inflation factor of five percent, the cost of the Ina Road

WRF project will grow to approximately \$190 million. The Ina Road project is the biggest construction activity within the ROMP Program.

The next step is to retain a program manager and construction inspection force to manage the Ina Road project and also to provide the full-time inspection for the project. The Procurement Department is advertising for qualification statements for this project. A pre-submittal meeting is scheduled for today.

Brown&Caldwell is the design consultant for the Roger Road to Ina Road Plant Interconnect. That design is well underway. There are various challenges with this project because of the alignment, stream crossings, property acquisition, permits, etc. This is the most critical element of the ROMP Program.

The Department will decommission the existing Roger Road WRF after a new Water Reclamation Campus is built in the vicinity of the Roger Road site. In addition to the treatment facility, the campus will include administrative offices, the headquarters of the Compliance and Regulatory Affairs Office and the regional laboratory. The County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department is also discussing the possibility of having some type of an installation at the Water Campus because of the potential of park development surrounding this facility.

The Department is in the process of selecting the procurement method for the Water Reclamation Campus. The Department is currently looking at the design-build procurement method and trying to come up with the most cost effective, expedited method to move ahead with this project. The Department has scheduled a series of workshops with a diverse group of project management individuals. The workshops will come up with what is the most appropriate procurement method for this particular project. Discussion followed.

Mr. Stratton commented that the Department is moving forward with all of the aspects of ROMP related to meeting the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality's (ADEQ) regulatory requirements; but, said the one component that is a question mark is the financing and asked Mr. Gritzuk to provide an update on this aspect of the ROMP. Mr. Gritzuk responded that the Department has presented its implementation schedule and its FY 2007/08 Financial Plan to the WMAC and to the Board of Supervisors and that the FY 2007/08 Financial Plan has detailed recommendations for rate increases and bond programs.

In addition, he reminded Committee members that the Department was successful in getting the immediate rate increases recommended in the FY 2007/08 Financial Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors. One 9.0 percent User Fee rate increase went into effect in January 2008 and another 9.5 percent increase in User Fee and Connection Fee rates will go into effect in July 2008.

The FY 2007/08 Financial Plan recommendations also projected that the Department would need a sewer revenue bond authorization no later than 2009. Mr. Gritzuk added that at the March 7, 2008 Bond Advisory Committee (BAC) meeting, Mr. Gritzuk and Jeff Nichols, Controller, made a presentation based on the financial data in the FY 2007/08 Financial Plan, indicating that the Department cannot wait until 2010 for a bond authorization election. Mr. Gritzuk felt the Department's presentation was well received.

Mr. Stratton suggested that the WMAC inform the Board of Supervisors of the Committee's concern that the bond election needs to be held as soon as practical so that there is an assurance that the ROMP Program does get funded.

Mr. Gritzuk responded that the ROMP will happen one way or another. The Department can implement in accordance with the Implementation and Financial Plan established for ROMP, or if we fail, ADEQ will step in and put the County under a consent decree or consent order along with an imposed implementation schedule and penalties. Financing capability is not a major factor with ADEQ. He informed the members that even with the recent rate increases, the County's sewer rates are still below the average of sewer rates across Arizona.

Mr. Bliven asked when the BAC would make its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding when to hold the bond election. Mr. Nichols responded that it was his understanding that Mr. Huckelberry informed the BAC that the Board of Supervisors they would need to make a decision in the May/June 2008 timeframe, if the revenue bond election was to be included in the November 2008 election.

Mr. Stratton noted that a current Arizona House bill would limit the number of elections that could be held for bond elections. He asked about the status of the legislation. Mr. Nichols responded the bill is pretty static according to the legislative updates received by the Department.

Mr. Bliven expressed that it was important that the Department receive the ability to bond these projects early rather than waiting until the last deadline. If the legislation to limit bond elections is approved, it will further tie the Department's hands. He suggested reminding the Board of Supervisors that this is a plan of action that they have pretty much approved – now it's just a matter of fulfilling that commitment.

Mr. Carlson asked for further clarification on whether the Department presented any specifics on the financing, how, when, where and how much. Mr. Gritzuk responded at that time the Department informed the Board of Supervisors that the estimated cost of the ROMP was \$536 million (2006 dollars). With the inflation over the construction period factored in, the total increases to approximately \$750 million. When you add debt service to that, the total ROMP program will be over \$1 billion.

Ms. Fairbanks stated that it would be important to note in the letter that the bonds are not only for the ROMP, but there are other projects funded by bond dollars. Mr. Gritzuk noted that the Department's request was \$565 million in the next bond issue. Mr. Nichols added that the ROMP was approximately \$445 million and the balance was for conveyance and outlying treatment facilities.

Mr. Nichols further noted that it was clear within the FY 2007/08 Financial Plan that there was a series of rate increases that would be necessary, as well as a series of bond issuances – not only in 2008 but in 2012 and 2016 in order to complete the CIP.

John Sawyer asked whether ADEQ had provided any type of milestone chart as far as if the Department does not meet certain processes of the ROMP that they would force the Department into the consent decree. Mr. Gritzuk responded that the schedule is detailed in the discharge permits for both plants. There are three major dates: 1) to present the ROMP plan to ADEQ, which the Department did in early 2007; 2) to award the construction contracts for both facilities (Ina Road by December 31, 2010 and Roger Road by January 30, 2011); and 3) completion of construction (January 30, 2014 for Ina Road

and January 30, 2015 for Roger Road). When Department staff meets with ADEQ for other issues, this is often on the agenda so they are being kept up to date.

Mr. Sawyer asked if ADEQ saw no progress they could force it up the chain and say they want a consent decree. Mr. Gritzuk responded that if the Department missed any of these dates, it could be in some type of enforcement action at that point. Mr. Sawyer then asked if the Department had any requirement to show ADEQ it had the financial capital – ability - to move forward. Mr. Gritzuk responded that regulatory agencies, normally are not concerned with how you raise the money and the rate impact.

Mr. Kulakofsky expressed that it would be important to emphasize in the letter that if the Department does not get the bond funding as soon as possible, then projects will be stalled and (because of the inflationary pressure of construction materials) the ROMP is going to cost more. Therefore the sooner we start this construction and get the cash in hand, the cheaper it is going to be in the long run and the easier it will be on rate payers.

The members unanimously approved a motion that the Chair be directed to submit a letter to the Board of Supervisors recommending expediting a bond election for the ROMP Program to make sure the Department has the financing in place to meet regulatory requirements. Members amended the motion to send a copy of the correspondence to the Bond Advisory Committee.

Mr. Bliven said he would work with staff to get a letter drafted and forward electronic copies of the draft letter to WMAC members for their input.

- 3. System-Wide Odor Control Program.** Mr. Gritzuk provided an update on the System Wide Odor Control Program. The first bio-tower project was completed a couple of weeks ago. Completion of the second bio-tower project (which was scheduled for July 1, 2008) is about a month ahead of schedule. Once this project is complete, all of the interim odor control projects will have been completed. With a total capital cost of approximately \$7 million for these projects, Mr. Gritzuk expressed that the Department has achieved its goal of seeing a significant reduction in odors throughout the sewer system, especially in the area surrounding the Roger Road WRF. The Department will continue to monitor for any break-through odors once both bio-towers are up and running.

Development of the Department's Odor Control Management Plan to operate, maintain, manage and budget the overall Odor Control Program has been completed. Mr. Gritzuk noted that development of an odor control management plan was one of the strong recommendations made by the Citizens Involvement Committee. A workshop with a large component of Department staff to finalize this plan and put it into action is scheduled for today. Mr. Gritzuk informed Committee members that staff would like to present the Odor Control Management Plan at a future meeting and suggested members may want to take a tour of the odor control projects especially at the Roger Road WRF. Discussion followed.

- 4. Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP).** Eric Wieduwilt, Acting Deputy Director of Planning and Engineering, provided an update on the Department's Five-Year CIP. Staff provided WMAC members with the prioritized listing of the Department's FY 2008/09 Five-Year CIP as of April 15, 2008. Mr. Wieduwilt informed members that ROMP projects are listed in escalated cost dollars (not 2006 dollars any longer) in the CIP since the Department is planning with a five percent cost escalation per year. The list reflects the Department's approved CIP budget for FY 2008/09 of \$117 million and ramps up to \$160 million by FY 2011/12.

Mr. Wieduwilt also reviewed some graphs. The first graph showed the Five-Year CIP divided between ROMP and Non-ROMP projects. This reflects that ROMP costs will dramatically increase as we move through the five-year CIP process. Consequently, the Non-ROMP costs will also be decreasing. In FY 2008/09 there are 53 CIP projects. The challenge in the next couple of years, is a \$91 million Non-ROMP capital delivery program that the Department is currently trying to gear-up for. With the constraints on the Department to be able to hire and fill vacancies in order to be able to deliver these projects, the Department will have to look for third party resources in project management and program management. Mr. Wieduwilt expressed that once the Department gets over this Non-ROMP hump, the work load would reduce and the Department would be able to manage the CIP with process improvements currently being implemented with the CIP Project Delivery Program.

Mr. Wieduwilt then referred to the second graph which reflected the number of Non-ROMP projects. This graph takes the top five projects in each fiscal year and reflects the percent that those five projects on the total Non-ROMP Program. The top five Non-ROMP projects contain 66 percent to 76 percent of the Department's total Non-ROMP CIP budget. Mr. Wieduwilt expressed that this was a good sign – it says the Department can put its resources towards the five projects, successfully deliver them and put the Department in a very good position to handle the rest of the projects. While the Department will continue to have staffing concerns in delivering the CIP program, Mr. Wieduwilt thought it gave the Department a good focus to move forward. Discussion followed.

Mr. Carlson noted that the cost for each of the FY 2008/09 CIP average-sized projects is \$1.5 million, and commented that was a lot of administrative work for such a small amount of work in an individual project. Mr. Wieduwilt responded the Department will have to be creative – possibly bundle projects and put them under one project manager or give them to one third-party person to help manage larger chunks of small projects.

Mr. Flores expressed that maybe it would be helpful to distinguish which projects are multi-year Non-ROMP projects and maybe having a project manager for those multi-year projects identified, which would aid in these projects being implemented. Mr. Wieduwilt responded the Department currently is looking at resource loading – what projects would require continuous project management through multiple years and which ones can be bundled for short-term impact and less drain on staff. He offered to provide any information the WMAC would like on the Department's exercise to do the resource loading, which he anticipated would be done in the next month to prepare the Department for the delivery of the FY 2008/09 CIP.

Mr. Bliven observed from a previous Staff Report to the Committee, that the Department had 13 vacant Civil Engineering positions and asked if the Department was having any luck filling those positions. Mr. Nichols responded the Department previously submitted a request to County Administration to fill nine engineering-type positions and received approval to fill three of those positions because the County is under a hiring freeze.

B. New Items. No new items were discussed.

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS. FY 2008/09 Budget; Water Infrastructure, Supply and Planning Study - CWAC/WMAC Joint Committee; Nominating Committee Appointment; State/Regulatory Update; Regional Optimization Master Plan; Odor Control Plan Update.

Mr. Stratton also requested that the Committee discuss a name change that would be more reflective of the Department's new name.

Mr. Flores noted that the Oversight Committee is planning a tour, and asked if they opened the invitation to WMAC members could they participate in the tour? Ms. Seacat responded in the affirmative and she would let Mr. Curley and Ms. Hunt know if the Oversight Committee schedules a tour.

Mr. Sawyer noted that the Department has approximately \$1.2 billion in CIP projects and noted that it is not able to hire needed staff. He requested that staffing be added to the agenda. Mr. Stratton also asked for an update on evaluations of compensation for hard to fill positions and whether Human Resources is looking at re-evaluating those salary ranges for hard to fill positions. Mr. Gritzuk responded that the lack of staff does not preclude the Department's need to have project management – because of the lack, the Department has to resort to consultants to do project management. The Department will have project management for the Ina WRF project and the Water Reclamation Campus project.

There is also a service that the Department avails itself of within the County – a separate CIP element - and the Department has given that element about six of the smaller CIP projects. There is a huge gap and the more cost effective way to fill that gap in project management is with additional staff and staff that is experienced in project management. Mr. Flores requested that perhaps a resource allocation exercise that would have been complete by the next meeting would be helpful in that discussion to appreciate the full situation. Mr. Bliven added that the WMAC can support the Department in possibly lifting the hiring freeze for certain positions it could provide if it's appropriate.

VI. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE.

John Holland, Pima County resident, offered his observations on the content of the meeting. He noted that he is a wastewater professional. He commented that Mr. Gritzuk mentioned a huge change order to a contract. He said, while not privy to the details of the actual contract with MWH, he thought that if the final GMP was not acceptable, the Department would be able to go out and bid that project and asked if that was still the case. Mr. Gritzuk responded that the procurement contracting method for the expansion of the Ina Road WRF is a process called Construction-Manager-At-Risk. In that process, the contractor is selected based on qualifications not low bid. The Department went through that process and selected MWH. The services of the contractor are basically in two major phases: the first phase is to provide pre-construction services, primarily in assistance in the development of the design. That was the first phase that was awarded by the Board of Supervisors at a not-to-exceed cost of \$2 million – the Department is negotiating that phase. In the future phases, the County will be awarding the construction contracts to that contractor. The Department intends to come back to the Board of Supervisors for every one of those components. If there is one overall contract, it could be in the vicinity of \$150 million and more, or, if there are components, then whatever the component cost is. The Department envisions that there will be two or more GMP components for the construction of the Ina Road project.

Mr. Holland asked whether there would be a case where there would be a bid process. Mr. Gritzuk responded in each of the GMP packages, the Department may require the contractor, MWH, to bid components of that package or the whole package. In which case, the contractor in that example becomes the construction manager, but they have other subcontractors that are actually constructing the components of that GMP. Mr. Gritzuk added that the Department does envision that portions of these packages will be bid. He commented further that the Department also

envisions that before those packages are bid out, the Department will go through pre-qualification of the subcontractors.

Mr. Holland commented that he was very pleased to hear Mr. Gritzuk's comment regarding the consequences of not complying with the regulatory dates. He noted that he lived in Atlanta Georgia during the period that city did not comply. He noted that Atlanta paid approximately \$14 million in fines during the period of construction of about \$350 million worth of projects. Mr. Gritzuk added that he thought the City of Atlanta was continuing to pay penalties because they are behind schedule.

Mr. Holland commented on the Odor Control Management Program update, and said he was coming down Interstate 10 from the north side late one the evening, and noticed that to the east of Roger Road there was a sewer smell, not a treatment plant smell. He observed he was not sure that all the citizens would not associate that odor with the Roger Road WRF. John Warner said he would follow-up on the odor.

There being no further response from the audience, Chair Bliven adjourned the meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting adjourned at 9:12 A.M.