

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Transamerica Building
Pima Association of Governments' 5th Floor Conference Room
177 North Church Avenue

Thursday, September 16, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

Committee Members Present:

Jeff Biggs	Mike Gritzuk	John Lynch	Ann Marie Wolf
Sheila Bowen	Barbee Hanson	Armando Membriila	
John Carlson	Kendall Kroesen	Mark Stratton	

Committee Members Absent:

Jim Barry	Bill Katzel
Brad DeSpain	Rob Kulakofsky

I. CALL TO ORDER. Chair Sheila Bowen called the meeting of the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) to order at 7:50 a.m. *(A quorum was not present so the Approval of Minutes was deferred.)*

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

III. COMMITTEE/SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Announcements of Recognition. Sheila Bowen gave recognition to committee members who have recently left the committee. Former member Corey Smith received a plaque recognizing his service to the committee thanking him for his invaluable input and his time. Adam Bliven was also recognized for his past service to the committee. Mr. Bliven was recently hired by the department and so was unable to continue to serve on the committee. Ed Curley relayed a message of thanks from Mr. Bliven. He will receive a plaque noting the committee's appreciation for his service. Marcelino Flores, former Environmental Planning Advisory Committee representative also received a plaque noting the committee's appreciation for his service. He was replaced by Kendall Kroesen. The committee also noted that Diana St. John had been promoted within the department and she was presented with a plaque for her year of support to the committee.

2. Announcement of Mike Gritzuk's Retirement. Mike Gritzuk announced his retirement plans. Despite his reluctance to leave the department (but with his family's encouragement) he will step down as Director while continuing to support Pima County in an auxiliary role. He was confident that the timing of his retirement would not interfere with the ROMP. The ROMP program has established all of the major contracts and the financing so that the program can continue on. The rate increases that go along with supporting that financing plan have been programmed and are in place. The last major contract for the ROMP is in the final stages of procurement - the Design-Build-Operate (DBO) Water Reclamation Campus project that would replace the Roger Road Facility. This Friday the final technical proposals were received as well as the cost proposals. Those proposals will go through a very aggressive review by the selection committee, subcommittees and consultants. On December 7, 2010, the contract is scheduled to go to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) for approval. After retirement, Mr. Gritzuk may continue on a part-time basis. The recruitment for the new director has been advertised and has gone national. Mr. Gritzuk's retirement has been planned in such a way as to provide an overlap between the beginning of the new director's duties and his departure. Mr. Gritzuk would be retiring at the end of this year or early in 2011.

3. New Member Announcement. Sheila Bowen announced that Bob Iannarino was present at the meeting and is going to be replacing Corey Smith as Supervisor Ann Day's representative on the committee. Mr. Iannarino's first meeting as an active committee member will be next month.

4. Announcement of New Employee with the RWRD. Mr. Curley announced that Merva Douglas-Bridges has replaced Diana St. John. Ms. Douglas-Bridges has worked previously with the County in the CIP Unit. Ms. Bowen welcomed Ms. Douglas-Bridges as the new coordinator for the committee.

5. Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update. Jeff Biggs reported that the last meeting of the CWAC was on September 1, 2010. Karen Dotsen, the Reclaimed Program Manager for the City of Tucson, gave an update on the City of Tucson's reclaimed system. Some main points covered by that update include the annual reclaimed use: 60% of reclaimed water is used by golf courses, 16% is used by 39 parks, 8% is used by 52 schools and 11% used by other providers such as Oro Valley. The reclaimed system on a normal day uses about 14 million gallons and on a peak day

close to 32 million gallons. The huge spike occurs in the summer which is also true with the potable water. Mr. Biggs said that another item that was also very important was the information regarding the residential customer and the financial issues that must be looked. The average Tucson water user pays about \$1.54 per ccf and the reclaimed is about \$1.83 per ccf. For a low water user it doesn't really make much sense for them to start using reclaimed water. Once the water usage starts getting into the upper tiers of 31 to 45 ccf, the cost is over \$8.00 a ccf and then it starts making some financial sense for people to start using reclaimed water. Tucson Water helps the customers to determine if it makes sense for them financially to use reclaimed water or stay on the potable system. Mr. Biggs stated that if anyone would like Ms. Dotsen to come and give this presentation to this committee that she would be more than happy to do so. Mr. Gritzuk stated that he saw the presentation given by Ms. Dotsen and thought it would be worthwhile to have her make that presentation to the committee. Mr. Curley stated that she had already been approached to have her present at one of the meetings towards the end of 2010.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES. The minutes of the August 19, 2010 meeting were approved unanimously.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Old Items/Updates

1. Tucson Water's Sentry Program: Voluntary Program for Monitoring Currently Unregulated Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs). John Kmiec, Tucson Water's Environmental and Regulatory Compliance Supervisor, gave a Power Point presentation regarding the City of Tucson voluntary program for the monitoring of currently unregulated contaminants. After the presentation, Sheila Bowen noted that National Medication Take Back Day is on the 25th of September.

Then Ms. Bowen asked if was there any University of Arizona research looking at the combined effect of those contaminants. Mr. Kmiec stated that there is no current University of Arizona research being done regarding the effect of combined contaminants. The research being done now is primarily focused on the detection of the contaminants. Mr. Carlson stated that research involving the effects of combined contaminants might be something to focus on in the future.

Kendall Kroesen asked how many contaminants were tested for at any given time. Mr. Kmiec stated that the current research includes a suite of about 35 to 40 compounds and those were adjusted every year based on what is being detected. Mr. Kmiec also stated that the suite of compounds is pulled from a 1999/2000 USGS study of compounds that have been found across the country. Mr. Carlson indicated that it looked as though the research efforts were in good shape but that agencies should stay alert. Mr. Kmiec said that the whole point of the Sentry program was a research effort by Tucson Water to know more about what was going on in the aquifer.

Ms. Bowen asked that if anyone wanted to obtain the full results of the research effort how might they go about getting that information. Mr. Kmiec said that a yearly memorandum goes out to the Mayor and Council and this would be considered public information. (Committee members will be sent a copy of the most recent research report.)

John Lynch asked if the current rate structure funds this program or are there other revenues that go to fund this testing. Mr. Kmiec said that the Sentry program is funded by Tucson Water to do the well testing. However, when we do the research in cooperation with the University of Arizona or USGS, funding generally comes from those entities while Tucson Water contributes in-kind support by providing those entities access to the water samples. Mr. Gritzuk added that in regards to funding, there is an effort underway to pass legislation to create a statewide program and Pima County is active in that effort. Mr. Gritzuk also added that the EPA is doing a lot of testing of waters nationwide to try to get a handle on the amount of these pharmaceutical waste products in the water. The EPA visited Pima County about a year ago and took effluent samples from the Green Valley Treatment Plant. The reason they picked Green Valley is because of the large senior citizen population located there. They also took samples from the University of Arizona. There are also reports out there about the amount of these waste products in the Colorado River. There is a lot of current research and discussion regarding this topic.

Barbee Hanson asked if there were other studies in other cities that indicate results contrary to the types of results found in the Tucson area. Mr. Kmiec said that the major USGS study done in 1999/2000 and the follow-up study done in 2003 showed that similar compounds, especially the carbamazepine and the sulfamethoxazole are found across the country in most major waterways. These are compounds that make it through the wastewater treatment process and get into the environment where they just don't go away.

John Carlson asked if there was concern for a build-up of these compounds. Mr. Kmiec said that he was unaware if there was current research available to answer that question. Jeff Biggs stated that Tucson Water has been sampling the Colorado River water at the point of entry from the recharge and recovery facility out in Avra Valley. Since the Colorado

River water is about 60% of the water usage right now and growing, the City of Tucson Water felt it was very important to begin sampling. Results so far show only the one "scotch guard" compound that was just barely above the detection limit of .2 parts per trillion so the compound is being included in the Sentry program.

John Carlson asked if there had been any indication of where this contaminant originates. Mr. Kmiec stated that no, these perfluorinated compounds were being detected nationally and are used both industrially and in households in the form of scotchguards, carpetings or the nonstick cookware. The perfluorinated compound is currently on the CCL3 list so this perfluoro octanesulfonate (PFOS) will be further investigated and considered for regulation by the EPA. Mr. Carlson said that the state program mentioned earlier would benefit from a relationship with Pima County and that the County should pursue that relationship.

Kendall Kroesen asked if there were any compounds with known health implications that may be present but for which there is not good analytical technology and so they wouldn't be in the suite of 35 or so compounds being currently tested. Mr. Kmiec said that originally most of the research was done looking at the estrogen compounds because it was thought that these were more endocrine disrupting. These compounds are included in this list though they have not been showing up in the groundwater.

Kendall Kroesen added that, in particular, there could be more industrial compounds out there which currently can't be tested. Mr. Kmiec stated that this was probably true. There are hundreds of thousands of compounds that may or may not break down in the environment or break down in the treatment process, but it seems to be a smaller number that actually reside in the environment for an indefinite time. There isn't enough research money to investigate every chemical man has created to see what it does past the treatment process or in the environment. The focus basically in the last ten years has been to investigate what we see with these very high tech analytical methods that can go down to a part per trillion. And we're seeing some of the same common compounds around the country and around the world. Ms. Bowen invited Mr. Kmiec to a future meeting to provide updates as more information and research becomes available.

IV.* APPROVAL OF MINUTES. When the minutes had been approved earlier in the meeting, there had not been a quorum. With a quorum now present, the minutes of the August 19, 2010 meeting were approved unanimously.

2. Regional Optimization Master Plan (ROMP) Update. Mr. Gritzuk then gave an update of the ROMP program.

- **Ina Road Upgrade and Expansion.** Mr. Gritzuk gave a recap of GMP 6 which he had explained in detail at the previous meeting. The GMP 6 is scheduled to be completed in late 2013. This date will beat the regulatory compliance date by about three months. GMP 7 is currently in design and includes miscellaneous improvements and GMP 8 has to do with power distribution and the creation of a substation. At least \$40 million has been budgeted for odor control both at the Ina Road Treatment Plant and the new Water Reclamation Campus.
- **Water Reclamation Campus Project.** The final technical proposals are due this coming Friday. At the same time, cost proposals are expected from the two DBO companies. The technical proposals will be distributed to the selection committee while the cost proposals will remain sealed and held in the Procurement Department. Once the scoring of the technical proposals has been completed, the cost proposals will be opened and scored.

Mr. Carlson asked for clarification as to what the technical proposals included and Mr. Gritzuk answered that design and construction were included in those proposals.

Mr. Gritzuk continued by discussing the budget saying that the design and construction elements of this project have a total budget of not-to-exceed \$240 million. When the project was advertised, those submitting a proposal were told that if they did not feel they could deliver this project under \$240 million then they should not submit. Five submittals were received.

- **Central Laboratory Complex.** To date, over 97,000 cubic yards of soil have been imported to the site. Currently, the site design work is at 10% completion and the building design work is at 90% completion. The plan is to advertise the construction of the lab structure itself in October and start construction before the end of this year with a projected completion date of December 2011. The importance of that date is that the existing labs at Ina Road have to vacate their existing space because the space is to be used for other purposes such as an operations control center.

Mr. Carlson asked for clarification as to whether this was a design construct project. Mr. Gritzuk said that this was a design-bid-build (DBB) procurement and stated that there were in fact two DBBs; one for the structure itself and another for the site work.

It was asked if the site work would be managed by Facilities Management. Mr. Gritzuk said that the structure itself will be handled by Facilities Management while the site work will be managed by RWRD.

- **Plant Interconnect.** The water campus diversion structure is the last remaining major structure in the interconnect project. This was originally envisioned to be constructed in the DBO project but was moved into the interconnect project because the construction situation was ideal without the presence of flow or the need to divert flow. Therefore, the interconnect contract completion date had to be extended to meet the new schedule. At this point in time, work is scheduled to be completed by December of this year. Eventually, when the DBO project is constructed, there will be diversion of a portion of flow from that line into the new water campus project. Mr. Gritzuk also explained that a paved roadway was constructed along the interconnect to act as an access road for maintenance as well as a bike path. The bike path is being completed in conjunction with other County departments.
- **Overall Financial Update.** Spending on the ROMP program for this year alone, starting in January, is a total of about \$24.3 million. In the last fiscal year the total budget in the capital improvement program (CIP) was about \$60 million. The total CIP budget for this fiscal year is \$170 million and about 70% or 80% of that is for the ROMP program itself and that is due primarily to the very aggressive construction that will be underway at Ina Road this year, particularly with GMP 6.

Mr. Carlson asked once the ROMP construction is complete, what happens to the work force. Mr. Gritzuk said that most of the construction is being done by contractors and once the project is complete they will move on to other projects elsewhere. The same holds true for the consulting work. There are also about 8 people on RWRD staff that are involved with ROMP activities, much of it at Ina Road, and as ROMP nears completion at the end of 2015, that staff will move on to other activities within the department. ROMP is not the only capital project within RWRD and that staff will be fully utilized.

John Lynch asked what the outcome was of site visits to DBO projects on the ratings that are given to submitting groups and did those visits focus more on operational issues or financing tactics. Mr. Gritzuk stated that the visits focused mainly on the operational issues and how well these facilities were maintained.

3. Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Supply & Planning Study. Melaney Seacat and Nicole Ewing-Gavin gave a presentation on the draft Action Plan for Water Sustainability. This Action Plan implements the Water Study Phase 2 report, which was finalized in January 2010. This report included 19 goals and 56 recommendations and established a basic framework for a sustainable water planning between the City and the County. The report was then presented to the elected bodies. They adopted a resolution directing staff to implement the recommendations via an action plan and asked that the study implementation continue to involve the RWRAC, Citizens Water Advisory Committee and the Planning and Zoning commissions as well as the public at large.

The scope of work originally consisted of a five phase study with the first two phases spanning two years involving the City and County only. Phases 3 through 5 were scoped as being regional. At the end of Phase 2, the resolution actually asked PAG to initiate a dialog regionally to see what the stakeholders' perspectives were and how to go about doing a regional process. At this point there is a group calling themselves the Regional Water Assessment Task Force which has five members including the Southern Arizona Water Users Association, Water Resources Research Center, PAG, and representatives from the environmental and business communities.

The presenters provided a recap of the framework of the Phase 2 study as well as a description of the process to develop the Action Plan and highlights of key activities in the action. The presenters then discussed key aspects of the framework.

Integrating land use and water resources planning ensures that, as things go forward, there is an effort to develop these future growth areas while also looking at the water resource aspect like storm water, effluent, potable water and CAP water. In terms of the water supply element, the goals here are looking at acquiring new water supplies by building upon current efforts and expanding those efforts in a cooperative way. In other words, maximizing and making efficient use of effluent and locally renewable water supplies, matching up water quality with water needs and using water close to the source of generation. Addressing regulatory barriers to maximizing local supplies has seen a lot of progress. The ROMP is also key to this effort.

Fifty City and County staff members were involved in interdisciplinary teams to develop the Action Plan and they met over five months. Each recommendation was looked at in terms of what are the concrete next steps to implement it and what are the time lines and resources needed to do that. The results were 87 specific actions to implement these 56 recommendations. To make the implementation manageable, the activities were embedded in existing program structures. No new funding is identified to implement the activities going forward but partnerships and grant funding will

be pursued.

An additional handout was provided that outlined all activities within the four elements totaling 87 activities. The Action Plan itself is about a thirty page document and describes the programs that were presented and the context for the recommendations. Ultimately there will be an appendix that will go into more detail on the scope of work for these activities. The comment period provided for this report will go through October 7th after which the report will be revised as needed and will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on November 2nd and the Mayor and Council on October 26th. There are plans to report back to the RWRAC as well as the preparation of an annual report. Comments will be accepted online as well as by phone.

Ms. Bowen asked how they might characterize productive use of effluent. Ms. Ewing-Gavin stated that in the study the three main purposes for using effluent were: use in the reclaimed system, for environmental purposes and aquifer augmentation or recharge. The idea of maintaining those three valued uses over time was a priority for this study.

Mark Stratton asked if there had been any coordination in regards to the numerous RTA projects as far as being inclusive of their storm water management plans in design of those roadway projects. Ms. Seacat said that within the multi-benefit group of recommendations there will be policies developed that will commit the City and County to building into their budgets a close look at multi-benefit opportunities. These policies would effect Transportation, Wastewater, Tucson Water and all the departments that have capital projects. Secondly, there are design guidelines being developed specifically for how to perform rainwater harvesting. Mr. Stratton asked about the RTA projects that are currently under design and fairly significant and wondered if we were losing an opportunity to do something with these projects. Ms. Ewing-Gavin stated that it was happening now on a case-by-case basis. Certain roadway projects are incorporating it while others are not. There is a plan to be more consistent with when and where it makes sense.

John Carlson said that when designing a job it would be advantageous to plan a project years into the future to accommodate new technologies and policies that might arise. Mr. Carlson added that the area is running out of water and that the area will not likely see the kind of growth potential at the rate that it has had in the past. There is the added disadvantage of conflicting jurisdictions that combines to create a need for total integration in an area-wide approach.

4. Financial Update. Ron Meck, Finance and Risk Management, gave the financial update. The financial plan this year will actually be a review of the existing financial plan that was adopted by the Board of Supervisors last March. Unlike prior years, when it was necessary to have an aggressive review and creation of a financial plan which included public meetings or rate increases, this year the primary purpose of the financial plan is to review how well the existing financial plan meets the department's financing needs, in particular for the CIP projects, the largest being ROMP. But, as Mr. Gritzuk had pointed out, there are a great deal of other projects that required financing.

A key portion of the financial plan for the current year is going to be updating the CIP projects for the current year as well as reviewing CIP projects that were planned for last year and how they impact the plan for the current year. The existing financial plan included rate increases going out four years. There is no anticipation of asking for any rate adjustments for at least two years. The primary driver of the financial plan will be the scheduling of the CIP projects and the timing of the funding that will be required to finance those projects.

The other major change will be that the financial plan is actually incorporated into the overall County budget submission process. In the past the financial plan had to be completed before the department could work on its own budget because they needed to know their funding. That is already in place so it will be much easier for the department to develop an operating as well as CIP budget. At this point we expect that the department's annual budget will be prepared at the same time as the report on the financial plan and in the past the financial plan had to be prepared well in advance. That should not be true for the current year or possibly next year.

Ms. Bowen said that during the committee's activities on the financial plan for the last year, there was a request by the committee to review the status. Ms. Bowen asked when the committee might expect this review.

Mr. Meck stated that the update from the department for CIP projects was needed in order to be able to accurately assess the funding needs in the current year as well as the following year. That is the largest driver of the financial plan.

B. New Items

1. The new business item noticed on the agenda will need to be deferred until a future meeting time at which it will be renoticed.

2. Adoption of the RWRAC Annual Report. Ed Curley thanked those who provided editorial comments to the

report and stated that the report would be presented to the Board of Supervisors as the official annual report.

VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS. Tucson Water's Reclaimed System with Karen Dotsen; 2010/11 Financial Plan; ROMP Update; Anonymous letter discussion and response;.

Mark Stratton asked when the committee would be interested in having Karen Dotsen make a presentation. Mr. Curley said that there are plans in place to have Ms. Dotsen present sometime in November or December of this year. Mr. Curley also said that on October 21st the meeting is scheduled to be held at the Ina Road WRF followed by a tour of the ROMP construction. Details on this meeting will be available shortly. Mr. Curley stated that the two meetings following the October meeting - November 17th and December 15th - have been changed to Wednesday due to the availability of the PAG conference room. The meetings will be held at the same time (7:45 am) on those Wednesdays.

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.