

REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Transamerica Building
Pima Association of Governments' 5th Floor Conference Room
177 North Church Avenue
Thursday, August 18, 2011

MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present:

Sheila Bowen	Rob Kulakofsky	Jackson Jenkins
John Carlson	John Lynch	Jeff Biggs
Barbee Hanson	Armando Membriola	
Bob Iannarino	Mark Stratton	

Committee Members Absent:

Brad DeSpain	Kendall Kroesen	Amy McCoy
Bill Katzel	Ann Marie Wolf	

- I. **CALL TO ORDER.** Vice-Chair John Lynch called the meeting of the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) to order at 7:50 a.m.
- II. **CALL TO THE AUDIENCE.** There were no comments from the audience.
- III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** The minutes of the June 16th meeting were approved.
- IV. **Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update.** Jeff Biggs gave a brief update in Amy McCoy's absence and stated that the committee had taken a break for the summer and would meet again on September 7th.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Old Items/Updates

1. Director's Update. Jackson Jenkins gave an update on recent activities in the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department. Overall, ROMP is moving along really well. Beginning with Ina Road, the construction effort at this location has been broken down into eight GMPs (Guaranteed Maximum Price contracts). GMP 1, 2, 3 and 4 are complete and 5, 6, and 8 are well underway. GMP 7 is in the engineering and design phase and includes building upgrades, the new warehouse and the modifications to the training center which will be a central control room and will be referred to as the OCC (Operational Control Center). There will also be modifications made to the maintenance shop and the administration building. The construction effort to date is at 33 percent complete overall and the entire project is still on track for an October 19th, 2013 total completion date. This date is well ahead of the compliance date of January 2014.

The Design-Build-Operate (DBO) at the Water Reclamation Campus is being handled by CH2M Hill and involves the \$172 million construction project. CH2M Hill came in with a bid of \$164 million and started construction on June 3, 2011. The formal groundbreaking ceremony was held on June 28, 2011. The total budget for the campus is \$275 million which has been reduced to \$215 million due to the competitive nature of the bidding and thereby providing a \$60 million savings. The scheduled acceptance date of this project is August 2014 which is well ahead of the regulatory compliance date of January 2015. The central laboratory is being constructed at the campus location and is currently on schedule for a December 2011 occupancy. The CRAO staff as well as the training staff should be moved in at that time. Both site construction and building construction are moving along nicely.

Bob Iannarino asked if the \$60 million owner contingency was refundable in part or as a whole. Mr. Jenkins said that the contingency amount belonged to the County and none of those funds would go back to the contractor.

John Lynch asked if, in regards to GMPs 1, 2, 3 and 4, there were any surprises budget wise that might have come up during the construction. Mr. Jenkins stated that collectively all four GMPs were under budget but that some came in slightly higher while others were slightly lower. While those that came in higher involved some complicated issues, solutions were applied that were mutually beneficial to both parties.

Mr. Lynch suggested that as a future agenda item for the committee an overview of lessons learned would be helpful.

Mr. Jenkins continued with the update by stating that the County had moved forward with a new contract for the Household Hazardous Waste Program. The contract is due to go to the Mayor and Council in early September. A small delay occurred in the issuance of this contract due to some issues with insurance but those have been ironed out. PDEQ is now the manager of the contract for Pima County. Another topic included in this update is the topic of odor control. Recently there was an article in the newspaper regarding odor control in the I-10 and Park area. RWRD has done a tremendous job improving odor control on a temporary basis given that the ROMP delivery is seen as the permanent solution especially at Roger Road where an old facility will be replaced with a new facility with state of the art odor control. There are still areas in our system, however, that cause problems. RWRD is in the process of installing two bone filters, one in the Tucson Market Place area and another one near Park and 36th, and those filters are designed to pull a negative pressure from the pipes thereby relieving some of the odor. The issues brought up by the newspaper are legitimate but RWRD is quickly addressing them.

Mr. Lynch asked if the newspaper had spoken with Mr. Jenkins before the article was published. Mr. Jenkins said that the reporter had talked with RWRD Deputy Director John Warner. Mr. Lynch continued by stating that it was unfortunate that the committee, as well as the public, was not made aware of the strides being made by the County in regards to odor control in this particular article.

Finally, Mr. Jenkins addressed another article in the newspaper that questioned the validity of fees instituted by the County for new businesses and the potential for those fees to discourage new development in the region. Mr. Jenkins clarified the issue by explaining that the business in question had come to the County over-designed and once the County worked with this business by providing feedback on potential revisions, the business came back with a redesign which significantly reduced their potential connection fees. Connection fees have been addressed in the news media as well as by public comment and the County continues to investigate the best method to calculate these fees. Some options include fixture unit equivalents or whether the County needs to convert to water meter size, which is a common practice throughout the United States. It is hoped that before the end of this calendar year, the County will have completed this evaluation and the data can be presented to this committee as a future agenda item.

Sheila Bowen asked if this evaluation would impact the next two scheduled rate increases. Mr. Jenkins said that he believed that the department was very interested in going to the water meter size measurement as it was a great deal simpler but it was important to understand all of the pros and cons associated with this method including whether the rates would be impacted. Eventually, regardless of the outcome of the evaluation, the rate increases would need to be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) along with the data from the evaluation.

Mr. Lynch asked if public input would be considered and, if so, how would public outreach be accomplished. Mr. Jenkins stated that once the internal evaluation had been completed there would probably be an opportunity for the development community to understand the intent of the County as well as allow the County to hear other issues and concerns before a decision is made.

2. Budget Update. Patrick McGee gave the budget update. Mr. McGee started by summing up the preliminary expense totals for fiscal year ending June 30, 2011. Operation and maintenance expenses are slightly under budget. The final numbers should be in around the end of October. The fiscal year budget for 2012 was adopted by the BOS on June 21st of this year. The operations and maintenance expense budget was set at \$72.9 million and the CIP budget was set at \$238.6 million. The July 2011 numbers are not available due to some glitches in the new financial system.

Mark Stratton asked if the new GPS systems that had been installed in RWRD vehicles were included in the

current budget. Mr. McGee stated that he believed those systems were included in the Risk Management Department budget. Mr. Jenkins confirmed this information.

Mr. Iannarino asked if the County was tracking the economic downturn and where it might be trending at this point. Mr. McGee said that he believed it was being tracked by Development Services.

3. Marana 208 Plan Amendment Update. Ed Curley gave a brief update on the Marana 208 Plan Amendment. Mr. Curley stated that the amendment had been presented to the CAAG group in Pinal County. The people who run the 208 Plan Process in Pinal County have put together an informal stakeholders group that includes Pima County, Town of Marana, Town of Eloy, and the Pinal County Board of Supervisors. The amendment being discussed calls for two plants; one plant at the county line over the border in Pinal County and one plant at the far northwest end of the Marana planning area in Pinal County. Pima County raised some concerns about the flows to the cross border plant coming from Pima County. A special meeting has been planned with the Town of Marana at the end of August to discuss this issue. A Scope of Work Committee has been assembled and Pima County will meet with them to discuss the County's concerns.

Mr. Stratton asked whether under the 208 Plan Process you are looking at where the plant locations are not necessarily where the sewage is generated so it's kind of a gray area so what questions does the County have with respect to that because the issue being looked at is the need to treat and potentially discharge or reuse from a treatment plant which would not necessarily be in Pima County but in Pinal County. Mr. Curley stated that Pima County wasn't quite sure what the rationale was for putting the plant right across the border when, in fact, that plant could be on the Pima County side and all the issues of taking Pima County water and putting it in Pinal County for their benefit would go away. Pima County felt there could be other ways to handle it.

Mr. Lynch asked if the meetings Mr. Curley referred to were closed meetings or if they would be open to the public. Mr. Curley said that these meetings were open but he was unsure what method was used to notice them. Mr. Lynch asked that the committee be advised of these meetings in advance and Mr. Curley agreed.

John Carlson asked what had happened with the legislative action. Mr. Curley stated that the legislation had passed and the Town of Marana had noticed Pima County under that law. Mr. Carlson asked if there was ongoing legal action. Mr. Curley said that he was unable to comment on that issue.

4. Engineering and Planning Operational Update. Eric Wieduwilt gave an Engineering and Planning Operational update. Topics to be covered include the update of the Engineering and Design Manual, the impacts of SB 1598, update on the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Capital Improvement Program and an overview on where the department is with the Biosolids and Biogas Master Plan.

The Engineering and Design Manual has been updated because it is hoped that the three elements that the department currently operates under will be found collectively in one manual. Also, the City/County Blue Book, which once housed the specifications and standards of the department, is no longer going to be available. Finally, the Arizona State Statutes reference the 2003 Blue Book as the current department standards and this updated manual might allow for the various governmental entities to work together with updated information. The current manual is on the RWRD website.

Mr. Stratton asked if there were a lot of changes being made since the 2003 Blue Book. Mr. Wieduwilt stated that there were only minor adjustments thus far.

Mr. Lynch stated that it might be worthwhile to mention that the Blue Book included only construction specifications and accompanying details whereas the manual will incorporate design criteria and design standards as well.

Mr. Stratton asked if the gray water, water harvesting and reducing flows standards been addressed in this update or were they still a work in progress. Mr. Wieduwilt said that the current standard seemed a good one to stay with but that monitoring would continue.

Ms. Bowen asked if they would still need to plan for a worst case scenario. Mr. Wieduwilt agreed that to use a

gray water system takes a lot of effort for long term and there were questions as to whether people would continue to use it.

Mr. Carlson asked if there were any new standards out there that they might have received from the engineering community for treatment. Mr. Wieduwilt stated that the manual was solely for the design of the conveyance system and pump stations. There are no treatment standards addressed.

Mr. Wieduwilt continued by discussing SB 1598. This bill is called the Regulatory Bill of Rights. Pima County is responding to this requirement. The intent of this bill is to allow more transparency of counties actions regarding licensing and also to prevent counties from making up their own rules. Licensing has a very general definition. For Pima County it applies to anybody requesting a permit and for the most part that has to do with the whole development process. The department must identify the licensing criteria, a notification process, and provide a complete denial explanation that ties back to the ordinances or statutes. If there are complaints then they will be submitted to the Clerk of the Board and then reviewed by the BOS who will decide if they want to move those to an agenda item. The County will need to publish time frames of the review times for these permits and a directory of all of the ordinances and statutes and substantive policies.

Mr. Carlson asked what the process was for those who did not agree with the County's decision and if that individual or entity had the right to go to court. Mr. Wieduwilt said that there is an appeal process internally as well as the right to take legal action as this pertains to a state statute.

Mr. Wieduwilt continued by giving a brief summary of the Capital Improvement Program. Ms. Bowen, in speaking about the funds that had been moved out of the adopted CIP to the next year because of the delay in some of the start dates for various projects, asked if the actuals reflected the start dates for those projects. Mr. Wieduwilt said that some of the projects did start but that the cash flow just wasn't as much so they were pushed into the current fiscal year while some were in fact delayed into the current fiscal year. Ms. Bowen asked if that had been accounted for in the \$122 million adopted budget and Mr. Wieduwilt confirmed this information.

Mr. Wieduwilt continued by summarizing the Biogas and Biosolids Master Plan. This Master Plan is part of ROMP and is intended to develop the long term solution to biosolids disposal and to 100 percent utilization of biogas. One of the main goals is to remove flaring from the process as it is believed to be a waste of resources and to have a negative impact on greenhouse gases. Brown and Caldwell assisted with this process by investigating every option available and helped the County decide on the most viable options. The plan was to short list these options to include those that looked most economically, environmentally and socially feasible and ultimately create a recommended plan. Currently, the County is reviewing the short list and is looking at some life cycle cost analyses and moving quickly into the adoption of a plan. The plan for biosolids included reliability, regulation compliance, cost impacts, an adequate technological standpoint, and whether the plan is consistent with Pima County's sustainable action plan. At the moment, it looks as though the current method being used by the County is the most viable but there is preparation being made for the possibility of regulatory changes, or land application changes, or if markets open up. Plans for the biogas need to include air permit modifications, cost impacts, coordinating with the Ina Road Master Plan with regards to energy and the County's sustainable action plan. Options being considered include a combined heat and power or cogeneration method by using new internal combustion engines.

Mr. Carlson asked if there was the capability to produce fuel for vehicles and, if so, what was the cost. Mr. Jenkins added that the cost was something like fifty cents to the dollar equivalent which is a huge savings. However, because the fuel would be produced at the Ina Road Plant, geography might be constricting regarding where this fuel could be used.

Mr. Lynch asked if anything of value had come out of the recent Pima County solicitation for expressions of interest in dealing with the biogas issue. Mr. Wieduwilt stated that they had not received any of the results of that solicitation yet but any final plan would wait until those results had been analyzed. Mr. Lynch asked about the timing of those results and Mr. Wieduwilt said that they expected the results by the end of the month.

Mr. Stratton asked if the County had looked at the alternative of using the biogas for electricity. Mr. Wieduwilt

said that they had looked at fuel cell technology but that the process looked very expensive at the moment due to the large volume produced by the County.

Mr. Jenkins added that with regards to the economical, environmental and social aspects of this plan, the County would include the carbon footprint that would result from any of the alternatives being evaluated.

5. Effluent Utilization Report. Sheila Bowen and Ed Curley gave an update for the committee. Ms. Bowen gave a brief background on the Effluent Utilization Study conducted last year. Mr. Curley added that hardcopy materials had been provided to the committee including the minutes from the two study sessions held last year. Mr. Curley also added that several presentations had been planned for the coming year that would address this topic. There is also an Effluent Utilization Report put out by the department and this can be found on the RWRD website.

Mr. Lynch asked if CWAC had been provided copies of this report. Jim DuBois stated that he did not believe they had provided this report to CWAC. Mr. Curley suggested that Mr. DuBois coordinate this effort as he was the individual responsible for compiling the report.

5. PAG Watershed Planning Program. Claire Zucker, PAG Watershed Planning Manager, gave a presentation on the PAG Watershed Planning Program. One of the topics covered included the Regional Water Assessment. In August 2010, a task force of five individuals ran a series of four think tanks involving 65 participants that generated 900 ideas. These ideas were ranked and the top ranked ideas were evaluated and analyzed with a resulting report which can be accessed on the PAG website. There is an upcoming meeting in September that is open to the public where this report will be discussed.

Mr. Iannarino asked if Ms. Zucker could elaborate on the recommendations put forth by the task force. Ms. Zucker stated that the recommendations were lengthy and all of these were included in the report. Ms. Zucker added that the information was so vast that it still required some refinement.

B. New Items.

1. RWRAC 2010/2011 Annual Report. Mr. Curley indicated that a draft of the RWRAC Annual Report had been provided to the committee members and any edits or comments would be welcome. A final draft of the report would be presented to RWRAC in September.

VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS. The next meeting will be held in September. Other future items include the RWRAC Annual Report, Lessons Learned from ROMP GMPs 1-4, Capacity Studies submitted to ADEQ in December 2010.

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.