

## REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Public Works Building  
Conference Room C  
201 N. Stone Ave.

**Thursday, October 20, 2011**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

#### **Committee Members Present:**

Sheila Bowen	Bob Iannarino	John Lynch	Mark Stratton
John Carlson	Bill Katzel	Amy McCoy	
Barbee Hanson	Rob Kulakofsky	Armando Membrilla	

#### **Committee Members Absent:**

Jeff Biggs	Jackson Jenkins	Ann Marie Wolf
Brad DeSpain	Kendall Kroesen	

**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.** Minutes for the August 18, 2011 meeting were approved.

**IV. Citizens' Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) Update.** Amy McCoy reported that the committee is working on two significant initiatives. The first one is a potential revision of the service area policy. The second one is the Rainwater Harvesting Rebate or Incentive Program, which will be developed in the next four to six months with the CWAC Conservation Committee and rainwater harvesting experts.

#### **V. DISCUSSION/ACTION**

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

**1. Director's Update.** Eric Wieduwilt presented an update on recent activities for the Regional Optimization Master Project (ROMP). The construction portion of the Ina Road project is approximately 30 percent complete. The Roger Road Water Campus project is starting to pour concrete. The new laboratory is complete and ready to move in. The plan is to move staff into the building in November.

Mr. Wieduwilt then gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Organizational Chart for ROMP which was put together by Mike Gritzuk and Greeley Hanson. The complete project organization chart described the roles and responsibilities for both the consultants and RWRD project staff working on the major ROMP areas.

Mr. Wieduwilt also discussed the Biogas Master Plan, the decommissioning, and redevelopment options for the existing Roger Road site. During the presentation, Committee members brought up questions for discussion including:

Mr. Carlson: Who will determine which of these redevelopment options we are going to pursue?

Mr. Wieduwilt: The County Administrator and the Board will ultimately decide. We are putting together options and having dialogue with the County Administrator to get direction.

Further discussions covered the integration and coordination of the Water Campus with the Tucson Water Reclaimed System.

Mr. Katzel commented that it is kind of overwhelming to a lay person to see an organizational chart of this complexity. When ROMP is fully implemented, will the chart get simplified?

Mr. Wieduwilt: The chart is just for construction purposes. As each construction element is complete, that portion of the organizational chart will go away.

Mr. Katzel: What kind of organizational chart replaces this one as we go to full operation?

Mr. Wieduwilt: I can answer that in several parts: 1) We currently operate the Ina Plant so the Ina expansion will be incorporated into our standard operations under John Sherlock; 2) The new Water Campus will transition to one member of the treatment division managing the contract for the third party operation; 3) The rest of our internal staff project managers will be absorbed in our capital delivery group to manage all the other CIP projects.

Mr. Katzel: So we are at 30-35% completion now. When do you project to be at 100% completion?

Mr. Wieduwilt: January 2014 for Ina and January 2015 for the Water Campus at Roger Rd.

Mr. Membrila: Where are we at on budget/cost? Have there been any increases or a lot of change orders?

Mr. Wieduwilt: We originally started with \$720 million for the overall ROMP program. Right now our prediction is that we will be at or under that dollar amount. We have already turned back \$30 million to the Board from our bid on the Water Campus. So it's really not \$720 million anymore, its \$690 million.

[Note of correction: Upon verification of the amount for the ROMP budget reduction, the actual amount is \$60 million, for a total revised ROMP budget of \$660 million.]

Mr. Katzel requested further clarification on how funds were returned to the Board.

Mr. Wieduwilt: We actually went to the Board and did a formal change to our \$720 million ROMP budget. This will be factored into the rates and the finances for the next couple of rate increase models.

**2. Budget Update.** Mr. McGee gave an update to the 2010/11 finances effective 6/30/2011. He stated that the Annual Audit is supposed to go to print either later this week or first of next week. The most current information should be available next month. For first quarter 2012, the expenses for operation and maintenance are approximately \$15 million which is about 21% of the overall budget for this year.

**3. Treatment Operational Update.** John Sherlock gave a presentation on treatment and operational issues. He said that by the time the ROMP is complete, at least 30% of the treatment work force will be retired. They have been aware of this for at least 3 or 4 years and have taken steps to address this issue by setting up an in-house training academy for the O & M Technicians which began in July of 2010. Currently there are 85 individuals that are taking the training. A training manager, who specializes in adult training, was hired 4 months ago. The average age for the techs taking this training is early 30's. Mr. Sherlock answered questions and concerns raised by Committee members.

Mr. Stratton: When you look at job descriptions for your operators right now, you're increasing the need for their skill set to be advanced. Are you looking at somewhere down the line, a need to upgrade their job description and perhaps their pay scale to reflect their higher level of expertise?

Mr. Sherlock: The state has 4 certification levels for operators. What we've done is incorporate the mechanical skill sets to parallel the operations experience so we can document and go through the levels of testing in-house. With the four skill blocks there are all new job descriptions and 9 pay steps within that matrix. The starting O&M Tech pay is about \$17.75/hr and goes up to \$29.12/hr.

Typically to go from an O1/M1 to an O4/M4 would probably take about 6 ½ to 7 years. Our employees are the most important asset. No matter the automation, you must have skilled people in the control room and out in the field that are able to assess and make changes.

Mr. Lynch: With the implementation of the automation of the Ina Road WRF and these controls, what impact is that going to have on the number of staff needed to operate this facility?

Mr. Sherlock: We have 85 O&M Techs right now for all of RWRD treatment. Roger Road is going to be DBO in 2015. The new Ina Road will operate with 35 O&M Techs.

Mr. Lynch: What is the current staffing level?

Mr. Sherlock: Right now there are about 28 O&M Tech and 26 maintenance folks. In five years we'll probably have 35 O&M techs and maybe 16 maintenance staff so the maintenance staff is going to drop off quite a bit, through retirement or attrition. We are also changing our maintenance philosophy to reliability-based maintenance systems so that the O&M techs are going to be doing the majority of preventative maintenance.

Mr. Sherlock continued with discussion on the new Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) Master Plan.

Mr. Iannarino: How long will it be before the SCADA system is outmoded or outdated?

Mr. Sherlock: Because of the SCADA Master Plan we look at these systems annually as the technology upgrades.

Mr. Iannarino: So what happens to the old equipment?

Mr. Sherlock: It depends on what equipment you're talking about. The computer for the SCADA would be replaced or would still be used and updated; the maintenance management system equipment has a certain life cycle and it is built into the budget to be replaced. With our maintenance philosophy that has gone to reliability-based, we are going to run the equipment until the end of the manufacturer's predicted life cycle, and then it will be replaced.

Mr. Iannarino: I understand that, but what happens to the equipment that you replaced? Do you sell it to a foreign market?

Mr. Sherlock: No. We usually store it in a yard to scavenge parts when needed.

**4. System Wide Odor Control Update.** John Warner gave a presentation on the System Wide Odor Control for both the second and third quarter of 2011. Mr. Warner noted that, in addition to the ongoing monitoring of odors and odor complaints, staff has been focusing on relieving structural problems in the system. Two major structural issues are being dealt with through the construction of the Santa Cruz Interceptor Phase III project and the ADOT-Prince & 1-10 roadway improvements.

Mr. Warner then presented the last two quarters of odor control data and responded to questions from the committee. Mr. Warner addressed questions from the Committee including:

Ms. Bowen: I've noticed more odors along Ina, I used to notice it more on Wetmore, has something changed because of the construction?

Mr. Warner: No, but these last six weeks the odor on I-10 is a little more predominant than it was but we also have some issues at Roger that Treatment staff have been working on and we're getting into the cool mornings and cool evenings season and every time that starts the trickling towers are a big component of any odors.

Mr. Carlson: Regarding I-10 - ever since I've been on this committee it's been Roger Road. Are

these new complaints do you think ---- with Ina Road? If you get rid of Roger, do you expect your system (complaints) to be cut in half?

Mr. Warner: I would have to say occasionally through out the year there may be one or two nuisance odors in the Ina Facility area, but Prince and I-10 has been the biggest hot issue for the recent past. I've personally driven through there myself, that's why I wanted to acknowledge that we still have an issue on I-10, and I've noticed that in between Prince and Ruthrauff area more so than on I-10 itself. I've detected odors when I'm coming down Prince going to Roger Road, and running from Roger up to Ina is when I've caught it, so it seems to move a little bit and that's something we'll look into.

Mr. Carlson: The last part of my question is when Roger goes down do you expect to have a lot more problems.

Mr. Warner: With the closing of the Roger Facility and the start up of the new Water Campus DBO with state of the art odor control technology designed into it, our intent is that there will be no odorous discharge from the Water Campus DBO with all the safeguards that are on place.

Mr. Carlson: What does GAC stand for?

Mr. Warner: The GAC is a granular activated carbon vessel and instead of a blower it's got a fan that runs suction and is pulling the head space gases out of the structure and then absorbing through a carbon media bed and discharges out the top. A performance test has been done on those and the performance test has been 99+ percent effective.

Mr. Katzel: One more question getting back to public relations and odor control, do we have a component in the organization that meets with HOA's that are consistently adversely affected to explain some of what is going on to the committee in lay terms so they can have some hope down the road that this is going to end up completely controlled? Do we have a public relations component in the organization that does briefings to home owners?

Mr. Warner: Yes, actually two of those staff are here today, in the back row.

Mr. Katzel: When you guys go out, do you interpret the language like this and talk to people and assure them that we are working on a problem and what the end solution is? I can recommend a neighborhood that has only 17 homes in it since we now have light at the end of the tunnel with your commissioning of the Roger Road.

Ms. Von Rago: When we go out into the community whenever there is a project, we go out and will do a public meeting, and we will bring the experts with us to talk about the project and the length of the project and what all it entails. I can also tell you that Laura Fairbanks, our Community Relations Manager, has met with folks in that Camino del Cerro area actually fairly recently - within the past 6 months or so.

## **New Business.**

1. **Regional Water Assessment Status Report** – Mark Stratton presented a brief recap of the *Regional Water Assessment Task Force Think Tank Report* (August 2011). The Task Force included Madeline Kiser, Sharon Megdal, Mark Stratton, Vince Vasquez, and Claire Zucker. Current efforts of the Task Force included the coordination of four think tank sessions in which a total of 64 individuals attended. The Task Force then grouped the think tank priority ranked comments under four different themes of Coordination & Cooperation, Sustainability, Supply, and Cost, Pricing, and Funding. Based on these results, the Task Force has developed a process to move forward on a regional basis. First a best-management practices evaluation would be conducted. This would be comprised of the research and evaluation of existing regional water

management systems and will also provide possible methods which have been implemented in other communities. The Task Force is recommending four regional solution groups be formed to implement strategies in supply; infrastructure; conservation/demand management; and reliability, sustainability, and aquifer health. Currently the Task Force is holding community discussions to evaluate the community acceptance and desire for implementation of these strategies.

2. **Approval of RWRAC 2010/2011 Annual Report** – Mr. Curley presented the Annual Report with changes suggested by committee members, and it was approved.

#### **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**

The committee discussed future agenda items including:

- The Hydraulic Model
- The new Design Manual
- Marana issues
- Customer advocacy including outreach on odors, bill appeals, and rate decreases
- ADOT relocation costs
- Meeting interval changes
- Meeting time changes
- Alternates to the wastewater system

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

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.