

## APPENDIX E

### Stakeholders' Interview Summaries



As part of the Pima County Wastewater Treatment System Capacity Management, Nutrient Removal, Solids Handling/Treatment and CIP Development Study, individual interviews were conducted with various stakeholders at the beginning of the Study to gather their views and input for evaluation during the study. Each interview varied from one-half hour to over one hour depending on the individual. Key questions asked in every interview were:

- What will success look like?
- What are the goals and needs?
- What needs to happen for success?
- What are the three most difficult/important issues that have to be worked through?
- What issues can be addressed with confidence; with no confidence?
- What has worked well; what hasn't?
- What additional topics need to be addressed in each of the workshops?

Results of these interviews are compiled and used as part of the evaluation of study alternatives.

List of names interviewed is provided below.

### List of Stakeholders to be Interviewed

#### **PCWMD**

##### ***Administration/Engineering***

1. Michael Gritzuk, Director
2. Paul Bennett, Assistant Director - Engineering
3. Michael Bunch, Assistant Director - Conveyance
4. Jackson Jenkins, Assistant Director - Treatment Plant O&M
5. Jeff Nichols, Assistant Director - Controller
6. Eric Wiederwilt, Chief Engineer
7. John Munden, PM/Engineering
8. Ron Riska, PM Regional Optimization Study
9. Frank Luiz, Engineering Design

##### ***Roger Road WWTP***

10. Helen Rhudy, Manager - Roger Road WWTP
11. John Sherlock, Operations Supervisor - Roger Road WWTP
12. Jack Van Riper, Maintenance Supervisor - Roger Road WWTP

##### ***Ina Road WPCF***

13. Jim Doyle, Manager - Ina Road WPCF
14. David Garrett, Operations Supervisor - Ina Road WPCF
15. Paul Jordan, Maintenance Supervisor - Ina Road WPCF

##### ***Outlying Treatment***

16. Frank Gall

***Planning***

17. Ed Curley
18. Bill Richardson

***Others***

19. Stewart Spaulding, Power
20. John Warner, Richey Road Operations (Conveyance)
21. Byron McMillan, Permits
22. Laura Fairbanks, Public Relations
23. Harlan Agnew, Legal

***Tucson Water***

24. Dave Modeer
25. Melodee Loyer
26. Mitch Basefsky

***Oro Valley Water***

27. David Ruiz

***Metro Water***

28. Mark Stratton

***Pima County***

29. Chuck Hucklelberry, County Administrator
30. John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator Public Works
31. Kathy Chavez, Flood Control District

After the list of stakeholders was confirmed for an interview, the interview process began by contacting each individual and arranging a time for a face-to-face or telephone interview. After each interview the comments during the interview were summarized. The summarized interviews were evaluated for major trends, reoccurring themes or issues, and other important items that would be of value to the study.

**Summary of Interview Comments**

A general summary of the interviews is divided into four categories -- planning, stakeholder buy-in, decision making and technical challenges. Items in bold are regarded to be of higher importance than the other items listed in the summary.

- Planning
  - **Need long-term plan that integrates all wastewater aspects for the benefit of the whole community**
  - **Need a short-term plan that addresses critical issues and decisions so “on-hold” improvements can proceed**
  - Lack of consistency in how planning is done by member and regulatory agencies

- Stakeholder Buy-In
  - **Satisfying all interests related to the Roger Road plant operation and associated wetland and riparian habitat impacts will be challenging**
  - **Need to build trust between the Pima County Board and PCWMD. Recent PCWMD management change seen as positive for culture**
  - **Need to address odor issues quickly to gain community trust**
  - **Need buy-in at all levels, staff, the Board, local agencies, and regulatory agencies**
  - The stakeholder workshop approach is good
  - Public doesn't understand the difference and impacts of managed recharge vs. constructed recharge on water rights
  
- Decision Making
  - **Final recommendations need to allow maximum flexibility in balancing funding with regulatory requirements and needs**
  - **Wastewater/Reuse/Water planning decisions need to be coordinated and made holistically**
  - **There is confidence that the best technical solution can be identified but that the regulatory deadlines will be missed due to procurement decisions/procedures**
  - Have procedures to prevent backsliding of decisions after workshops
  - There are differing perspectives at all levels as to the drivers for decisions
  
- Technical Challenges
  - **Sizing of the Interconnect pipeline between Ina and Roger Road plants**
  - **Alternative methods for biosolids disposal due to shrinking land availability**
  - Site and setback issues at Ina Road plant
  - Increase in influent wastewater concentrations due to conservation and gray water use

## Specific Major Trends

Specific comments repeated in a number of the interviews are represented as a major trend for consideration. The comments often repeated and deemed important to the plan are noted below.

- The study needs to provide a long term plan that integrates aspects of wastewater conveyance, treatment, reuse, and biosolids for the good of the community as a whole.
  
- To be successful, the study must obtain the buy-in of the Board of Supervisors, Tucson Water, Oro Valley, Marana, the Sonora Desert Conservation plan, the Bureau of Reclamation and ADEQ. Consistency of planning among these entities is an issue.
  
- The study must address the key reuse issues of who owns and operates reclamation treatment facilities, where the reclaimed water will be delivered, whose water is it, what quality of reclaimed water is produced and direct recharge vs. other forms of reclamation/reuse. Water/wastewater/reuse need to be considered together, not separately.

- Alternatives that would adversely affect the wetlands and riparian habitat downstream of Roger Road are likely to encounter public, environmentalist and political resistance. Multiple use type projects are more acceptable to the community.
- Community objections to Roger Road plant are odor-related and would go away if odors controlled.
- Differing perspectives of study drivers for plant location, capacities and conveyance system – long term growth patterns vs. shorter term cost effective facilities.
- There is a lack of public understanding of the effects of constructed recharge vs. managed recharge as it relates to the wetlands and riparian habitat and the ability to obtain CAP water during a drought.
- There is a history of distrust of the wastewater department by the Board of Supervisors. A proactive program to build Board buy-in throughout the study will be needed to overcome this history.
- Presenting a single package with a huge price tag is not likely to be effective with the Board. Phased projects with choices to be made by the Board will be more effective.
- Address odor problems as quickly as possible to gain public confidence.
- There is confidence that the study can identify the best technical solution. There is no confidence that the County system of procurement and project implementation can complete the planning, design and construction of the facilities in time to meet the regulatory deadlines.
- A short term plan is needed as quickly as possible to address the immediate facility and staffing needs at Ina Road and Roger Road plants and what is to be done with the interconnecting pipeline so that so that the plants remain in compliance with treatment requirements during the 8-9 years before any significant new facilities can be placed in service. Funding is in place for rehab projects so just need direction.
- Sizing of the interconnecting pipeline to cope with the large diurnal flow variations at Roger Road and pipeline routing issues will be challenges associated with transferring Roger Road flow to Ina Road.
- The fact that water conservation and gray water use will increase influent wastewater concentrations needs to be considered in treatment process evaluations.
- The development of alternative methods of biosolids disposal needs to be accelerated. There are concerns about loss of current land application sites to development.
- Site and setback issues are significant when considering expansion at Ina Road.

- Funding of the needed projects and the related rate structure is a major concern.
- There is a history of backsliding on decisions – documentation of workshop decisions with appropriate signoffs will be needed.
- The approach of workshops involving all levels of County staff and involving other affected entities is a good one.
- There is a sense that the County culture is slowly changing for the better to allow more participation of all levels affected by decisions. Recent changes in wastewater department management are viewed favorably and there is a cautious air of optimism about the future.

The interview information will be applied in areas where appropriate to strengthen the outcome of the plan.

As part of the Pima County Wastewater Treatment System Capacity Management, Nutrient Removal, Solids Handling/Treatment and CIP Development Study, individual interviews were conducted with various stakeholders at the beginning of the Study to gather their views and input for evaluation during the study. Each interview varied from one-half hour to over one hour depending on the individual. Key questions asked in every interview were:

- What will success look like?
- What are the goals and needs?
- What needs to happen for success?
- What are the three most difficult/important issues that have to be worked through?
- What issues can be addressed with confidence; with no confidence?
- What has worked well; what hasn't?
- What additional topics need to be addressed in each of the workshops?

Results of these interviews are compiled and used as part of the evaluation of study alternatives.

List of names interviewed is provided below.

### List of Stakeholders to be Interviewed

#### **PCWMD**

##### ***Administration/Engineering***

1. Michael Gritzuk, Director
2. Paul Bennett, Assistant Director - Engineering
3. Michael Bunch, Assistant Director - Conveyance
4. Jackson Jenkins, Assistant Director - Treatment Plant O&M
5. Jeff Nichols, Assistant Director - Controller
6. Eric Wiederwilt, Chief Engineer
7. John Munden, PM/Engineering
8. Ron Riska, PM Regional Optimization Study
9. Frank Luiz, Engineering Design

##### ***Roger Road WWTP***

10. Helen Rhudy, Manager - Roger Road WWTP
11. John Sherlock, Operations Supervisor - Roger Road WWTP
12. Jack Van Riper, Maintenance Supervisor - Roger Road WWTP

##### ***Ina Road WPCF***

13. Jim Doyle, Manager - Ina Road WPCF
14. David Garrett, Operations Supervisor - Ina Road WPCF
15. Paul Jordan, Maintenance Supervisor - Ina Road WPCF

##### ***Outlying Treatment***

16. Frank Gall

***Planning***

17. Ed Curley
18. Bill Richardson

***Others***

19. Stewart Spaulding, Power
20. John Warner, Richey Road Operations (Conveyance)
21. Byron McMillan, Permits
22. Laura Fairbanks, Public Relations
23. Harlan Agnew, Legal

***Tucson Water***

24. Dave Modeer
25. Melodee Loyer
26. Mitch Basefsky

***Oro Valley Water***

27. David Ruiz

***Metro Water***

28. Mark Stratton

***Pima County***

29. Chuck Hucklelberry, County Administrator
30. John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator Public Works
31. Kathy Chavez, Flood Control District

After the list of stakeholders was confirmed for an interview, the interview process began by contacting each individual and arranging a time for a face-to-face or telephone interview. After each interview the comments during the interview were summarized. The summarized interviews were evaluated for major trends, reoccurring themes or issues, and other important items that would be of value to the study.

**Summary of Interview Comments**

A general summary of the interviews is divided into four categories -- planning, stakeholder buy-in, decision making and technical challenges. Items in bold are regarded to be of higher importance than the other items listed in the summary.

- Planning
  - **Need long-term plan that integrates all wastewater aspects for the benefit of the whole community**
  - **Need a short-term plan that addresses critical issues and decisions so “on-hold” improvements can proceed**
  - Lack of consistency in how planning is done by member and regulatory agencies

- Stakeholder Buy-In
  - **Satisfying all interests related to the Roger Road plant operation and associated wetland and riparian habitat impacts will be challenging**
  - **Need to build trust between the Pima County Board and PCWMD. Recent PCWMD management change seen as positive for culture**
  - **Need to address odor issues quickly to gain community trust**
  - **Need buy-in at all levels, staff, the Board, local agencies, and regulatory agencies**
  - The stakeholder workshop approach is good
  - Public doesn't understand the difference and impacts of managed recharge vs. constructed recharge on water rights
  
- Decision Making
  - **Final recommendations need to allow maximum flexibility in balancing funding with regulatory requirements and needs**
  - **Wastewater/Reuse/Water planning decisions need to be coordinated and made holistically**
  - **There is confidence that the best technical solution can be identified but that the regulatory deadlines will be missed due to procurement decisions/procedures**
  - Have procedures to prevent backsliding of decisions after workshops
  - There are differing perspectives at all levels as to the drivers for decisions
  
- Technical Challenges
  - **Sizing of the Interconnect pipeline between Ina and Roger Road plants**
  - **Alternative methods for biosolids disposal due to shrinking land availability**
  - Site and setback issues at Ina Road plant
  - Increase in influent wastewater concentrations due to conservation and gray water use

## Specific Major Trends

Specific comments repeated in a number of the interviews are represented as a major trend for consideration. The comments often repeated and deemed important to the plan are noted below.

- The study needs to provide a long term plan that integrates aspects of wastewater conveyance, treatment, reuse, and biosolids for the good of the community as a whole.
  
- To be successful, the study must obtain the buy-in of the Board of Supervisors, Tucson Water, Oro Valley, Marana, the Sonora Desert Conservation plan, the Bureau of Reclamation and ADEQ. Consistency of planning among these entities is an issue.
  
- The study must address the key reuse issues of who owns and operates reclamation treatment facilities, where the reclaimed water will be delivered, whose water is it, what quality of reclaimed water is produced and direct recharge vs. other forms of reclamation/reuse. Water/wastewater/reuse need to be considered together, not separately.

- Alternatives that would adversely affect the wetlands and riparian habitat downstream of Roger Road are likely to encounter public, environmentalist and political resistance. Multiple use type projects are more acceptable to the community.
- Community objections to Roger Road plant are odor-related and would go away if odors controlled.
- Differing perspectives of study drivers for plant location, capacities and conveyance system – long term growth patterns vs. shorter term cost effective facilities.
- There is a lack of public understanding of the effects of constructed recharge vs. managed recharge as it relates to the wetlands and riparian habitat and the ability to obtain CAP water during a drought.
- There is a history of distrust of the wastewater department by the Board of Supervisors. A proactive program to build Board buy-in throughout the study will be needed to overcome this history.
- Presenting a single package with a huge price tag is not likely to be effective with the Board. Phased projects with choices to be made by the Board will be more effective.
- Address odor problems as quickly as possible to gain public confidence.
- There is confidence that the study can identify the best technical solution. There is no confidence that the County system of procurement and project implementation can complete the planning, design and construction of the facilities in time to meet the regulatory deadlines.
- A short term plan is needed as quickly as possible to address the immediate facility and staffing needs at Ina Road and Roger Road plants and what is to be done with the interconnecting pipeline so that so that the plants remain in compliance with treatment requirements during the 8-9 years before any significant new facilities can be placed in service. Funding is in place for rehab projects so just need direction.
- Sizing of the interconnecting pipeline to cope with the large diurnal flow variations at Roger Road and pipeline routing issues will be challenges associated with transferring Roger Road flow to Ina Road.
- The fact that water conservation and gray water use will increase influent wastewater concentrations needs to be considered in treatment process evaluations.
- The development of alternative methods of biosolids disposal needs to be accelerated. There are concerns about loss of current land application sites to development.
- Site and setback issues are significant when considering expansion at Ina Road.

- Funding of the needed projects and the related rate structure is a major concern.
- There is a history of backsliding on decisions – documentation of workshop decisions with appropriate signoffs will be needed.
- The approach of workshops involving all levels of County staff and involving other affected entities is a good one.
- There is a sense that the County culture is slowly changing for the better to allow more participation of all levels affected by decisions. Recent changes in wastewater department management are viewed favorably and there is a cautious air of optimism about the future.

The interview information will be applied in areas where appropriate to strengthen the outcome of the plan.