



***District of Columbia  
Water and Sewer Authority***

***Board of Directors***

***Environmental Quality and  
Operations Committee  
Tuesday, June 23, 2009***

*9:30 a.m.*

***MEETING MINUTES***

**Committee Members Present**

David W. Lake, Chairman  
David J. Bardin  
Howard Gibbs  
Jimmie Jenkins  
Paivi Spoon  
Beverly Warfield

**WASA Staff Present**

Jerry Johnson, General Manager  
Leonard Benson, Acting Chief Engineer  
Avis Russell, General Counsel  
Debra Mathis, Executive Assistant to the  
Board Secretary

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Lake called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**II. AWTP STATUS UPDATES**

**1. BPAWTP Performance**

Mr. Walt Bailey, Director of Wastewater Treatment (DWT), reported that plant performance was excellent for May. Flow averaged 341 MGD for the month with rainfall being higher than normal, at 8.1 inches. The 12-month rolling average is 294 MGD. Biosolids production averaged 1184 wet tons per day, with a 12 month average of 1163 tons. BNR performance averaged 5.8 mg/l; below the current annual goal of 7.5 mg/l and above the proposed permit limit.. Construction activities continue to limit the ability to reach optimal performance.

In response to a question from a Committee member last month, regarding whether ozone hydrolysis was considered when biosolids treatment options were evaluated, Mr. Bailey advised that this process has been looked at in Europe, but has only been tested at lab scale and never at a full scale plant. Therefore, it is not a process we would consider for use here, as one of our prerequisites for process selection is that it be proven at a large scale treatment plant.

Mr. Johnson called the Committee's attention to three handouts on biosolids and singled out Mr. Chris Peot, Biosolids Manager, for his leadership role in biosolids Atlantic region and promotion of positive public attention for biosolids.

Mr. Benson responded to a Committee member's question from last month regarding the calculation of impervious surface charge for the Blue Plains AWTP. Mr. Benson noted that there are 3408.3 Equivalent Residential Units (ERU's) applied to the bill for the 153 acres at Blue Plains for surfaces considered as impervious for the impervious area charge (IAC). There is a large amount of open tankage on the site, which for the purpose of this calculation is considered pervious, and has no impact on LTCP facilities. A Committee member strongly objected and stated that the verbal answer is inadequate, and he would like a written response, as well as he would like to see the actual bill prepared for Blue Plains. He felt that Blue Plains is receiving preferential treatment in the calculation of charges. He also requested this information should be made available to the Retail Rates Committee which he noted has been cancelled for three months in a row. In related questions, he would like to know how big a customer Blue Plains is, and the calculation by square feet of the impervious area.

Mr. Lake called attention to several handouts that illustrated the breakdown by sources of various pollutants on the Chesapeake Bay. A Committee member requested further information regarding the amount of nitrogen that Blue Plains contributes to the wastewater treatment plant loads. Staff will furnish that information.

### **III. STATUS UPDATE**

#### **1. AWTP NPDES Permit**

Mr. Leonard Benson, Acting Chief Engineer, advised the Committee that the 30-day public comment period for the draft permit closed on June 8<sup>th</sup> with WASA comments forwarded on June 5<sup>th</sup> to EPA. Concerns that WASA had on both the permit and the LTCP Water Quality Standards are addressed in the proposed permit. The only other comments that EPA received were from Earth Justice. Federal agencies have another 30 days to respond and then the record will close around July 8<sup>th</sup>. It was slated that further details of the issues should be discussed in executive session due to the legal nature of the discussion. Mr. Lake proposed that a brief executive session take place as Agenda Item XI, followed by reconvening and adjournment. It was noted that Earth Justice stated that some of EPA's positions in the permit could be challengeable, but they were not specific, and Ms. Russell stated that we have no issues unless Earth Justice takes legal action to challenge the permit when it is issued by EPA as final.

## **2. LTCP/Water Quality Standards**

This item was addressed in the permit discussion above.

## **IV. STATUS UPDATES**

### **1. Potomac Interceptor Sewer Odor Abatement Project**

Mr. David McLaughlin, Acting Director of Engineering and Technical Services, updated the Committee on recent activities, and noted that a July construction advertisement for Maryland and D.C. sites is on schedule. As an interim measure, addition of the odor control chemical Thioguard commenced in early June and we have received one response, a positive one, stating that odors have decreased. In response to a Committee question regarding whether the availability of electrical power would impact achievement of the schedules, Mr. McLaughlin noted we have worked with Pepco throughout this project and their requirements are built into the construction schedules.

### **2. Potomac Sewage Pumping Station – Consent Decree Compliance: Update**

Mr. McLaughlin advised the Committee all crescent plates have been removed, with only minor improvements. On May 29<sup>th</sup> we received sufficient rain to allow us to run all pumps but could achieve only 90% of the station's rated capacity. On June 2<sup>nd</sup>, we met with our expert panel to look at the next steps. Currently, Fairbanks-Morse, the pump manufacturer, is doing computational fluid dynamics (CFD) modeling of the pump intake and impeller. We are also looking at the possibility of air entrainment in the force mains. In response to questions from the Committee on liability, Mr. McLaughlin stated the pump manufacturer would be responsible for his pump meeting the performance that was specified and the project design engineer consultant CDM evaluated the system and modeled inlet conditions and the wetwells in his design, however there may be constraints with the overall system. A progress report/update will be presented next month. As far as regulatory status, Ms. Russell advised that we report to EPA each 30 days as to what was done in the preceding month and the plan going forward. EPA has still not agreed that this is a force majeure event, pending their consideration of our response for additional information they requested.

## **V. BIOSOLIDS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM STATUS REPORT**

Mr. Benson gave a presentation regarding the project delivery analyses and project schedule for bringing the proposed facilities on-line by 2014. The presentation reviewed the components of the Biosolids Management Plan, and how proposed contracts could be packaged. Potential project delivery methods were evaluated for each contract package, and a delivery method recommended for each of the four packages. A combination of Design-Build and Design-Bid-

Build (traditional) have been selected. The analyses of delivery methods for the various BMP packages were compared to the analyses done under the LTCP. A project delivery schedule culminating with commissioned facilities by December 2013 was presented. A proprietary thermal hydrolysis process, Cambi, remains a key part of the plan and will be designated as a sole source for all contractors proposing on the DB contract that includes THP.

Mr. Lake questioned whether the schedule was a best case scenario and Mr. Benson confirmed that it is a doable schedule, although not easily and not with a lot of contingency or 'float time'. The need for specific board approvals would be when contracts are generated as the disbursement schedule is already approved in the CIP. The Board should be briefed on the proposed plan. However, the need for Board approval of the project delivery methods has not by way of precedence been required.. A Committee member requested a presentation to the Retail Rates Committee on the impact of this project on retail rates. Mr. Lake advised that a summary level presentation will be given to the full Board next week.

## **VI. SEWER SYSTEM FACILITY PLAN**

Mr. Johnson introduced this item, noting that he would like to have the Committee's reaction to the process that was undertaken to determine the project delivery method has not by way of precedence been required approach to prioritize projects. The methodology used for the assessment study is a combination of a standard approach and our own. Mr. McLaughlin gave a presentation on the highlights of the facility plan, reviewing the CIP history of the sewer system. The facility plan recommended program based on condition assessments and priority ranking consists of parallel elements of specific CIP projects and a Service Life Restoration Program (SLRP). The specific projects amount to an estimated \$536M in 2008 dollars. Additionally, \$37M annually (2008 dollars) is recommended for the SLRP. Mr. Benson reviewed the development of this aggregate \$900M in newly identified needs for the ten year CIP and our traditional capital budgeting process of determining and budgeting for only "the most important projects". He noted that while it is easy to defer such requests as presented in the facility plan until "next year", each year this work is put off, the system deteriorates more and becomes more costly to fix. If the system reaches a certain state of deterioration, regulatory action and court orders could be the result.

The Committee noted that this situation is emblematic of the state of infrastructure throughout the country, and it is necessary to engage Congress. A Committee member requested that all Board members receive the handouts, and Mr. Johnson noted that they all do as a standard practice. The member noted that he would like them to receive it as soon as possible, and requested that a one-page summary be available for the Budget and Finance Committee. Mr.

Lake noted that if staff is looking for concurrence with the process, the Committee certainly supports what we are doing.

## **VII. DCWASA BIOSOLIDS REUSE PROGRAM**

The presentation and discussion on this agenda item were deferred to a future meeting due to time constraints.

## **VIII. DCWASA BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT PLAN: FY2007 AND 2008 LSDBE/MBE/WBE REPORT**

Ms. Barbara Grier, Assistant General Manager Support Services gave a presentation on recently completed reports on WASA's Business Plan for FY2007 and FY2008, which analyzed the participation of LSDBE firms with respect to WASA's goal of 50% participation on discretionary spending and MBE/WBE participation measured against the "fair share" objectives on federally assisted projects. Spending was also broken down as to amount of spending with firms categorized by user jurisdiction location and spending with LSDBE and MBE/WBE firms by location. The Committee noted that it was hard to decipher exactly what the spending was by fiscal year, because the methodology used was to track spending results of contracts awarded in a fiscal year, even though the contract extended beyond that fiscal year. Clarification of the data along with sufficient footnotes for each table was requested. Mr. Johnson noted that the intention was to compare the contractor's LSDBE and M/WBE commitment to actual performance. It was also pointed out that there is no double counting for firms that may be certified under both the LSDBE program and the MBE/WBE program. They count only once, towards whichever goal or fair share objective is applicable for the awarded contract.

## **IX. ACTION ITEMS – JOINT USE**

The following two joint use contract items were presented by Mr. Benson and submitted for Committee consideration to forward to the full Board:

<b>Joint Use Contracts Considered and Approved</b>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Prime Contractor</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Amount</b>
DCFA #371- WSA	Engineering Services	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C..	Supplemental Agreement	\$1,166,930.00
DCFA #393- WSA	Engineering Services	Black & Veatch Corporation	Supplemental Agreement	\$284,478.00

Mr. Benson noted that the DCFA #393 action item has an incorrect funding split noted on the user share information. The funding will be clarified prior to presenting to the full Board. The Committee agreed to recommend all action items to the full Board for approval.

## **X. EMERGING ISSUES/OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. Six Month Look Ahead: Large Contracts**

The updated six-month look-ahead of anticipated large procurements was distributed.

### **2. Stimulus Projects**

There was no discussion on this topic.

### **3. Digester Project and TN Project Disbursement Plan**

There was no discussion on this topic.

## **XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The open meeting was temporarily adjourned at 12:08 p.m. for an executive session. The open session meeting was reconvened at 12:30 p.m.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.