

**District of Columbia
Water and Sewer Authority**

Board of Directors

**Environmental Quality and
Sewerage Services Committee**

Thursday, December 16, 2010

9:30 a.m.

MEETING MINUTES



Committee Members Present

David Lake, Vice Chairperson
Joseph Cotruvo
Howard Gibbs
James Patteson
F. Alexis Roberson
Paivi Spoon
Beverly Warfield

DC Water Staff Present

George Hawkins, General Manager
Leonard Benson, Chief Engineer
Randy Hayman, General Counsel
Linda Manley, Board Secretary

Board Member

David J. Bardin

1. Call to Order

Mr. David Lake, Vice Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. and noted that Mr. Hoyt would not be able to attend due to personal matters.

II. BPAWTP Performance

Mr. Walter Bailey, Assistant General Manager for Wastewater Treatment reported that the plant achieved full compliance with all permit parameters for November. Flow for the month averaged 281 MGD with a 12-month rolling average of 312 MGD. Biosolids production averaged 1306 wet tons per day with a 12-month rolling average of 1181 wet tons per day. BNR performance was good at a TN (total nitrogen) average of 5.8 mg/l, much better than the 7.5 mg/l goal. His report also noted that a patent was recently received by DC Water for a biosolids treatment process.

Mr. Bailey noted that staff is still looking at the best way to report on CSO's as requested by the Committee, since CSO volume is not metered. An estimate of 50 million gallons of overflow in November was developed using modeling. Mr. Lake advised that exact volumes were not necessary. It would be more useful for the Committee to know the number of events, perhaps as number of days, and whether they were wet weather or dry weather overflows. Mr. Bailey noted that there was only one significant rain event last month, and

only one excess flow event from the plant. Mr. Lake advised that the Board would be interested in how much flow went through the plant and received partial treatment, and how frequently we had other overflows.

III. STATUS UPDATES

1. TRASH TMDL/WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

Mr. Leonard Benson, Chief Engineer, reported that contrary to previous months there are changes in status to report. A meeting was held on the Trash TMDL involving the General Manager, General Counsel, outside counsel and staff and the conclusion was that although the TMDL is oddly constructed, DC Water does not need to appeal it, unless other parties appeal. Regarding Water Quality Standards, DC Water continues to review these issues, and will be meeting in-house next week to discuss the long-term implication of these standards. There should be more details to report in January.

2. Chesapeake Bay TMDL and DC WIP

Mr. Benson reported that the WIP (Watershed Implementation Plan) for D.C. was finalized on November 29. DDOE was generally responsive to DC Water's concerns and needs. DC Water would have preferred that the TMDL or WIP provide direction as to what permit writers could include in permits, which they do not. DC Water has made a request to EPA for a meeting prior to TMDL issuance (due December 31st) but has not received a response.

3. LTCP Consent Decree Modification

Mr. Benson noted that it is still DC Water's responsibility to respond to EPA/DOJ on their proposed modifications. Although there is no legal time frame, DC Water's goal is to respond by the end of the month.

IV. STATUS UPDATES: POTOMAC INTERCEPTOR

1. Potomac Interceptor Sewer Odor Abatement Project

Mr. David McLaughlin, Director of Engineering and Technical Services, reported that the Fairfax County Planning Commission expressed unanimous support for the Fairfax site; he thanked Mr. Patteson and his staff for their assistance. The project will be presented to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors for approval at their January 11th meeting. Both Virginia sites are in the final stages of design and expected to be bid in the spring. Mr. McLaughlin also explained that foundation issues on the D.C./Maryland sites were due to the fact that investigation done during design did not detect large

boulders in the fill at these sites, resulting in change orders for the site work at these locations.

2. Potomac Sewage Pumping Station-Consent Decree

Mr. McLaughlin noted that the plan to modify a pump inlet to determine the extent that it would improve the stations rated flow has been delayed by several weeks due to a leak that developed in a downstream force main, necessitating shutdown for repairs and requiring that all three of the pumps for which modifications are being considered to be in service. He indicated that he should be able to report on progress on the test modification in January, and on test results in February barring any other unforeseen issues.

V. ACTION ITEMS – JOINT USE

Mr. Benson presented the following action items for Committee review and discussed the scope of each. The action items on the agenda (Item 5) related to the proposed budget were deferred until later in the meeting, after the presentation of the Capital Budget agenda item.

Joint Use:

1. Contract No. WAS-09-064-AA-RE; PVS Chemical Solutions, Inc.
2. Contract No. DCFA #425-WSA; HDR Engineering, Inc.
3. Contract No. 080010; Singleton Electric Company, Inc.
4. Contract No. 090240; Ulliman Schutte Construction, LLC

Non-Joint Use

1. Contract No. 030220; W.M. Schlosser Company, Inc.

The Committee gave positive reviews to the additional explanatory notes that have been added to the option year fact sheets. Mr. Lake asked if there were any advantages to working with other entities, such as WSSC in the procurement of commodities such as chemicals that both agencies use. Ms. Teresa Scott, Acting Director of Procurement advised that this is something that can be looked into going forward. The Committee requested that further information be considered on A/E services fact sheets to put the value of the contracting action being considered in context-perhaps including summary level project capital budget information on the fact sheet. A Committee member noted that certain listed contractors appeared to be non-local and inquired about the contract requirements for use of local businesses and keeping contract dollars in this region. Mr. Benson pointed out that the use of contractors and subcontractors is in accordance with Board policies and federal or EPA requirements. A question was also raised on the definition of "local". Mr. Lake noted that these are all interesting questions and

observations, and should be included in the planned periodic review of contracting procedures. Additional questions were raised regarding distinctions between various federal funding sources (such as CWA or congressional approved funds) and whether certain congressional approved funds should be available for all DC Water users. Mr. Benson noted that DC Water will standardize the method of identifying the type of federal funding included in the fact sheet cost distribution.

At this point of the meeting, Mr. Hawkins (along with David Bardin) had to leave to attend/host the D.C. Chamber of Commerce meeting, but he wanted to note that there is a fundamental question that DC Water is exploring, with respect to our LTCP, which is whether use of LID's can be implemented to modify the tunnel aspect of our current plan for the Potomac and Rock Creek sewer sheds. The related regulatory interpretations are a national issue, however, DC Water will be having a summit focused on Washington D.C. and involving all stakeholders to come up with a road map forward. This half-day meeting is planned for February 15th.

Before Mr. Bardin left he stated his concerns that one action item did not include suburban funding when a study shows that the referenced facility does handle suburban flow, and also that he is interested in knowing where D.C. flow enters the Potomac Interceptor (PI) in relation to established PI funding allocations. It is anticipated that these issues will be discussed at next month's EQ&SS Committee meeting.

Returning to the action item discussion, a Committee member asked if DC Water tracked information on contract change orders, their causes/categorization, and whether trends in each were available and evaluated. Mr. Benson responded that staff will share this information with the Committee. Returning to the comments referenced above by Mr. Bardin, it was clarified by Mr. Lake that the funding allocation which was questioned is consistent with the original contract and IMA cost splits. Flow-related questions that affect the existing funding split agreements would be best taken up by the Blue Plains Regional Committee since they relate to the IMA, but that updates on these items would need to be reviewed by the EQ&SS Committee. Mr. Benson pointed out that there are two facilities implicated in this discussion (Potomac and Main Pump Stations) and that if flow is added to one of these, it would have to be subtracted from the other. Further discussion of this item is anticipated at the next EQ&SS Committee meeting.

Mr. Lake confirmed that all Committee members agreed that all the above contractual action items should be sent to the full Board for approval.

VI. LTCP-BPT RISK ASSESSMENT AND VALUATION

Mr. Benson introduced Dr. George Teetes, Risk Manager with the LTCP Program Consultants Organization, to give a presentation on the methods used to evaluate and quantify risk for the upcoming LTCP projects. The presentation highlighted the qualitative and quantitative factors and considerations used to develop a risk cost curve. These analyses were used to determine the level of risk that DC Water needed to be aware of due to the high risk underground construction involved in the LTCP. It was explained that this risk translated into possible financial exposure of DC Water and that Capital Authority Request being proposed for consideration later in the meeting included capacity to cover this financial risk, it was explained that funds are not being placed in the budget to cover these contingencies. A committee member asked for examples of risk allowances used on other tunnel projects. Dr. Teetes confirmed he will provide this information, but indicated that due to the number of variables in these projects he did not believe there was a “rule of thumb” that one could anticipate. Since time for this EQ&SS Committee was running short Mr. Lake asked that the Committee members submit any further questions to Mr. Benson/ Ms. Manley.

VII. CAPITAL BUDGET

Mr. Benson provided an introduction to a presentation on the proposed capital improvements budget, which had been deferred from the November Joint Committee meeting due to time restrictions. Mr. McLaughlin following up with discussion on project changes within each service area. Mr. Lake thanked the staff for assembling this presentation, noting that this information ensures that the Committee members are up to date on the budget changes. After confirming that Committee action was required, he verified that the Committee was in full concurrence with sending the FY 2012 budget action items deferred from Agenda Item V forward for Board approval as identified below:

Proposed FY 2012 Budget Action Items

- a. FY 2010-2019 Capital Improvements Program (Lifetime & Cash Disbursements Basis)
- b. FY 2012 Capital Authority Request

VIII. LTCP POTOMAC RIVER AND ROCK CREEK WATER SHEDS

This topic was deferred due to time constraints.

IX. EMERGING ISSUES/OTHER BUSINESS

1. Update: Fresh Creek End of Pipe Trash Capture System
2. Overview of Uncertainty and Risk Evaluation at Blue Plains

Discussion on these topics was deferred due to time constraints.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Lake adjourned the Committee at 11:50 a.m.