



**District of Columbia
Water and Sewer Authority**

**Board of Directors
Environmental Quality and Operations
Committee Meeting**

Monday, June 30, 2008, 11:00 a.m.
Room 407, COF, Blue Plains

SUMMARY MINUTES

Board Members

David W. Lake, Chairman
David J. Bardin
Joseph Cotruvo
Beverly Warfield
Brenda Richardson
Howard Gibbs

Staff Members

Jerry Johnson, General Manager
Avis Russell, General Counsel
Leonard Benson, Acting Chief
Engineer
Linda R. Manley, Board Secretary

Presenter

Mr. Rich Batiuk, Associate Director for Science for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Chesapeake Bay Program Office

I. CALL TO ORDER

David Lake called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. AWTP STATUS UPDATES

1. **BPAWTP Performance**

Average flow at Blue Plains for the month of May was 368 MGD, with record rainfall of 10.66". Excess flow of approximately 641 MG was treated through primary treatment, disinfection, and dechlorination. All permit parameters were met. Biosolids production was 1,133 tons per day, and effluent total nitrogen for the month was 7.81 mg/L; a concentration higher than prior months but allowing Blue Plains to meet the permitted annual limit of 8,467,200 lbs/yr.

The Committee commended the Department of Wastewater Treatment and other staff for the recent publication of three articles and the continuing support of research.

The Committee asked for the charts in the report be marked to show where readings are averaged and where they are point readings (this modification should be made for future reports on Blue Plains' performance). The Committee also asked that in the write-up on the fine bubble aeration diffusers and low energy mixers the savings be quantified, by dollars, Kw hours or another measure. It was also recommended that an energy summary be developed for future major projects proposed by WASA.

The Committee inquired as to the status of recruitment of an Energy Manager. The General Manager responded that staff's efforts to recruit an energy manager to handle both energy purchasing and programmatic energy use management has not identified a viable candidate. It is apparent that an energy manager qualified to handle both purchase and use aspects of energy management are limited in number, and are in high demand. To address this issue WASA has decided to contract out for expertise in energy purchasing, and to recruit for an energy manager that would be responsible for programmatic energy use management at WASA. Accordingly, WASA is rewriting the position description toward that effort.

III. ACTION ITEMS

The following contracts were submitted for Committee action:

Contracts Considered and Approved				
No.	Type	Prime Contractor	Scope	Amount
Joint Use				
DCFA #413-WSA	Engineering Services	Bryant Assoc., Inc., O'Brien & Gere Engineers, P.C., and Construction Dynamics Group/ARCADIS; Joint Venture	Agreement	\$14,700,000
Non-Joint Use				
040200	Construction	Anchor Construction Corp.	Contract	\$2,089,500
080070	Construction	Corinthian Contractors, Inc.	Contract	\$3,613,000
080030	Construction	Anchor Construction Corp.	Contract	\$5,979,250

The Committee asked that on the Relocation/Replacement of 20-inch 4th High Water Mains, 040200, the Purpose of the Contract be reworded to indicate that the relocation to public space is not the primary purpose of the project. All action items were recommended for approval.

IV. CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM – TN PERMIT LIMIT VS. GOAL

Mr. Rich Batiuk, Associate Director for Science for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Chesapeake Bay Program Office made a presentation on Defining Restored Bay Water Quality and Establishing and Allocating Cap Loads.

The Committee asked what total contribution of the pollutants was from point loads. Mr. Batiuk responded that approximately 20% was from point loads with the remainder approximately evenly divided between airshed and land runoff. The Committee asked if there were enforcement options on the non-point load contributors similar to the discharge permit requirements with associated fines. Mr. Batiuk indicated that there were not, but EPA was working with these contributors to develop strategies for pollution mitigation.

The Committee asked that Mr. Batiuk or his office define the specific water quality benefits to the Bay for the approximately \$1 billion that the Blue Plains users were being required to spend on additional nitrogen removal. Specifically, the Committee would like to see a map, similar to a slide in the presentation showing “dead zones” before and after Blue Plains TN (ENR) project completion, and after all treatment plant work is completed. Mr. Batiuk agreed that additional model runs could be done to provide this information.

The Committee asked that the data supporting the “Bay report card” be provided. Mr. Batiuk agreed.

The Committee asked that the impact of the LTCP on the Bay water quality be modeled. Mr. Batiuk stated that this could be done, but would take some time to complete.

Mr. Batiuk agreed to return to the Committee in a few months with more specific answers to the Committee concerns.

The Committee also noted that the Blue Plains Regional Committee would need to address the allocation of these costs to the various Blue Plains Users.

V. BIOSOLIDS MANAGEMENT PLAN / DIGESTER PROJECT

Mr. Benson provided a presentation to the Committee on the Biosolids Management Plan as follows:

After the Egg Shaped Digesters were bid and only one bid was received, the Board asked that the project be deferred for three years, and that staff review the project and other options and report back to the Board on a periodic basis. After reevaluating all options, biosolids digestion remains the most beneficial option, with the continued disposal via land application as long as that remains economically viable.

WASA staff has researched the Cambi Thermal Hydrolysis digestion process – a proprietary system – and believes that this is the most economically viable system for digestion at Blue Plains since it greatly reduces the digester volume required at Blue Plains.. WASA staff analyzed and compared twelve options, from providing 100% digestion to maintaining the existing lime stabilization with no digestion. Some of these alternatives have project costs within the existing CIP budget.

WASA staff recommended an alternative which provides 4 Cambi trains and 4 digesters while maintaining lime stabilization for peaks and Cambi down time. This alternative has the lowest projected O & M costs, and a relatively low capital cost, but would require an increase in the capital budget, above the current \$308 million, of \$99 million.

The Committee asked that the following information be added to the report on analysis of the Alternatives:

- Lifetime energy balance / costs for use as comparison between alternatives.
- A column to the alternative comparison table that indicated net energy for each option (+/-)
- In the CO2 analysis, add construction additions
- Provide present worth analysis with sensitivity of the cost of money.
- Provide delivery methods options and recommendations.

The Committee indicated their support of continuing development of the digester project concept design as recommended by staff. The BOD will be presented a fully developed project plan, including schedule and cost for consideration as a part of the Capital Budget approval process later this year.

VI. EMERGING ISSUES

The Chairman indicated that after July his availability for the current meeting date would be limited, and therefore asked the Secretary to investigate other available dates in coordination with the D.C. Water Quality Ad Hoc Committee.

It was reported that the Blue Plains Regional Committee discussed the list of "Joint-Use" facilities as proposed by WASA staff. It was reported that there was a general direction that the definition of Joint-use facilities would be more useful than a finite listing of Joint-use facilities (as is presently in the legislation creating D.C. WASA) since a listing would need to be updated periodically. It was agreed that this issue would be brought to the attention of the Governance Committee for consideration.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was presented.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Lake adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.