



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
July 17, 2025
(via Microsoft Teams)**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

1. Sarah Motsch, Chairperson, Alternate, Fairfax County
2. Howard Gibbs, Vice-Chairperson, Principal, District of Columbia
3. Christopher Herrington, Principal, Fairfax County
4. Richard Jackson, Principal, District of Columbia
5. Amy Stevens, Board Member, Alternate, District of Columbia

DC WATER STAFF PRESENT

1. Marc Battle, Chief Legal Officer and EVP, Government and Legal Affairs
2. Michelle Rhodd, Secretary to the Board
3. Kirsten Williams, Chief Administration Officer and EVP
4. Jeffrey Thompson, Chief Operating Officer and EVP

The Environmental Quality and Operations Committee meeting was called to order by Sarah Motsch, Chairperson at 9:30 AM. The meeting was held via Microsoft Teams. Michelle Rhodd, Secretary to the Board called the roll.

I. BPAWTP Performance Update

Nicholas Passarelli, Vice President, Wastewater Treatment Operations, reported that Blue Plains met all NPDES permit requirements for June 2025, treating an average daily flow of 310 million gallons (MGD) with a peak flow of 455 MGD recorded on June 19th 2025. The tunnel system captured 266 million gallons of flows with no overflows. For June, 24% of electricity used at Blue Plains was generated onsite and achieving power savings of \$2,360,400 for FY2025 through May 2025. Biosolids production totaled 16,234 tons, with 6,847 tons sold through Blue Drop's Bloom program amounting to a year-to-date total of 41,361 tons sold as Bloom against an annual goal of 70,000 tons for FY2025.

II. High-Priority Program for Linear Sewer System

Ryu Suzuki, the Director of Sewer and Wastewater Engineering, provided an update on the Linear Sewer System.

Background of the Sewer Program

Mr. Suzuki explained that the sewer system has suffered from decades of underinvestment, leading to significant infrastructure deterioration. More than half of the pipes in the sewer system are over 85 years old while some date back to the early 1800s. In the past two years, nine emergency or high-priority repairs were executed due to increased identification of risks through the pipe condition assessment program. While the long-term goal is to move toward proactive, sustainable renewal program, the near future will continue to rely heavily on reactive and semi-reactive interventions.

Spectrum of Project Types

- Emergency Repairs: Unplanned, immediate response work to address sudden critical failures and prevent public safety hazards. These are high-risk and time-sensitive repairs.
- High Priority Repairs: Identified through systematic inspections as urgent but not yet emergency status. These segments pose elevated risk and are expedited ahead of capital improvement projects (CIPs).
- Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs): Planned, long-term infrastructure upgrades aimed at system renewal and capacity enhancement. These projects typically follow traditional design-bid-build timelines.

The creation of a dedicated high-priority contract vehicle has allowed faster mobilization and design for repairs that fall between Emergency and standard CIP criteria. Mr. Suzuki explained that the classification between the emergency repairs and high-priority repairs is tricky as it is difficult to predict the timeline of sewer failure. The focus of this effort is to ensure consistency and transparency in risk definition.

Northwest Boundary Trunk Sewer Incident

The Northwest Boundary Trunk Sewer project is an example of an emergency repair executed using progressive design-build (PDB) delivery method. This sewer segment was especially vulnerable due to surcharge conditions during any rainfall, which fully filled the 30-foot sewer with stormwater. The instability created visible street-level issues such as manhole chattering and cobblestone voids, posing collapse risks. Conventional repair strategies, such as Carbon Fiber Reinforced Polymer (CFRP) lining, were ruled out due to extreme site conditions. Custom repair solutions were developed by technical teams to account for structural instability, wet weather access issues, and pressurized flow

behavior in the gravity system. The PDB methodology was particularly beneficial for this project.

Phase 1 of the project utilized the emergency contract while Phase 2 utilized a high-priority contract. Phase 1 addressed the void whereas Phase 2 addressed the upstream and downstream segments of the void. The project was completed 1-month ahead of schedule, ensured public safety and avoided a sinkhole; and demonstrated the successful use of the PDB methodology for modern sewer project delivery. The total project cost across both phases was approximately \$13 million and the project was completed \$930,000 under budget.

Chris Collier, Vice President, Water Operations commended the efforts of all the teams that contributed to the project's success; particularly the CCMB (Construction Contractor Management Branch) who develop the initial response strategies. Committee Member Sarah Motsch also praised the efforts of the different teams and Mr. Suzuki's informative presentation.

III. Action Items

The Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the following capital contracts and amendments. Each item was discussed in the context of the FY2025 Capital Improvement Program, with emphasis on schedule assurance and maximizing DBE/WBE participation.

Joint Use

- 1. Contract No. 16-PR-PRO-45 – Uniform Services – Cintas Corporations**
- 2. Contract No. 19-PR-DET-22 – Capital Project Contract Management Software – Oracle America, Inc.**
- 3. Contract No. 10523 – Grit Disposal Services – Waste Management of America**
- 4. Contract No. 250190 – Heavy Sewer Cleaning and Inspection – Doetsch Environmental Services**

Non-Joint Use

- 1. Amendment to Memorandum of Understanding: DDOT-Lead Free DC Permitting Services - District of Columbia Department of Transportation**
- 2. Contract No. 10118 – Excavation Spoils Disposal Services – Rodgers Brothers Custodial Service**

The Committee recommended all action items to the Board for approval.

IV. Executive Session

The Committee met in executive session to discuss, establish, or instruct the public body's staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken in negotiating the price and other material terms of a contract pursuant to the Open Meetings Act of 2010 § 2-575(b)(2).

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:42 am.