

Scope of Work Task Force Town of Marana DMA 208 Amendment

Minutes of April 24, 2009, Meeting

Attendees

Dorothy O'Brien, Town of Marana
Thom Martinez, Westland Resources
Mike Caporaso, Westland Resources
Melodee Loyer, Tucson Water
Michael Block, Metro Water District
Eric Wieduwilt, Pima County Regional
Wastewater Reclamation Dept.

Deborah Tosline, Bureau of Reclamation
Reis Lindley, Tucson Water
Frank Cassidy, Town of Marana, Attorney
Ed Curley, Pima County Regional
Wastewater Reclamation Dept.
Tim Ensign, Axis Corp.
Claire Zucker, PAG staff

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Claire Zucker called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and introductions were made.

2. Approval of the Minutes

The Scope of Work Task Force was offered an opportunity to comment on the revised March 12 minutes and the minutes from the April 9 meeting. Ed Curley, Pima County, moved the March 12 minutes be approved. Mike Caporaso, Westland Resources, seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved unanimously. Eric Wieduwilt, Pima County, moved the April 9 minutes be approved. Thom Martinez, Westland Resources, seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Marana 208 Amendment Status

Claire Zucker asked for feedback on the list of revisions compiled by Westland Resources based the April 9 meeting of the Task Force. Melodee Loyer, Tucson Water, mentioned that she had sent information about the amounts of potable and reclaimed water provided by Tucson Water. Mr. Caporaso mentioned that Westland also had received comments from Mike Block, which would be incorporated into the amendment.

4. Revised 208 Amendment Text and Figures

The Task Force continued to review the draft amendment, beginning on page 30. Mr. Curley asked that a discussion of overall planning context be added to the amendment by outlining existing plans and then proceeding to discuss the Town's plans for smaller facilities. Much of the historical context for wastewater planning could be directly taken

from the PAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. Mr. Martinez suggested referencing the Sewer Basin Study, which discusses retiring small facilities and putting those flows into a regional facility. Ms. Zucker suggested that the Town incorporate better effluent flow data for the Rillito Vista and the Marana facilities, and Pima County staff agreed to provide the most current flow data.

Ms. Loyer suggested that the SROG members be acknowledged as part owners of the 91st Avenue WRF on page 31 of the draft amendment, and that it be noted that each member has its own pre-treatment system. Mr. Curley suggested that the Wastewater Service Agreement section be moved to page 35 after the Alternative #3 chart.

Discussion ensued about the Wastewater Service Agreements section and how to best address the existing Marana WRF in the amendment. Mr. Curley pointed out that the current draft amendment does not explain why the Marana facility is not incorporated into any of the alternatives, or how it might be incorporated on an interim or permanent basis. Dorothy O'Brien explained that the amendment and the Sewer Basin Study reflect the Town's plans for sewer service, which do not include incorporation of the Marana WRF. She expressed concern that including flow calculations for the Marana WRF would take an extraordinary amount of additional work and re-design. Mr. Martinez pointed out that consideration of the Marana facility was expressed on page 30. Mr. Curley agreed that this language could be incorporated into the Wastewater Service Agreement section. He also suggested that contingency scenarios could be outlined, so that there would be a road map for future discussion and decision making after the litigation is resolved. If Marana plans to phase out this facility regardless of the litigation outcome, the amendment could describe the reasons for this decision and how the Town plans to utilize the Marana facility on an interim basis. Mr. Martinez said that for a variety of reasons, including the placement of the Barnett channel and the sizing of pipes, the Marana WRF was not sufficient to meet long-term treatment goals for Marana. Ms. Zucker asked that this be more clearly stated so that the topic was addressed conceptually in the document.

Ms. Loyer asked about the reason for selecting the entire planning area for the DMA area instead of staying within the Town boundaries or some portion of the planning area. Ms. O'Brien cited various communities in Maricopa County as examples and explained that for long-term planning the Town felt that it was important to include all areas that might be included in the Town over the long term and this was best defined by the planning area boundary as shown in the amendment.

Ms. Loyer asked for clarification on the statements made in the July 26 letter from Mayor Honea and in the July 24 Marana Town Council minutes, regarding the idea that the Town would honor the ownership of effluent provided that the water providers pay for treatment. Frank Cassidy said that these references indicated the Town's conceptual approach and the acknowledgement that the Town would need to negotiate agreements with each of the water providers in the future. He added that he thought that the intention was that if a water provider received A+ quality water, it would need to participate in the cost of treatment. Mike Block verified that this would be for treatment beyond secondary treatment. The group further discussed the fact that if the

effluent generated in Marana was no longer at the Ina Road facility, those effluent resources would no longer be available to reclaimed systems tapping into the Ina Road facility. Ms. Loyer added that this concern would be relevant to the financial planning portion of the amendment.

The group discussed Figure 4 and whether these boundaries had been adopted by Pinal County. Mr. Cassidy described the general planning process and how Pinal County had been involved. Mr. Martinez clarified that the Town's planning area is bigger than its proposed DMA boundary in Pinal County due to arrangements locally. In response to the discussion, the Town agreed to go through the document and make sure that the DMA boundary is clearly delineated.

In response to a question, Mr. Martinez agreed to include a definition for equivalent dwelling units. Mr. Block noted that all the sewer basin's were not included on Table 4. Mr. Martinez agreed to add text and notes to Table 4, on page 32, regarding existing flows to facilities for all sewer basins. Mr. Block noted that there were three public and three private facilities and that this should be shown in the amendment. Mr. Block asked if the County line facility must be shown as either located in or outside of Pima County in the final amendment. The Task Force agreed to revisit this issue at a future date and that the current 208 amendment should include discussion about the pros and cons of the two possible locations.

On the bottom of page 33, the draft amendment references the fact that the Sewer Basin Study includes a detailed description of the alternatives, including cost estimates. Task Force members recommended that information from Chapters 6 and 7 of the Sewer Basin Study, which includes a description of the alternatives (pages 28-30) and a description of the infrastructure (pages 35-37) and Table 7.2 on page 37 be incorporated into the amendment. The Task Force discussed page 49 of the draft amendment and suggested that the specific information at the bottom of the page be placed above the template chart at the top of the page and that the discussion be moved earlier in the document, perhaps after the description of Alternative #3.

The Task Force asked that reuse facilities and plans to construct be generally discussed in the amendment but that the level of detail would be less than the level of specificity required for re-use permits. This plan should show that the Town of Marana has the technical and financial wherewithal to provide wastewater service and that includes re-use. Mr. Caporaso said that reuse plans would be identified when the Town does consistency reports for individual facilities. Ms. O'Brien pointed out that reuse was listed in the template on page 49. Mr. Curley suggested that an overarching discussion about the primary method of disposal, which would be reuse and recharge, be included and that the amendment state that details would be provided with each consistency report. Mr. Caporaso agreed to add some more explanation about this topic.

The Task Force discussed the presentation of financial information in the document and the fact that costs are not clearly presented for biosolids handling and disposal or effluent re-use. Mr. Curley agreed that solids handling is integral to the process and the group agreed that a generalized description of the plan for the solids handling and

associated costs should be incorporated. Mr. Martinez asked for clarification about the level of detail required. He added that reclaimed water is going to be run and financed through a different department. Mr. Martinez agreed that the costs presented were only capital costs and did not include other costs such as biosolids handling and disposal or effluent reuse through a reclaimed system. Mr. Curley added that a discussion about how the entire cycle will work including dealing with peak flows and reclaimed water systems and recharge would be very useful.

5. Visioning the Transition from Pima County to Marana

Because significant amounts of time were used for Agenda item 4, the Task Force did not continue to discuss the vision of the transitioning wastewater provision from Pima County to the Town of Marana.

6. Future Meeting Dates

The following meeting dates and times were selected for future meetings:

May 20, 2009, 9:30 a.m.

June 8, 2009, 9:30 a.m.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.