District of Columbia
Water and Sewer Authority

Board of Directors

Environmental Quality and Sewerage Services Committee
Thursday, December 17, 2015

9:30 a.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Committee Members Present
James Patteson, Chairperson
Matthew Brown
Rachna Butani
Howard Gibbs
David Lake
Elisabeth Feldt
Rev. Kendrick Curry

DC Water Staff Present
George Hawkins, CEO and General Manager
Len Benson, Chief Engineer
Randy Hayman, General Counsel
Linda Manley, Secretary to the Board

I. Call to Order

Mr. Patteson, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM.

II. AWTP STATUS UPDATES

1. BPAWTP Performance

Mr. Aklile Tesfaye, Assistant General Manager for Wastewater Treatment, reported that the monthly average influent flow was 264 MGD. 3.17-inches of precipitation fell during the November reporting period. The enhanced nitrogen removal facility is performing well, producing a low total nitrogen (TN) concentration of 2.76 mg/l. Mr. Tesfaye noted that since the January 1, 2015 EPA-mandated effluent TN limit, the cumulative discharged TN was 2.5 million pounds, which is well below the permit effluent limit of 4,377,580 pounds per year. Overall, plant performance was excellent with 100% permit compliance. Biosolids production was 438 wet tons per day (wtpd).

Mr. Tesfaye commented that the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility continues to operate in the commissioning phase with all systems in service undergoing testing and optimization. The average energy generated from CHP was 171 MWH/day or 29% of the 596 MWH/day Blue Plains energy demand as depicted in the revised Blue Plains monthly energy consumption chart. The Committee commented that the revised energy consumption chart was well presented and clearly depicts the energy purchased from Pepco and the energy generated from the CHP facility. The Committee commented that the plant influent flow and the TSS graphs appear to be superimposed. Mr. Tesfaye responded that was a printing error and he will make the correction.

III. UPDATES: POTOMAC INTERCEPTOR SEWER

1. Odor Abatement Project

Ms. Liliana Maldonado, Director of Engineering and Technical Services (DETS), noted that starting January 2016, the Potomac Interceptor (PI) Long-Term Odor Abatement project status report will be dropped from the monthly committee agenda given that construction is past substantial completion at all six sites. Ms. Maldonado explained that updates will be provided as necessary to keep the committee informed of any PI-related issues.

Ms. Maldonado reported that the blended media has been installed at three of the six sites and that the media at the other three sites will continue to be monitored and replaced with the blended media when the useful life of the existing media has been reached. The Committee asked how the odor is monitored and whether there is an early detection device/system that can be installed. Mr. Maldonado responded that an early or continuous detection device is not installed; however, the sites are monitored weekly. Ms. Maldonado indicated that there are sampling ports upstream and downstream of the odor control system to take off-gas samples prior to and post-treatment.

Ms. Maldonado noted that, based on lessons learned from the investigation of recent odors reported at Site 27 shortly after media replacement, dampers will be installed at five of six sites to control the air flow through the odor control system so it remains within the range originally intended in the design. The Committee asked when the dampers will be installed. Ms. Maldonado responded the dampers will delivered in January 2016 and installed as soon as possible thereafter. Ms. Maldonado noted that there will be a meeting with the Operating Departments in January 2016 to discuss operations and maintenance recommendations for optimal operation of the PI odor control system.

IV. WASTEWATER SERVICE AREA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT UPDATE

Mr. Len Benson, Chief Engineer, introduced Ms. Diala Dandach, Supervisor Blue Plains Program Management, to provide an update of the wastewater treatment program management (WTPM) contract and the Phase 1 accomplishments. Ms. Dandach noted that the WTPM is a six year contract that was approved by the Board in November 1, 2012 and funded in two phases. Phase 1 received a notice to proceed in January 2013. Ms. Dandach explained Phase 1 consists of traditional and non-traditional program management tasks with accomplishments summarized on pages 21 and 22 of the EQSS committee report. Ms. Dandach noted that the program tasks are authorized based on an approved annual work plan that is updated each year. Ms. Dandach noted Phase 2 of the WTPM contract is a continuation of the Phase 1 services that are summarized in page 23 of the committee report with an anticipated notice to proceed in January 2016.

Ms. Dandach noted that in addition to the continuation of Phase 1 services, the Biosolids program, all instrumentation and process control work and asset management support at Blue Plains will be consolidated under Phase 2. The Committee inquired as to details on the asset management work to be included in this contract and how it might relate to the Asset Management Program (AMP) work. Ms. Dandach responded that the asset management work in this contract is to implement many of the processes developed in the AMP for the wastewater treatment assets and to align this analysis with the CIP development and prioritization efforts. The Committee asked if there is diagram that illustrates the relationship between the program management (PM) consultant as it pertains to the multiple construction contracts under way and various delivery

methods being applied such as design-bid-build (DBB), design build(DB) and design-build-operate (DBO).. Ms. Dandach responded that a diagram can be provided illustrating the relationship between the various contracts and delivery methods and that in essence the Program Manager personnel function as extension of DC Water staff, supporting DC Water with oversight of the different projects and contracts being delivered and providing technical expertise as needed. The Committee asked if the PM consultant is involved in coordinating the multiple contracts underway. Ms. Dandach responded that a special logistics task force was developed in Phase 1 of the WTPM contract in response to the need to coordinate the multiple simultaneous construction contracts to be implemented. The task force consisted of representatives from DC Water (design and construction) and the PM/CM consultants; however, many of the future Blue Plains projects will be smaller and the need for the logistics task force will slowly diminish during Phase 2.

The Committee inquired if the PM consultant is involved in managing the rolling owner controlled insurance program (ROCIP). Ms. Dandach responded that during the design phase of projects managed by the PM consultant, a ROCIP review is conducted to ensure compliance with ROCIP requirements and that any necessary changes identified via this review are incorporated in the design documents before finalization. The Committee asked for an explanation of the role of the PM consultant in risk management and analysis. Ms. Dandach explained that a risk assessment is initiated at the concept phase of projects and that the recommendations from this assessment are factored into the execution, contract packaging and project delivery decisions made throughout the project/design development phase. Mr. Benson highlighted that the WTPM provides seamless integration and coordination among DETS, the Department of Wastewater Treatment (DWT) and Process Engineering by accessing subject matter experts (SME) to augment DC Water technical staff expertise to tackle any needs or challenges that arise. The Committee inquired as to the metrics used to determine whether Phase 1 was successful. Ms. Dandach responded that performance reviews are conducted annually by evaluating the completed deliverables outlined in the annual work plan. Additionally, timeliness of deliverables, budget adherence, accuracy and quality of deliverables (e.g. design errors and omission), are evaluated and scored in the annual performance review.

V. ACTION ITEM - JOINT USE

1. Contract No. DCFA #449 – AECOM Services of DC
2. Contract No. 15-PR-WWT-53A, Carter & Carter
3. Contract No. 15-PR-WWT-53B, PVS Technology
4. Contract No. WAS-12-029-AA-JR, M.C Dean, Inc.
5. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-01, Advanced Digital Systems
6. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-02, IMG
7. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-03, Mansai Corporation
8. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-04, Mega-Tech
9. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-05, MVS
10. Contract No. 14-PR-DIT-06, Namtra

Mr. Len Benson, Chief Engineer, presented action item 1 and Mr. Dan Bae, Director Procurement, presented action items 2 through 10.

Action Item 1 is a request to execute a supplemental agreement for Phase 2 of the WTPM contract to provide continuing professional engineering, program management, and technical services. The Committee asked about the current Phase 1 expenditure. Mr. Benson responded that $54.5

million has been expended of the $63 million original contract value and that he anticipates that the remaining contract budget will be exhausted by January 2016. The Committee asked as to the addition of Brown and Caldwell to the sub-consultants listed in the fact sheet. Mr. Benson responded that Brown and Caldwell was previously the Biosolids program manager and has since been added to the WTPM Phase 2 supplemental agreement because the remaining Biosolids Program responsibilities have been merged in to a single program under the WTPM contract.

Action Item 2 is a request to execute a contract for the supply and delivery of ferric chloride. Mr. Bae explained that a single invitation for bid (IFB) was advertised to select two vendors to provide DC Water with two distinct ferric chloride supply sources. Mr. Bae noted that Carter and Carter (action item 2) was selected to provide 70% of the ferric chloride needed and PVS Technology (action item 3) was selected to provide 30%. The Committee inquired as to the contract clause that would enable DC Water to shift the supply percentage from one vendor to the other and what would trigger the clause. Mr. Bae responded that quality of the product, timeliness of the supply, and customer service are criteria that would be used to determine how much each vendor would provide for a given request, and noted that repetitive issues with product quality would had to have occurred for DC Water to activate the "notice of performance failure" clause in the contract.

The Committee requested that the contract to be reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) to ensure the language is clear and defines "performance failure" appropriately to achieve the goals, objectives, and flexibility needed for DC Water in sourcing the ferric chloride. The Committee inquired as to how the 70/30 supply split was derived between the two selected vendors. Mr. Bae responded the split was based on the purchase of 50% of the available capacity from each vendor; Carter and Carter had a larger ferric chloride capacity than PVS Technology.

Action Item 3 is a request to execute a contract for the supply and delivery of ferric chloride. Details of the request were discussed in action item 2 above.

Action Item 4 is a request to execute option year 3 for electrical power distribution equipment for the annual maintenance of high- and low-voltage switchgear throughout DC Water facilities.

Action Item 5 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology to implement and support the enterprise document management system, Lan/Wan and Help Desk.

Action Item 6 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology services to provide SCADA and Lan/Wan support.

Action Item 7 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology services to provide enterprise systems and Help Desk support.

Action Item 8 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology services for Maximo, GIS Systems, and Help Desk support.

Action Item 9 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology services for network/data operations, engineering, Oracle DBA and Help Desk support.

Action Item 10 is a request to execute option year 2 for information technology services for Maximo, Enterprise and Lan/Wan systems. The Committee asked as to the difference between the Maximo support work under action items 8 and 10. Mr. Bae responded that one contract is for Help Desk support related to Maximo and the other is for technical customization and support.

The Committee will recommend the action items to the full Board. Ms. Butani recused herself from weighing in on Action Items 2 and 3.

VI. CLEAN RIVERS PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Carlton Ray, Director Clean Rivers, commented that the update will focus on a summary overview of the Anacostia River Projects (slide 3) and that the Clean Rivers project specifics could be read individually by Committee members due to time constraints. Mr. Ray reported that the tunnels from RFK Stadium down to Blue Plains are on track to be completed by March 23, 2018. Mr. Ray noted that the Blue Plains Tunnel has been completed. Mr. Ray reported that the NE Boundary Tunnel (NEBT) is in the procurement stage. Completion of the mining operations at the First Street Tunnel is anticipated by December 23, 2015 with a target project completion timeframe of Spring 2016. Mr. Ray explained that the First Street Tunnel is part of the Bloomingdale flood control strategy, whereas the tunnel will be utilized as a storage reservoir to alleviate neighborhood flooding until the NEBT is completed. Mr. Ray explained that after a storm/rainfall event occurs and flows in the sewers have subsided, the contents stored in the First Street Tunnel will be pumped from the reservoir into the sewer. The Committee inquired about the Consent Decree dates versus the commitment dates depicted in the Anacostia River Project schedules shown in the presentation materials. Mr. Hawkins responded that December 2022 is a DC Water commitment date and that the Consent Decree requirement to place the NEBT in operation continues to be March 2025.

Mr. Ray reported that the Kennedy Center is planning an expansion that would result in their facility being constructed over DC Water's trunk sewers and structures. Mr. Ray noted that the expansion would be built over the sewer to CSO 021 (slide 7), which handles over 70% of the CSO volume that discharges into the Potomac River. Mr. Ray noted that capturing the flow to CSO 021 is essential to comply with the Consent Decree. Mr. Ray explained that instead of waiting until after the Kennedy Center expansion occurs and in order to minimize the risks, cost, and disruption to the Kennedy Center operations, it was determined that it would be in the interest of both parties to coordinate with their existing contractor to construct the CSO 021 facility during the Kennedy Center expansion. The Committee asked whether there was a proffer requirement for the Kennedy Center to pay for the proposed CSO 021 facility. Mr. Ray responded that no proffer exists between the Kennedy Center and DC Water.

Mr. Ray noted DC Water will negotiate easements for the existing and future sewers as part of the agreement with the Kennedy Center. Mr. Ray explained that the procurement approach is outlined in slide 10 and the intent is to have a contract with Davis (the Kennedy Center's contractor) that will include compliance with DC Water's contract requirements. Mr. Ray highlighted the benefits of the approach (slide 11) and noted the additional benefit of using the Kennedy Center's environmental assessment (EA) and modifying the EA document to provide for access off the Rock Creek Parkway, which is necessary for the proposed CSO 021 facility construction. Mr. Ray reported that a contract with Davis will be presented to the Committee in about 2 months.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS/EMERGING ISSUES

None.

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

An executive session was held.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50am.

Follow-up Items

1. Correct the plant influent flow and TSS graphs.
2. Provide a diagram illustrating the relationship between the WTPM and the various contracts and delivery methods (DBB, DB and DBO) being used for the Blue Plains program.
3. OGC will review the Ferric Chloride contracts to ensure that the language is clear and defines when the clause to reduce/increase the supply to be provided by each vendor can be triggered.