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CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I call the September 19th, 2012, meeting of the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority to order. Let the record reflect that all members are present this evening.

Now, let the record also show that pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 10-15-1 H and J, the water authority board held a closed session today, September the 19th, at 4:00 p.m. in the Albuquerque City Council committee room to discuss the pending litigation issues and personnel issues. Let the minutes reflect that a quorum was present and the matters discussed in the closed meeting were limited only to those specified in the notice of a separate closed meeting and no action was taken.

We will begin with a silent invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, which will be led by CAO Mr. Rob Perry.

(Whereupon, there was a moment of silence.)

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Rob Perry).

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mr. Perry.

Next item is the approval of the minutes. I make a motion to approve the August 22nd, 2011, minutes. We have a motion and a second. Are there any questions?
Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no?

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 3 approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have no proclamations and awards this evening. The next item on the agenda is public comment.

Ms. Jenkins, how many individuals do we have signed up to speak this evening?

MS. JENKINS: We have five.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Those individuals will have 21 minutes to speak, with a warning at one and a half minutes.

Go ahead and call the first speaker, please.

MS. JENKINS: Joseph Wechsler, followed by Judy Cull.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: And once your name has been called, you can come to the front. We have seating here in the front for you to be prepared to speak.

Welcome.

MR. WECHSLER: Good evening. My name is Joe Wechsler. I’m a civil engineer. They’re working on the water injection into the aquifer and its
potentials. And I did draft a copy of a benefit/cost ratio for pumping 5,000 acre feet of San Juan Chama water into our aquifer. My costs come up -- annually, the cost of doing just that is approximately $33 million a year, which comes out per household at around $14 per year. But the annual benefits, sadly, only comes -- with the information I have, comes to 10,400,000 a year. That's a benefit/cost ratio of .3.

No engineering office would accept that sort of proposal, and I expect you to question your technical people about that. Do you have any questions on that point?

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I think about two months ago, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Wechsler, wasn't there direction that someone would talk to you about this?

Has there been any communication?

MR. WECHSLER: There's been no contact.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Director, could someone get together with Mr. Wechsler? Because to get the information that is disseminated in two minutes is just not enough. And I think if we had a concerted effort on the part of both folks who have the concern, and the administration, it would really be helpful to
this board. At least I think it would be helpful to
me.

MR. WECHSLER: Yes. It's a highly technical
problem and must be considered in depth. Thank you.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And what I'm trying to get
to, Mr. Wechsler and Director, is that the board be
apprised of what this all means and that we have
information that we can digest, as it were.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Garduno,
the storage and recovery project is in the water
resources management strategy. So it's technically a
policy of the water authority moving forward as part
of our sustainability plan.

If the interest is to not have that as part
of our plan, it would require action of the board to
take it out. However, we have not designed that
project yet. It is conceptual. Mr. Wechsler has done
some calculations which we obviously would not agree
with. We don't think he has all the information.
We'll certainly reach out to him and have that
discussion. But before that project would ever go
forward, it could certainly come before this body, it
would be vetted, all the technicalities would certainly be aired.

About three months ago, I think Mr. Stomp provided a presentation to the board about the cost/benefit analysis in kind of a high level way, and Mr. Wechsler was not present for that. We'll make sure he has that information.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Judy Cull, followed by Jim McKay.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Welcome, Judy.

MS. CULL: Good evening. I'm Judy Cull of Citizen Action.

Dave McCoy of Citizen Action New Mexico recently obtained the report of an interview by the project manager and an auditor of the EPA's inspector general interviewing a hydrologist about groundwater monitoring at the Sandia Labs mixed-waste landfill.

The interview actually took place October 15, 2008. But the information was only obtained recently through a lengthy, ongoing lawsuit by Citizen Action against the EPA through the Freedom of Information Act.

And I quote from the interview. The hydrologist stated that Region 6 had its results
preconceived. Region 6 management did not want the NMED doing anything wrong. Therefore, management created a structure to ensure the appropriate outcome would result. Furthermore, as the writing and draft comments progressed to a final letter, the team was pushed more and more to agree with NMED's position.

He also stated that the team's initial evaluation would have changed the solution, meaning the dirt cover on the landfill, at Sandia mixed-waste landfill. NMED pushed extremely hard for EPA Region 6 not to even question the past results or the viability of present test results.

Finally, he stated that Citizen Action New Mexico got shortchanged by Region 6.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Judy.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Jim McKay, followed by David McCoy.

MR. MCKAY: Good evening. My name is Jim McKay. I'm just picking up where Judy left off on that report.

The hydrologist stated that EPA Region 6 December 13th, 07's letter to Citizen Action, and Mr. Gilkison did not answer their questions or included redacted. And it's analysis because they did
1 not entirely agree with NMED's position.
2 He also believed that Citizen Action and
3 Mr. Gilkison's analysis of mixed-waste landfill's
4 groundwater flow and groundwater monitoring well
5 network was thorough, well-documented and included
6 some stretches, but nonetheless, thorough.
7 The hydrologist also stated that the old
8 wells, prior to the new installation of three wells,
9 were located in the wrong location. It's been stated
10 for years, I'll add, but never considered or
11 corrected. Wrong depths. Same thing going on with
12 sampling at Ridgecrest 5, by the way. Stainless steel
13 well screens were corroded, and several had problems
14 with obtaining sufficient water, in parentheses, gone
15 dry, no sampling really going on to collect samples.
16 He also stated that the corrosion to the
17 stainless steel screens within some of the MWL,
18 mixed-waste landfill, monitoring well, in fact there's
19 such as the well going dry, may have skewed the sample
20 results for some of the monitoring wells.
21 That's the stated -- he's -- excuse me, the
22 hydrologist that's redacted in this document stated
23 that the data is questionable from the two improperly
24 screened and located wells. Again, same issue we have
25 going on at Ridgecrest 5. He strongly briefed that
the new wells should be located at the north end of
the landfill because of dispersion that compensated
for the possibility of flow direction could be
slightly off.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Jim.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Dave McCoy, followed by Michael
Jensen.

MR. MCCOY: Good evening. Dave McCoy, Citizen
Action.

The matter of the mixed-waste landfill has
been under contention for quite some time. The
documents have been kept secret from the public.
There's been three lawsuits over this thing. Citizen
Action got sued by the New Mexico Environment
Department to keep tech log documents secret from us
for three years until they laid down the dirt cover.
The tech log documents said that the transport -- Fate
& Transport model that Sandia Labs had given them was
defective based on a black box.

Anyhow, now the cockroaches are coming out
of the woodwork with these documents that I'm getting
about the political influence exercised to keep the
Region 6 environmental team from really getting a good
look at these problems. And the groundwater
protection advisory board asked for that oversight report from the EPA Region 6 years ago, along with Citizen Action. They still haven't gotten it and we haven't gotten it.

What I want to tell you, though, is NMED is planning on doing a public meeting on October 16th, I believe, for the long term monitoring and maintenance plans of the mixed-waste landfill. That plan is based on the defective monitoring wells that are in place out there and the defective data.

So I'm asking this board to ask the New Mexico Environment Department to hold a public hearing so that we can get some of this new evidence that's come out over the last seven years into the record. And I would really appreciate it if you would consider that request, because there is a lot of the new information. And I'm sorry, it just doesn't back up Sandia's story, and it doesn't back up the environment department's story.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Dave.

MS. JENKINS: Michael Jensen.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I'm sorry.

Mr. McCoy, Director, again, what standing do
we have in this situation, and where do we go with
this request essentially?

MR. MCCOY: So are you asking me?

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: No. I was going to ask the
director first, and then...

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Garduno,
last Friday, the water protection advisory board
reviewed this item, heard some testimony on this, and
they plan to be on the October agenda before you to
make a report on this issue. What I would suggest is
you hear that report and have some dialogue with them
at that time and determine what the proper course is
to proceed.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair, thank you.

Thank you, Director.

Mr. McCoy, does that sound like something
that would be -- you would be amenable to or at least
a first step?

MR. MCCOY: Well, I would suggest to the water
utility authority that it go and read the April 14th,
2010, inspector general report that was written in
relation to our complaint that we raised with Region 6
about the mixed-waste landfill. And these -- it's a
public meeting, and then the comment periods are
coming up so quickly and are going to be over so
quickly, that there really needs to be either a request for a delay, a little more time on this if the water protection advisory board is going to adequately review the matter. I sent them quite a bit of material to look at. And then subsequently, your review, based on what they give to you.

So I think there needs to be a letter going to NMED to tell them that you're interested in potentially a public hearing and that your advisory board is looking at this matter.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. McCoy.

Mr. Chair, if we could have that as part of the presentation and if need be, ask for a delay of action, as I understand it.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MS. JENKINS: Michael Jensen.

MR. JENSEN: My name is Michael Jensen. I work for Amigos Bravos. We're a statewide water quality organization with a national reputation for working with impacted communities. Tonight you're going to hear a presentation on the NPDES, the narcotic pollutant discharge elimination system permit, for the Southside Water Reclamation Plant. That presentation
is going to tell you that the new permit has been
under negotiation for almost three years and it will
take effect at the end of this month. The
presentation also indicates that the utility is still
considering appealing some of that permit.

I would like to urge you to tell the utility
to stop fighting conditions in the permit and get on
with its work. Reports you've received indicate a
looming crisis in the wastewater collection system.
Mr. Sanchez himself summed it up in spring of last
year to this board saying that if the huge backlog of
infrastructure problems wasn't dealt with, there would
be a system collapse.

The new permit requires, among other things,
that the utility make timely reports, increase its lab
operations, increase its monitoring, improve overall
system management, deal with fats, oil and grease, and
pay particular attention to ammonia, nitrogen, mercury
and other contaminants.

The presentation doesn't tell you why this
is being asked for. The reason is simple. The
utility has had ongoing violation of its existing
permit, failed to implement requirements stipulated by
EPA to stop those problems and won't deal with these
infrastructure issues for nearly a decade.
The EPA issued an administrative order in May last year for effluent exceedances, reporting failures and failure to prevent unauthorized discharges. This has a huge list of violations. It included mercury, ammonia, nitrogen and other things, exactly what the new permit required that they pay attention to.

There was another notice on June of this year for effluent exceedances and gave the utility 30 days to -- gave the utility a list of infrastructure projects to implement in the next seven years.

So I would just urge that the utility soldier up, get the work done, and stop wasting scarce resources on reviewing a permit that's long past due.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Do we have any more speakers?

MS. JENKINS: No.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. That concludes the general public comment.

We are now under announcements and communications. The next scheduled meeting is October the 17th of 2012 at 5:00 p.m. in the Vincent E. Griego Chambers.

We have no introductions tonight. We have the consent agenda items tonight.
Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I don't know if this is the appropriate time to bring this up, but I probably will embarrass Commissioner Hart Stebbins, but she deserves to be embarrassed because she did such a great job last Saturday.

Last Saturday was International Community Day in the Southeast part of the city, her district, but also my district, since they coincide. And it was an amazing get-together. The philharmonic orchestra played, as they do every year. And it was the 8th year.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Seventh.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: No, seventh. I'm thinking -- I'm looking for next year, I guess. But it was just an amazing community event. And I think it was enjoyed by everyone. And I can't help but make sure that -- many people have given the commissioner kudos, but I wanted to do it publicly and in this venue.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Councillor. I really appreciate that. Although I do have to give credit really to our county staff.

Amanda Colburn is the woman who's in our parks and rec
department who puts this together every year. And she
does a fabulous job. I regret every year that we
haven't gotten the word out a little bit better to
have invited more people. I think very late we
reached out to all of you with an invitation, but
every year we try to do better getting the word out.
But it is a wonderful event. Again, thanks to our
county staff who put it together.

And it was great to see you there,
Councillor, again. Thank you for your kind comments.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Let's go ahead and proceed. We are now
under approvals. The next item is Item 8, WUA
C-12-21, the reappointment to the water protection
advisory board. And Rick Shean is going to make that
presentation.

MR. SHEAN: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of
the Board. I'd like to put forward to you tonight the
reappointment of Dr. Jennifer Thatcher to the water
protection advisory board. Dr. Thatcher started
serving her term or completed a term for Susan Kelly,
who resigned from the board in March.

Dr. Thatcher is a professor, an associate
professor of economics, at the University of New
Mexico; received her Ph.D. from the University of
Colorado Boulder in economics. She has a broad
variety of environmental economic skills she brings to
the board, which we pride ourselves in having a broad
review, including attorneys and hydrologists,
engineers and research scientists.

So we request that she -- her membership be
reappointed and that can start the first of two
three-year terms that she would be eligible for.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: I move approval and
confirmation of WUA C-12-21 for Dr. Thatcher.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a
second. Any questions?

Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shean, what is Dr. Thatcher's attendance
record on prior meetings?

MR. SHEAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Perry, she's attended
86 percent of the meetings since March. So she's
missed one of seven meetings she's available to go to.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Any other questions?

Seeing none, we have a motion and a second
on the floor for confirmation.

Any questions? Seeing none, all those in
favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no?

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 9A approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is Item B, WUA C-12-22.

Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board of the authority, what's before you is an agreement with the federal bureau of reclamation to lease San Juan Chama water to them for river operations, specifically up to 10,000 acre feet. They would compensate the water authority at $100 an acre foot. We have done this in the past two or three times and would certainly recommend continuing to partner with them. It's in the interest of the Middle Rio Grande. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Let me go ahead and move WUA C-12-22.

COMMISSIONER DE LA CRUZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.
ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no?

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 9B approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Next item is Item C, WUA C-12-23, the recommendation of award. The RFQ, on-call construction services, 2012-1, plan facilities, Project Number 7893.

Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chair and Members of the Authority, this respects an RFQ, a request for qualifications of firms to be on call. We've started the practice of identifying more than one firm. What we found is if we select a qualified pool, we have jobs where we can get them to bid against each other, and we know they're already qualified. And we experienced a reduced cost over time for a lot of our projects.

So in this case we have before you five of six firms that applied. The sixth firm, you can tell by the score sheets, lacks experience.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second for approval. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.
ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no?

That carries unanimously.

(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 9C approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We are now on Item D, WUA C-12-24, the appointment to the water authority labor board.

Mr. Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, what's before you is the appointment of Wayne Bingham for an additional term. He is the water authority's representative. Our labor board has three members. One is appointed by the water authority, one by labor, and the two select the Chair.

Labor's current member is Carol Oppenheimer.

That will be before you at your next meeting. We just received a letter from the unions. And the current Chair is former Chief Justice Joseph Baca.

MR. PERRY: Move approval, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

Seeing none, all those in favor, signify by saying yes.

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Opposed, no?
That carries unanimously.
(5-0 vote. Agenda Item 9D approved.)

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: We are now under Item 10, other business, the presentation on national pollutant discharge elimination systems permit review. And Barbara Gastian will be making that presentation.

Welcome.

MS. GASTIAN: Thank you.

All right. Good afternoon, Members of to Board and, Mr. Chair, of course.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Do you want to speak into the microphone, Barbara, because we can't hear you.

MS. GASTIAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

MS. GASTIAN: I am Barbara Gastian. I've met some of you before. I've had that privilege. I'm the compliance subdivision manager. And it is the compliance division's responsibility to work with plan operations to assure that we understand things like permitting, all of the requirements that are necessary, the reporting functionality, and assuring that all of the reports are submitted in a timely fashion.

So I wanted to talk to you about the national pollutant discharge elimination system and do
a quick permit review with you. So this will be quick. And I do want you to understand, even with the folks on our staff that have a lot of experience and expertise, there's a lot of information here that -- to put their arms around, so feel free to ask questions.

What do we want to talk about? What is the NPDES permit? What is the permit process? What does the permit require us to do? And what's in the new permit?

What is an NPDES permit? The Clean Water Act authorizes the NPDES program for environmental protection of water bodies. The NPDES permit is a means by which the EPA regulates the discharge of pollutants into the environment from what we call point sources. So things like the sanitary sewer system is a point source. The water reclamation plant is a point source. Among other things, the permit tells us how clean the water needs to be before we discharge it to the receiving water; in this case, the Rio Grande.

This is a photo of the outfall from the Southside Water Reclamation Plant. And I know some of you have been to the plant. If not, just south of Rio Bravo Boulevard, on the bike path, you can have a
I think it's really important to see where the river -- where the rubber meets the road, so to speak.

What is the permit process? In 2009, the water authority submitted an application for renewal of the NPDES permit. The permit that we have actually expired in April of 2010, but we did apply in advance of that expiration. And because that permit was deemed -- excuse me, that application was deemed complete, the EPA allowed us to continue to operate the old permit until the new permit was issued.

In 2011, EPA proposed that new permit. The proposed permit underwent review and comment by the water authority, NMED, fish and wildlife service, the public and many, many others. There was a hearing process. There is a written comment submittal process as well. On August 30th of this year, EPA issued a new permit, and the effective date is September 30th of 2012.

There is a challenge. We do need to look very carefully at this permit, not only the compliance division staff, but all of our operations staff from the collections system, from the plant, from the soil amendment facility, and the laboratory, so that we can be prepared to meet the challenge within the 23 days that we have to do so between the time we receive the
permit and the effective date. There may be a chance that we will appeal some of these things, but please be assured that we're looking at it with a very close eye.

What does the permit require us to do?

Let's look at it from the point source perspective, the collection system, the sanitary sewer system. The collection systems group at Southside Water Reclamation Plant manages operates and maintains the collection system and prevents and responds to sanitary sewer overflows out in the streets, for example. The mandate, the permit contains specific requirements. And so that's the collection system, responsibility to mandates.

These two gentleman are members of our Vactor crew. I think perhaps you've seen them with these giant vacuum cleaners on trucks. These folks are out doing maintenance on the collections system itself. And indeed it is a giant vacuum. It will collect what has created a block and in the sanitary sewer system, or responding to a sanitary sewer overflow.

What does the permit require us to do in terms of the next point source? Users of the collection system in the Southside Water Reclamation...
Plant. The pretreatment program protects the collection system, the treatment plant processes and the workers by regulating the quantity about quality of wastewater that's discharged by the users.

To meet the mandate in the permit for the pretreatment program, we have the sewer use and wastewater control ordinance. That has prohibitions and limitations on the quantity and quality of what can be discharged into the sanitary sewer. So it covers things like permitted industries, septage haulers, hospitals, dental clinics. Restaurants, that's a biggie. Restaurants are particularly responsible for FOG; and we'll talk about FOG in a minute.

Again, we have the permits for industries and there are very specific requirements for inspections and monitoring and reporting. So indeed, the water authority regulates those industries and businesses according to the NPDES permit and EPA regulations.

This gentleman in the rear of this photo is our industrial waste engineer doing an inspection on a metal plating facility, and we regulate these very highly. They're routine monitoring events that take place at each of these facilities to assure they don't
discharge metals that would disrupt the operations of
the Southside Water Reclamation Plant and affect four
effluent quality limits.

The next point source would be the Southside
Water Reclamation Plant itself. The Southside Water
Reclamation Plant operations group treats wastewater
to desired standards before releasing the effluent to
the Rio Grande. The mandates and their -- in plural,
the requirements are based on EPA regulations and New
Mexico Environment Department and Isleta Pueblo water
quality standards specifically. There are mandates or
treatments for effluent quality and quantity, the
testing methods that we use in the laboratory, the
monitoring we do, where we take samples, how
frequently, how the samples are taken, how we handle
them until we get them to the lab, how quickly they
have to be processed.

And there are very specific monitoring
requirements. For the Southside Water Reclamation
Plant, we submit a monthly report, the discharge
monitoring report. And it has a lot of information,
but that's a good thing. It allows us to take a look
at the data, stay in touch with the data so we know
what's happening at the plant and in the plant
process.
As many of you know, this is the entrance location for the south side plant. For those of you who have not visited there, I would encourage you to get ahold of Mr. Sanchez and come for a visit. It's truly a fascinating process, and there's a lot going on there and has been for the last year.

The other regulatory mandates are the sewage sludge and biosolids mandates. The responsibility is the Southside Water Reclamation Plant operations group, and the soil amendment facility up on the West Mesa. Those groups work in tandem, and they're responsible for treatment, disposal and the reuse of the sludge in the biosolids. Sludge is the byproduct of the water treatment process.

There are mandates for the management practices we use, the quality limit, again, the testing methods monitoring that we do and reporting. We submit an annual report on the quality of our sludge and biosolids.

And this is a photo of the south side water -- excuse me, not south side -- soil amendment facility up on the West Mesa. This is a land application.

Other regulatory mandates for the Southside Water Reclamation Plant, any sewage spills at the
plant have to be reported 24 hours, five days, so there are very specific reporting requirements there as well.

The water quality lab, which is actually in the compliance division, plays a big part in these mandates. We maintain the laboratory operations to meet all of the EPA requirements. We perform the analyses and we report the results in a timely fashion. The results are used not only to satisfy the monitoring requirements and the reporting requirement but the plant uses the results to manage the plant.

Every day we have a report that comes out 10 minutes ago. We look at that and we know what changes operationally we'll have to make the next day. And that's a new tool that we have at the plant. And it's a very useful tool.

The collection system requirements, this is in the new permit. It's called CMOM and FOG. Capacity management operation and maintenance. We have to have a new policy in place within a year and implement it to emphasis the reduction of FOG: fats, oils and grease. The policy has to be approved by the USEPA and NMED, and we will have to redo our sewer use and wastewater control ordinance. And we have that process ongoing right now. So we've been working on
that for about a year. And the collection system
group have been working on the CMOM policy for about a
year at this time. So they had a meeting this
afternoon to address some of those issues, so I want
to assure you, we're making progress in that regard.
So we hope to have a draft policy by December.

There are effluent limit changes in the new
permit. There are many. And it takes some time to
sit down and, actually take a look at it. It's not
only what they're telling us we have to test, but how
we have to test, at what limit this is. So there are
a lot of things in the matrix. The effluent limits
that have been removed, the current permit has
seasonal limits. So we have two times of the year:
The summer, when the river flow is highest; and then
the other parts of the year, when the river flow is
lower. So we have these seasonal limits, and in
addition, we have quantity limits, quantities of
flows. So right now, our permit is based on six
potential conditions. As of the first of October, we
will have one, and that one condition will fly
year-around, irregardless of flows in the river. So
we are taking a very careful look at all of those
challenges and impacts that may result from that.

But the good news is, we do have some limits
that are removed. We have two metals, boron and molybdenum, that we know longer have to monitor. We'd have reduced monitoring frequencies. So for arsenic, instead of doing it weekly, we now go to monthly. However, there are challenges. We have no effluent limit that we need to look at, so we now have some things like the efficiencies which we did not have before. We had limits, quantitative limits. But now we have efficiency of the treatment limits. We'll meet that easily. But we need to look at those data, look at those processes and define if there are any changes that we need to make in preparation.

The more stringent limits on several items, ammonia is one of them. Total inorganic nitrogen, those are based upon the low flow in the low season. So there could be some challenges. We're looking at those things. There are new monitoring requirements for things like PCBs. There's increased monitoring frequencies. So for TIN, total inorganic nitrogen. So we're going from the weekly monitoring to daily monitoring. That has real impacts.

There are lower testing limits, which means if we're testing for arsenic at the current time at 10 parts per billion, we're soon going to .5 parts per billion through this magnitude down, and that requires
some change in the instrumentation, and some modification of our processes in the lab.

So what are some of the impacts? Ammonia and total inorganic nitrogen, we need more aeration. It's a difficult process to control. For those of you who have been at the plant, you've seen this, you know. There are other required operational changes. The operations group is looking at that now. And we're paying a lot of attention to how do we prepare to meet the new standards. We've been doing this for quite some time, the preparation phases.

Dissolved oxygen, there's a new requirement that was not in the proposed permit. We may need new equipment to meet that new standard. But we're evaluating those potentials at this time.

Mercury, when we moved from monitoring mercury on the monthly basis to weekly, we have a new $44,000 analytical bill for a much lower limit of mercury. We have to take that into consideration overall. It doesn't sound like a lot of money, but when you're trying to manage a laboratory, it can be. We'll do it, but we need to figure out how we move things around.

In terms of the laboratory, there are some impacts. We will have to have some staffing changes
so that we have staff that are certified to do certain tests available on weekends and on holidays. Previously, when we did the monitoring once a week, we could handle it. We still will handle it, but we have to move people around. Obviously, there will be some increased monitoring costs which we have to develop alternative testing methods for lower methods that are specified in the new permit. That is not a simple task. We can do that, but it does take some time. So we have people working on that even today, and six months ago, and a year ago.

Identification of accredited laboratories that are capable of lower testing limits. For example, PCBs, some of you may remember when we did the pharmaceuticals and personal care product testing, we sent the samples to a laboratory in Canada. It was the only laboratory that we could identify that could perform the test methods that EPA had specified. So we -- we have to look for some new laboratories that can do those kinds of work. The environment dependent is using the same Canadian laboratories that we are. So with that, I'll close. And if you have any questions, please let me know. I'd be happy to answer those questions.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Are there any questions?
Commissioner Hart Stebbins.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Of these changes, which ones do you think -- which aspects do you think you might potentially appeal?

MS. GASTIAN: We're still looking at that, Commissioner Stebbins. We're looking at DO, and I think that's very important.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: DO is?

MS. GASTIAN: Dissolved oxygen.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Okay.

MS. GASTIAN: The value there -- in the current permit, we have a limit of two, during low flow conditions, and four in higher river flow conditions. The new permit is five year-around. And we've done a lot of adjustment in our quality assurance and quality control in our sampling that indicate the results. Once we have control in the sampling, we'll have different results potentially. So we are looking at that and we've been spending a lot of our time and effort to evaluate that for some time. So that's a possibility. But we will not know. We'll make the decisions clearly this week.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Okay. And you
think that might be the only one?

MS. GASTIAN: It could possibly be. We may actually look at some of the ammonia and the total inorganic nitrogen. But at this point, again, we do not know. We are looking at data, we're looking at the operation processes. And we'll give it a very good review before we go forward, I assure you. We have, again, a lot of staff looking at it from a different -- many different perspectives.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Because they don't really give you a lot of time, do you they, but one month?

MS. GASTIAN: No, no.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: Okay.

MS. GASTIAN: But if that -- you know, we have -- they did present us last year with a proposed permit. So we do have some idea. But we really don't know what's the ultimate permit until it arrives on the 7th of September, and we have until October 1st to implement. So yes, you're exactly correct, we have 23 days.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: And then if you do appeal, what happens then? What's the process?

MS. GASTIAN: It goes to an environmental review board with the appeal. So we would submit that by the
effective date. And only the issues for which we appeal is there any recourse. So we would have to file that appeal in order to allow any further contemplation, if you will, of that part of the permit.

COMMISSIONER HART STEBBINS: All right. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Councillor Garduno.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In, your presentation, I think it was Page 8, anyway, it was talking about the vacuum debris. When those sewer lines are unclogged, is there any kind of analysis done of what is clogging up? I mean, is it shoes or -- what is in there?

MS. GASTIAN: Well, indeed, sir, they do do a visual inspection. And they -- every sanitary overflow report that we submit to EPA within 24 hours will say it's rags, it's FOG, it's roots, it's rope. Sometimes it's clothing. Sometimes it looks like someone opened a manhole and dumped their garbage there. So there's any number of things, and yes, we -- doesn't sound particularly delightful, but yes, our crews do do a visual inspection of each one of
COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And I assume that from that also, there's an analysis as to where maybe this debris is coming from?

MS. GASTIAN: Indeed. And after -- for many years, the pretreatment program works very closely with the sanitary sewer collection system folks, so they look at each one of those sanitary sewer overflows, visual inspections. If the pretreatment folks need to take samples, they will indeed do that. But oftentimes they go and do a house-to-house survey, or, as it might be, a business to business survey. So they will visit businesses to see if things like grease traps are actually installed and operating correctly. So there is much work that goes on regarding each one of those SSOs.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: And, Mr. Chair.

And thank you for that, but then I was going to go over to the metal plating facility that was also talked about. That is really dangerous chemicals that are used for that process. Are they required to capture the plating, whatever it's called, chemicals at the site, or how is that done? We did that with -- we did that with mercury with the dentist, so I assume this is the same?
MS. GASTIAN: Indeed it is the same. And for each industry, whether it's a plater or someone who does etching, or someone who produce chile. There is a specific treatment process that is detailed in the permit. The water authority issues a permit to each of those industries, and there's 70 of them right now, that specifies what treatment processes are allowable, and the treatment parameters in terms of monitoring, reporting for each of those treatment processes that that industry operates.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Mr. Chair.

Those are items that are introduced into the system. But I wanted to go to -- there was public comment about some infractions in the effluent that was delivered to the river. Did I understand that correctly, or did I not hear that?

MS. GASTIAN: Commissioner --

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I don't know. Maybe --

MS. GASTIAN: No, Councillor. I'm sorry. Councillor Garduno, I think you were talking about the effluent violations that we've had over the past.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right.

MS. GASTIAN: Indeed we are aware of those. The operations group is painfully aware. However, we have done far better in the last year and a half than we
had done in the previous year. So we are well aware of that, and we are making extreme efforts to operate that plant to reduce those violations.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The only other things that I wanted to mention is that, going forward, what are we going to do -- and I know this is not under the purview of the water authority, but, you know, drainage, or discharge, or storm water, what's going to happen there? It's going to end up, I think -- I don't know, Mr. CAO, is it going to come back to the water authority or is -- is that still a city item?

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Chair, Councillor Garduno, we had to apply for EPA for a storm water permit. That's entirely separate, and it's a situation that that's rather -- rather involved, complex, and hitting a lot of local governments and state governments, anybody that has a waterway basically. But we have a permit issued, that's been issued, and our permit is a conglomerate permit with Bernalillo County, the City of Albuquerque, UNM --

MS. GASTIAN: DOT.

MR. PERRY: DOT.
MS. GASTIAN: AMAFCA, and there's --

MR. PERRY: AMAFCA. There's about five people on our permit.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: I don't know, but I'd like to throw it out that maybe we can start giving the water authority more to do. But it seems to me like this water, that it should be something that -- and if the would city like to pitch in and help the water authority to capture that, maybe that's the only way we can do it. But, Mr. Director, Mr. Sanchez, am I giving you too much to do?

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, Councillor Garduno, I wish we could capture that water, but by law, we're unable to. You know, cannot dam and hold water for more than 96 hours. It must naturally flow into the river because of the interstate compacts.

COUNCILLOR GARDUNO: Right. And that's sort of counterintuitive, isn't it. Or sounds like it to me. If you have water that's contaminated and you want to cure it so it doesn't go into the waterway in a, you know, dangerous sense, wouldn't it make sense, if somebody who's well equipped to do that kind of remediation, that they should be the ones that receive that water and essentially protect the river, the waterway? But that's probably, as Chairman De La Cruz.
says, above our pay grade. So I'd like for us to
think about it.

CHAIRMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Are there any other
questions for Ms. Gastian?

Seeing none, thank you very much for your
presentation.

And this meeting is adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 5:54 p.m.)
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