

JOINT WASTEWATER FACILITIES COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA

Monday, August 3, 2009, 10:00 AM, at the
Donner Summit Public Utility District, Board Room
53823 Sherritt Lane, Soda Springs, CA. 95728

1. Call to Order - Chairman
2. Appointment of Committee Co-Chair- Committee
3. Approval of Minutes of the June 26, 2009 Committee Meeting
4. ECO:LOGIC – J. Hauser, R. Emerick
 DSPUD Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Facilities Plan Scope
5. Acceptance of Facilities Plan Scope- Committee
6. Project Updates
 - a. Cost estimate to expand anoxic zones in Plants 1 and 2
 - b. 2009 spring/summer biostimulation report
7. Correspondence
 - a. Letter dated July 2, 2009, from Mike Livak, Royal Gorge, Supporting Future Staged Additional Capacity
 - b. Letter dated July 10, 2009, from Wade Freedle, SLCWD Board President, Stating SLCWD's Request for 80 Additional EDUs
 - c. Email comment from Joe Gray dated July 24, 2009 regarding the treatment and disposal facilities plan scope.
 - d. Email comment from Joe Gray dated July 27, 2009 regarding the DSPUD 2009 spring/summer biostimulation report and work plan.
 - e. Email from Bernard Pech dated July 27, 2009 regarding statement in the biostimulation report about the 303(d) requirements.
8. Next Meeting
9. Public Participation*
10. Adjourn

* Any member of the public desiring to address the Committee on a matter on the Agenda before or during the Committee's consideration of that item may do so. After receiving recognition from the Committee Chair, please give your Name and Address (City) and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please limit your comments to the specific topics of discussion.

Tom Skjelstad

From: Joseph Gray [joseph-gray@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2009 4:59 PM
To: Tom Skjelstad
Cc: Al Cheryl Le Bel; Amber Green; anna nickerson; Christopher Parker; dianna Smith; Geoffrey O. Evers; Jason Rainey; Lynn Hall; Mike Livak; Susan Snider; Blake Tresan; Kathryn Gray; Bernard & Joan Pech
Subject: Comments for the Joint Facilities Meeting

Tom and all:

Thank you for the agenda and documents for the upcoming joint facilities meeting. Unfortunately, I will be in Colorado on August 3rd, so I won't be able to attend.

Here are my comments, which I would hope are considered at the meeting.

1) **Study the current plant first.** How much would the study cost if it were directed to look at fixing the current plant only? Perhaps just address alternatives 1 and 2 which deal with retaining the existing infrastructure. A phase 2 study can always be funded in the future if the conclusion is that the current plant can't be fixed.

2) **Do not study Seasonal Storage at this time.** Since the amount of seasonal storage, and even the need for it, is dependent upon the results of the bio-stimulation study, it does not seem appropriate to include items 13 and 14 (seasonal storage and changes to spray irrigation due to it) in the facilities plan at this time. Those two items can be addressed separately, if needed, when the bio study is complete, and do not effect the rest of the plan. Removing those two items reduces the Plan budget by **\$51,716**.

3) **Temperature Mitigation.** Temporary covers for winter use only, and for the critical tanks only (do all tanks need covered?), should be considered. This should include the use of floating styrofoam or other insulating objects instead of just considering rigid covers.

4) **Capacity.** Emphasis should be upgrades or fixes to satisfy the current flows and loads as a baseline, and then look to how much more capacity each alternative can handle, and at what cost. This allows the two district boards to see the cost differences between alternatives that just satisfy current ratepayers, vs ones that provide 5% more capacity, 10% more, 25% more, 50% more, etc. This would also indicate to future development interests, such as Royal Gorge, whether their needs can be accommodated, and how much it will cost them to have them included.

Joe

On Jul 24, 2009, at 2:25 PM, Tom Skjelstad wrote:

<august32009jtcommtg.pdf>

Tom Skjelstad

From: Joseph Gray [joseph-gray@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2009 1:46 PM
To: Tom Skjelstad
Cc: Al Cheryl Le Bel; Amber Green; anna nickerson; Christopher Parker; Kathryn Gray; dianna Smith; Geoffrey O. Evers; Jason Rainey; Lynn Hall; Mike Livak; Susan Snider
Subject: Re: Biostimulation Report

Tom,

Thanks for the reports. So far the biostim study seems to say the 2008 bloom is a mystery and may remain that way, which could imply that a huge spring bloom is unlikely to happen again. The suggested next steps look good.

A possible source to consider for the nutrients that caused last year's bloom may be the residual lake in Van Norden meadow. Besides being a marshy, it has been used to graze sheep in the recent past, and there could be lots of pockets of "nutrients" ready to be released, as might have happened last year. The residual lake may also heat the water, also leading to algae growth. Unfortunately, it doesn't explain why last year's growth was only below the discharge point.

One wonders if it might be a good idea to take down the remaining Van Norden spillway so it no longer holds back any water? I wonder if there could be any watershed restoration grant money available for that.

Joe

On Jul 27, 2009, at 12:02 PM, Tom Skjelstad wrote:

As promised, attached is the biostimulation work plan and report for spring 2009.
<DONN09-003_Biostimulation Workplan 07-09.pdf><Attachment A.pdf><Attachment B.pdf><Attachment C.pdf><Attachment D.pdf><Attachment E.pdf>

Tom Skjelstad

From: Bernard Pech [bj.pech@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2009 3:15 PM
To: Tom Skjelstad
Subject: Re: Biostimulation Report

More exactly, I could not find the text related to:

"This procedure requires all land users in the watershed to be party to the solution."

On Mon, Jul 27, 2009 at 3:13 PM, Bernard Pech <bj.pech@gmail.com> wrote:

Looking at the Act, I could not find the specific relevant section. No need to answer at this point, as it can be addressed at the meeting. Bernard.

On Mon, Jul 27, 2009 at 2:18 PM, Bernard Pech <bj.pech@gmail.com> wrote:

I read the report and the appendix. Excellent work from my layman viewpoint. One of the items which attracted my attention, and I did not know about is the reference to section 303D of the Clean Water Act (see attachment).

Bernard

On Mon, Jul 27, 2009 at 11:46 AM, Tom Skjelstad <tskjelstad@dspud.com> wrote:

As promised the biostimulation work plan and report from spring 2009