



**REGIONAL WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RWRAC)  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING  
Conveyance Division  
3355 N. Dodge Blvd - Conference Room**

**Wednesday, January 6, 2016**  
**8:30 a.m.**

**Members Present:** Sheila Bowen (Vice Chair), Bob Iannarino (Chair), Matt Matthewson, Amber Smith, Ann Marie Wolf

**Others Present:** Jennifer C. Coyle (RWRD), Merva Douglas-Bridges (RWRD), Jackson Jenkins (RWRD), Ray Pagel (RWRD), Patrick McGee (FRMD), Jaime Rivera (RWRD), Lorraine Simon (RWRD), Jody Watkins (RWRD), Don Willhoit (RWRD)

**A. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Bob Iannarino (Chair) called the meeting to order. Meeting began at 8:30. Jody Watkins, Program Coordinator, Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (RWRD), took roll call.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

**C. Safety Share**

Patrick McGee, Division Manager, Finance and Risk Management Department (FRMD) provided a Safety Share. He threw his back out, lifting and turning, when he was working around the house this past weekend. His advice is to use your legs and not your back when lifting. Also please don't twist and turn when lifting objects.

**D. Call to the Audience**

None

**E. Approval of Minutes**

Meeting Minutes for November 20, 2015

Sheila Bowen (Vice Chair) made a motion to approve the minutes. Matt Matthewson seconded. Meeting minutes were approved.

Meeting Minutes for December 3, 2015

Mr. Iannarino had a couple of corrections he noted to the minutes for the December 3, 2015 meeting. On page two there was a typographical error with the word NASSCO. On page four he requested that the sentence, that states that were design deficiencies with the ROMP project that were not originally planned, be paraphrased. Jackson Jenkins, Department Director, confirmed that investigations are underway to determine the cause and assume liability of additional items that were not initially discovered during the completion of ROMP.

Ann Marie Wolf made a motion to approve the minutes with the corrections noted. The Committee agreed unanimously to approve the meeting minutes.

**F. Discussion/Action**

**1. Commence Review of Each Project in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 2016/17**

Mr. Iannarino advised the Committee that a review of each project in the CIP is being commenced. He stated that there is a deadline for the CIP Sub-Committee to recommend the adoption of the proposed CIP budget to FRMD by Friday, January 8, 2016. Jennifer C. Coyle, Special Assistant to the Director, RWRD, confirmed that there are internal deadlines in submitting the budget request for the next five-year plan of the CIP. Mr. McGee elaborated that the requested budgets go to Chuck Huckelberry, County Administrator, for his review and adjustments. From there the requested budgets move on to the Board



## WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

of Supervisors (BOS) for approval. The County departments have a cutoff of this Friday, January 8, 2016, to have the budgets ready for Mr. Huckelberry. Following the January 8, 2015 deadline, FRMD has a week to make any adjustments or corrections. Mr. Iannarino stated he had thought the objective for the CIP Sub-Committee was to have a consensus adopted to provide back to the Finance Sub-Committee, which is meeting today, on what the CIP budget is going to be. Ms. Wolf stated there is still time. The recommendation still would go to the Regional Wastewater Reclamation Advisory Committee (RWRAC) full committee. The RWRAC full committee would then write a letter of recommendation to the BOS. The recommendation of the CIP Sub-Committee may be different than that of the Department. Mr. Iannarino said the impact the CIP has on the debt service is miniscule. Mr. Jenkins advised the group that last year the CIP budget was reduced by \$10 - \$15 million and the amount recommended for the rate increase was 2 – 3%. There was some impact.

Jaime Rivera, RWRD CIP Section Manager, referred to the DRAFT FY 2016/17 CIP Proposed Budget. He stated that FY 2015/16 is underway right now, we are halfway through the budget. He explained that projects that have dollar amounts in the column for FY 2015/16 are currently under design or construction. If there are projects that have dollar amounts listed for FY 2015/16, with nothing listed for FY 2016/17, these projects will be complete by the end of this fiscal year. These projects are already committed to the contract, and the Committee would not have any influence on the completion of these projects. Projects with dollar amounts for both FY 2015/16 and 2016/17, are currently either in design or in construction this Fiscal Year and will be complete by the end of FY 2016/17. These projects can finish the design already committed and delay construction, or if the project is already under construction the Department is committed to complete the project. The projects the Committee has more leeway in influencing are the ones that are blank in the column for FY 2015/16 and begin with FY 2016/17 or other subsequent years. This means the project is intended to start design next fiscal year or other subsequent years. These are the projects that the Committee can discuss and evaluate.

Mr. Iannarino used the example, beginning with line item 13, begins in FY 2016/17, in the amount of \$1,225,000, is discretionary. Mr. Rivera clarified that this item is reflecting projects that are being developed now. The amount in line 13, matches the items in the orange columns, which are buckets of dollars set aside now, until they can be reflected in the Finance budget. These items are not being double counted.

Mr. Jenkins noted that there is \$8 million for buildings and infrastructure that has not yet began, that was a part of the Regional Optimization Master Plan (ROMP). ROMP was an expansion and an upgrade; but there are parts of the old Ina Road facility that were never touched that are old and need rehabilitation. Mr. Rivera added this is for line item 24.

Mr. Iannarino, what's the pleasure of the committee? To review those items that may have some discretionary criteria? To look at what is the necessity for completing the projects and budgeting by line item basis. Mr. Jenkins suggested that Department staff inform the Committee what the listed projects are for. Ms. Bowen suggested to highlight the criteria based on the scoring sheet (i.e.: safety or regulatory).

Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Rivera provided an explanation on the projects. Discussion and questions followed.

### Treatment

Line 14, Avra Valley Emergency Overflow Basin. The Avra Valley Wastewater Reclamation Facility (WRF), a 4 million gallon a day (MGD) facility, does not have an emergency overflow basin (EOB). An emergency overflow basin is a temporary holding pond for incoming flows, when issues occur with the plant operations. There is a need to install this EOB to hold up to one day's worth of wastewater flows. This project is currently in design. The construction would begin in FY 2016/17. Currently recharge basins are being used at Avra Valley. Questions arose on the buffer for capacity at the plant, what type of permit this facility operates under, the contingency plan in handling excess flows. Mr. Iannarino commented that this is a safety issue.

Line 17, Emergency Overflow Basin #4 Improvements. The Tres Ríos WRF has three EOBs in place, that total 17 MGD. These are used quite often during storm events, power outages, and plant shut down activities for cleaning and maintenance. The WRF has a capacity of 50 MGD. Each EOB can hold flow for only eight hours. Installing this fourth EOB would give one entire day to hold the flows. Having the fourth EOB is a Best Management Practice, but not a regulatory issue. There is a safety factor to mobilize staff at a plant facility.

The Committee members all agreed that items 14 and 17 should both be complete.

Line 16, Corona de Tucson Wastewater Treatment Facility Ultraviolet (UV) Disinfection and Filtration. When the Corona de Tucson facility was built, it was a one MGD closed loop reactor, with no disinfection. The disinfection method being used is Soil



## WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

Aquifer Treatment (SAT). The SAT method uses the ground to be the cleaning system. This is an acceptable method, but the wastewater facility must demonstrate that this works. The flow does not all go through the soil. Laboratory samples come back with coliform or bacteria findings. The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) is saying this is not acceptable. A design has been complete for a UV disinfection. This is costly however, with a cost estimate of \$2-3 million. Bids have been obtained for chlorine disinfection, at an estimated cost of \$1 million. The low bids came in at \$1.6 million. This project is required for the Department to meet permit requirements. This is a regulatory issue. Construction on this project is scheduled to begin in February 2016 and will wrap up next Fiscal Year.

Line 19, Green Valley WRF Future Development Plan. The design for the rotation of lift station that is in Quail Creek, is located outside of the plant, and under a flood plain. The intent is to move the lift station inside the plant, which is on higher ground and outside of the flood area. This would save the Department from having to build a huge barrier to protect the Green Valley WRF from the 100-year rain event. Another part of this project is the recharge basin. Currently water is being sent to Robson for recharge. The flows at the Green Valley WRF are 2 MGD, of which the Department is obligated to provide to Robson Communities 1 MGD by contract. The Department would like to obtain their own recharge credits. There is work needed to be done to capture the recharge into basins at the Green Valley facility. This will involve plumbing to existing basins to get the recharge basins built. Completing this would provide the Department with revenue credits.

Line 20, Two Additional Centrifuge Sludge Screens – Tres Ríos. This is phase two that installed one screen in the centrifuge building. The benefit of completing this project is to remove extra debris that can be very labor intensive on the centrifuge unit. Two more filters are needed to clean out the debris from the pumps and equipment. This involves purchasing the equipment and having it installed. Currently, the centrifuge units are cleaned weekly. Having this new equipment would require cleaning be done monthly, instead of weekly. Completing this project would save the Department on centrifuge maintenance costs, save wear and tear on the equipment, and staff costs.

Line 22, Tres Ríos Sludge Holding Tank. A bladder (lagoon that holds the liquid biosolids) is used for sludge that pumps into the tankers that go out into the fields. The bladder is about 40 years-old, and has been maintained and rehabilitated several times. This unit is not pumping well with the deep wet well. This has resulted from the change in newer treatment processes, with the sludge being thicker and gummier. This project would put an above-ground tank to make it easier for the pumps to move the sludge and fill the tankers. This would be more efficient for the pumps. The current bladder tank is working; however, it is operating slower with more work and time to flush out the sludge.

Line 23, SCADA WAN Infrastructure Upgrade. Currently at Tres Ríos there is 80% of a new plant facility, with 20% remaining of an old plant facility, that needs to be brought up to the new standards. Completing this project would update the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) remaining from the old Ina Road plant facility to the standards of the new Tres Ríos facility. This is an infrastructure upgrade to update the entire Tres Ríos facility with the new SCADA technology.

Line 21, SE Houghton Area Recharge Project. This project is not up for negotiation. This is a settlement with Tucson Water for the Speedway Sinkhole. This is an environmental project for a recharge basin at Houghton and Irvington Road. This project is ready for construction. Tucson Water will pay for the project upfront and the Department will pay them a portion of the costs.

Line 30, Tres Ríos – Nutrient Recovery Program. This project is for the struvite recovery. Currently ferric chloride is being used, at a cost of almost \$1 million annually, to prevent struvite from forming in the pipes. The proposed recovery system, at a cost of \$ 7 million, will eliminate the need to add in ferric chloride in the wastewater treatment process. The struvite will provide a sellable product, fertilizer that will pay for itself in seven to eight years. If the cost recovery extends beyond this time frame, the Department may decide to forgo this project. A question arose on the life expectancy of the technology used for the project.

Line 37, Green Valley – Two Additional Secondary Clarifiers and Line 38, Green Valley – Disk Filter Cover and Crane. Mr. Iannarino had a question on the projected budget FY 2019/20. Merva Douglas Bridges, RWRD CIP Tracking Support Manager, replied that these numbers are so far out, the budget for these items is still being negotiated. The buckets are being maintained up to a certain point, but since FY 2019/20 is still so far out there is more flexibility with projects that go into the system. Mr. Jenkins added that the Department budgets for \$30 million to be spent annually on Treatment and Conveyance CIP projects. Money is placed in buckets, for future years spending. Other projects, such as Aerospace Corridor, that the BOS approved, \$7 million must also come from the CIP budget. The Department has to have the money set aside to pay for this.



**PIMA COUNTY**  
WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

Line 31, Tres Ríos WRF – Biogas Sales & Utilization. The \$400,000 cost is for the Department to get the pipes installed for another firm to complete the project using a Design-Build-Finance-Own-Operate (DBFOO) procurement method. Once the project is complete, The Department would receive revenue from the gas sold.

There were several comments and questions raised. What do connection fees fund? Mr. Jenkins replied that the fees collected go toward Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs, debt servicing, and CIP projects. Some of the items mentioned are efficiency related. Have some of the items listed been pushed out and delayed from prior years? Another question arose, if some of the projects previously mentioned were efficiency projects and have these already been moved out further back in the schedule. Mr. Rivera answered that Corona de Tucson has been on the books for many years. Mr. Jenkins added that the Department will receive a Consent Order from ADEQ if this project does not get completed. The Centrifuge project is an efficiency project that will improve operations at the Tres Ríos WRF. The efficiency of a proposed Tres Ríos Sludge Holding Tank. Regarding the recharge credits at the Green Valley WRF, the lift station is functioning now in a flood plain. Mr. Iannarino asked the Committee if everyone is in consensus for the Treatment CIP projects.

### **Conveyance**

Mr. Jenkins summarized that the Committee gained an understanding at the last meeting of how the CIP process works for identifying projects utilizing the Closed-Captioned-Television (CCTV) and maintenance program for planning and prioritizing. There are more buckets in the outer years, with the details forthcoming. A discussion ensued regarding the CIP for Conveyance projects. A comment was made that interceptors require additional rehabilitation. Mr. Jenkins clarified that this depends—some of the interceptor lines are over 50 years old, others last only 20 years. Another comment was the spreadsheet that had all of the identified projects that are known of today, what is going into the CIP budget in the early years is a fraction of the big list. Mr. Rivera replied that some projects, such as MR818 (manholes) and MRPs (pipelines) are a fraction of the identified work being assigned for a particular project for a fiscal year period. This is a way to chip away at the bigger list.

Line 70, System-Wide Conveyance Rehabilitation Program. This is a bucket reserved for the South Rillito Interceptor (SRI) project. The Charter is not complete yet on this project.

Line 77, Minor Rehabilitation Projects FY 16/17. A question arose if the Department typically spends \$10 million a year for these projects. Mr. Rivera replied the commitment is \$10 million a year. Last year the Department spent \$13-\$14 million. This number may eventually go down. More will be known on the pipe conditions once the CCTV program goes into its second 10-year cycle. A question arose on how much of the first 10-year CCTV schedule has been complete. There are buckets set aside for unanticipated repairs, such as the Pines housing subdivision in Marana. A question arose if the Aerospace Corridor project comes online next year, FY 16/17, does this reduce the CIP budget to complete some of these minor rehabilitation projects? Mr. Jenkins replied that large projects such as the Aerospace Corridor, does have an impact on the total CIP budget.

Mr. Iannarino, stated the program the Department has in place for Conveyance maintenance and rehabilitation is very proactive.

### **Augmentation – Growth and development.**

Mr. Jenkins stated that the Department pays for these costs, not a developer.

Line 116, Aerospace Parkway Sewer Extension. This was initially budgeted for \$300,000, about \$16 per foot for each mile. The detailed estimate is closer to \$450,000 – \$500,000. This is why the Department reserves an amount in the bucket for projects. As the design gets more refined for a project, and the bids come in, then a more exact estimate will be determined. As the Project Manager gets more information, they adjust the budgeted forecasted amount. The Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) engineer for this project has been selected. Design will begin next month and continue for about one year, for this 14-mile design. Once the design is complete, the construction for the CMAR will begin. Once the final design is complete, the budgeted numbers may go up or down based on the forecast. The timeframe and spend rate are both also factors in the project cost.

Item 113, SE Interceptor Augmentation. This project needs to be complete. This pipeline is already at its capacity. Additionally,



## WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

the location of this interceptor is at the end point of the Aerospace Corridor. The SEI has to be complete before work can be done on the Aerospace Corridor project. This project is in process already, with construction starting in April.

Line 111, Connection of the Fairgrounds WRF to the Conveyance System. The plan is to tie the Fairgrounds to the SEI to get out of the current lagoon system. Mr. Matthewson asked if there is more money for this project in the out years or is it complete in FY 2019/20? Mr. Jenkins replied the anticipated timeframe for this project is 2-3 years.

Line 105, Speedway BL - Warren to I-10 Augmentation. This project was already planned because this area is reaching the 75% capacity mark that the Department is mandated not to exceed. Once the 75% capacity threshold is reached, the line needs to be upgraded and made bigger. Much capacity has been used up around the University of Arizona, due to many of the high rise buildings that have recently been added. The pipeline near the Banner University Hospital is near capacity for infill growth. For any more growth in the area, the UA will need to put in a new pipeline at their cost.

Line 106, 22nd Street Alvernon Way to Swan Rd Augmentation. This pipeline is full and needs to be augmented. Chapman was the last business coming on, and the Department completed an analysis. Every week the Department receives readings on the flows. If anything else comes online in this area, even a few houses, the Department has to complete this project. Otherwise, there will be a sanitary sewer overflow occur in this area and the Department will be in violation. This is a regulatory requirement and the Department is moving ahead on this project.

Questions and much discussion followed. The comments and questions specifically, pertaining to the Aerospace Corridor project are as follows. The Aerospace Corridor project which has been hugely identified as economic development. This seems like an impact fee, or connection fee, not being paid. The general fund of the County, to where all of the economic development revenue is coming into through taxes, should have a line item that would pay this as opposed to spreading these costs to all of the users. Mr. Jenkins responded that this is done through the BOS and they are not going to touch the County general fund. There is not a slush fund to cover that expense that would benefit the general fund with the development activity. There is \$12 million that existing users would have to pay for the Aerospace Corridor project. Mr. Jenkins responded that the AeroSpace Corridor Augmentation, is about \$18 million. This would have some impact on the rates charged to sewer customers to cover this cost. Many projects are being deferred to complete the Corridor project. The total Aerospace Corridor project is \$45 million. The Committee is only looking at \$18 million of it. The Department can handle \$5 million of this project per year in the outer years. A question was asked when did the BOS make a decision to add the Aerospace Parkway. Is the Department trying to hold together a five-year plan that was deliberated prior to the addition of this project? Mr. Rivera stated when the Aerospace Corridor was added, the Speedway Boulevard – Warren Avenue Augmentation project got pushed back two years. A comment was expressed that the bigger picture here is for job creation and economic development. This project has been deferred already for several years, based on the assumption that the burden should not be placed on the customer base. The bigger picture has significant benefits to the community as a whole. Mr. Matthewson asked the Committee if the Aerospace Corridor is already a done deal, and it makes no sense to anguish over this project. Ms. Wolf responded this project is not yet a done deal. It is the Committee's responsibility to state that user fees should not pay for this project and it should be funded through some other mechanism. Also, the Aerospace Corridor project defers other projects that were already planned.

The \$5 million spend rate that is being projected for FY 2018/19, and the ability under the current Five-Year Plan to keep that bottom line fixed, with the maintenance side of the CIP decreasing, is that clear to everyone that this is occurring? The condition of the sewer system is either accelerating in its decay or holding its own, there could be a shock value that the Committee needs to make known. There is a list of known identified projects which need to be complete and are continuing to be pushed back. Eventually this could lead to another expensive project similar to ROMP down the road. ROMP was over \$600 million.

User fees should not be paying for augmentation work. Connection fees are impact fees, even if a developer offered an incentive to be credited or not charged for the work, there still is another department in the County that has to put that money into that pot to offset it. The impact fees ultimately do get paid. Last year the CIP was reduced by \$10-\$15 million, which dropped the amount of the requested rate increase by 1%. This scenario should be used with next year's proposed budget, to see what the result would be. Mr. Jenkins stated that this exercise could be done at the upcoming Financial Sub-Committee meeting. There are projects that need to be complete. The priority should be placed on the Department's need to maintain the system. There are other unplanned projects the Department is told they must complete. The question is who is going to pay for it, the developer or the users? The developer pays connection fees to offset some of the cost. Specific offsets should be in place to track connection fees to quantify and make for a stronger argument to the BOS. A letter needs to be provided to the



## WASTEWATER RECLAMATION

BOS that the RWRAC supports this plan, but changes have occurred.

These augmentation projects are because new development is coming. New development has to pay connection fees to cover the costs of augmentation. Mr. Jenkins replied it has to be ready now, for 20 years to come. When the Committee makes their recommendation to the BOS, it should reflect the findings include that the Department is requesting a fee increase for due to higher costs (Aerospace Corridor, unfunded mandates in the Information Technology system, etc.) that need to be covered. Mr. Jenkins stated that it was the \$600 million costs for ROMP that has placed the Department in this financial situation. The Department is still continuing to spend and paying for that big investment that is tremendously positive for the community. Pima County now has some of the best sewer infrastructure in the country now. Mr. Jenkins said he is comfortable with the proposed five-year CIP budget, but it will indicate that a rate increase is necessary.

Some of these projects are not in line with real project delivery times. When is it the Department's responsibility to be out ahead of future growth and when is it a developer, or business, or general funds responsibility? Currently there is no mechanism for that. Typically, the developer builds out capacity and provides this to the Department. Augmentations have not in the past been a big part, but now they are starting to be a big part. The Department is now being mandated to fund many of these projects. Mr. Rivera added these are investments in the future. The capacity that is there, the Department pays for it. If a developer wanted to pay for capacity, and it's not available, they wouldn't get a permit. These are investments the Department has to pay for upfront, and the money will come in later. The Department will recoup some of this investment in connection fees sometime later. Mr. Jenkins stated that at the Finance Meeting, a discussion will follow on how these projects could affect the debt service ratio.

### Utility Coordination

Mr. Jenkins informed the Committee that these projects are mandated. There is no discussion required. The Department is required to pay on these projects. This occurs whenever a utility line is moved. This category also includes ROMP, this is the last year any money will be spent on ROMP.

Mr. Jenkins stated the CIP budget reflects \$40 million for the next few years, and then drops in the \$30 million range in the outer years. If other types of unforeseen projects, such as the Aerospace Corridor project, the budget amount will have to be higher. The requested totals for the five-year CIP budget may change slightly when presented to the Finance Department. These numbers reflect a snapshot in time. Mr. Iannarino had questions on the difference in numbers reported. Ms. Wolf asked if Mr. Iannarino was looking at what the CIP Sub-Committee wants to recommend to the Finance Sub-Committee. Ms. Wolf and Mr. Matthewson stated there doesn't appear to be anyplace to reduce the items of the proposed Five-Year CIP budget. Mr. Iannarino asked for a motion.

There were additional questions and discussion raised from the Committee members. If the \$40 million requested for the first three years, which drops off to \$30 million in the least two years pertains to the Aerospace Corridor. Mr. Jenkins explained the higher amounts for the first three years are to pay off ROMP, the North Rillito Interceptor, South Rillito Interceptor, and other big projects wrapping up. The last two years are too far off to completely forecast ahead. Mr. Iannarino asked if the proposed debt service additional borrowing, one line item for \$32 million, is to cover the CIP program. Mr. Jenkins responded the Operations and Maintenance budget requested for next fiscal year is the same as this past year. The CIP budget projection is the same as was projected as last year. Connection fees have dropped \$2 million. The Department saved on expenses for some items.

**ACTION:** Ms. Wolf made a motion to support the FY 2016/17 proposed CIP budget as presented to the Finance Sub-Committee; with the caveat the Finance Sub-Committee understands that funding the augmentation will have an impact on user fees. Mr. Matthewson stated everything revolves around the 15-year financing of ROMP. If that got strung out the pressure would be gone. The more light that can be shed on that decision as being the continuing cause of the stresses with this program. Mr. Matthewson seconded. Mr. Iannarino asked for any discussion from the Committee.

Mr. Jenkins stated that if the \$18 million budgeted for the Aerospace Corridor was removed from the five-year budget, the amount of the requested rate increase would go down.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bowen requested to share Mr. Matthewson's comment to the Finance Sub-Committee meeting later today. Mr. Iannarino asked if both Agenda items one and two were covered with today's meeting discussion. The Committee concurred that yes, both items were covered.



**PIMA COUNTY**  
**WASTEWATER RECLAMATION**

**2. Exercise in How Reductions to the CIP Budget Affects the Debt Service Ratio**  
Covered above

**3. Investigate Alternatives of Other Funding Sources for CIP Projects**  
Mr. Iannarino asked if there was discussion on item three, alternative funding sources for CIP. He expressed he would like to discuss funding sources, it might not necessarily be about funding sources for CIP, but it might be more for a discussion with the Finance Sub-Committee. It concerns holding so much money in reserve. There is \$110 million. In the private sector this is retained earnings. Is there an alternative way to get the Department out of the mandated debt service ratio, of everything bonded before 2010? Open up the discussion for what other opportunities are out there for CIP funding. He brought up the possibility of Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (WIFA) loans. Mr. Jenkins responded WIFA loans are still instruments that have interest payments and a timeframe. You can obtain the same results from obligations and Certificates of Participation. There is the expenditure limitation the County is under. The Department could use more of their cash, but that would exceed the expenditure limitation. He questioned if this can be thrown to the legislature or is this a voter issue. Mr. Matthewson expressed there may be an exception to that for capital projects. This could be subject to a voter approval requirement.

Mr. Iannarino asked, given the CIP Sub-Committee's recommendation and the Friday budget deadline, is there a need to continue this Committee necessary? Mr. Jenkins said the motion was to pass the FY 2016/17 CIP Proposed Budget. He wants the Committee to understand that the actual budget numbers will be slightly different. Ms. Smith stated she understands the process the Department uses and the decisions being made.

**ACTION:** Ms. Wolf motioned to make a statement to the Finance Sub-Committee that the CIP Sub-Committee understands and approves the process the Department uses to develop their proposed CIP budget. The CIP Sub-Committee supports any additional minor changes. Ms. Smith seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Jenkins said as a follow up to your additional question, does this committee need to meet? Ms. Wolf responded there may be additional changes to the budget which the Committee has not yet seen. Mr. Iannarino expressed he would like to receive some follow up input from the Finance Sub-Committee. Mr. Matthewson stated one of the Committee's assignments in the charter by Ordinance is to review and report to the governing body on the long-term 10-year capital needs for the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Iannarino asked if the Committee needs to meet to discuss the 10-year program. Ms. Wolf stated in the past there has been information presented at meetings on the 10-year capital needs program.

**G. Call to the Audience**

None

**H. Future Agenda Items**

Look at 10-year capital needs in the Ordinance  
Is the purpose of CIP Sub-Committee still necessary?  
Understand County deadlines for financing target dates

**I. Schedule Next Meeting Date**

Tentatively set for January 13, 2016, 8:30 a.m. The outcome if another meeting is necessary will be decided later today at the Finance Sub-Committee meeting.

**J. Adjournment**

Ms. Wolf made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Bowen seconded. Meeting adjourned at 10:31a.m.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE:**

Tentative January 13, 2016  
8:30 a.m.  
Conveyance