



Public Notice Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02

April 4, 2019

TO: Members of the Sub-Regional Operating Group Committee of the Joint Municipal Water Reclamation System

FROM: Ms. Holly Rosenthal, Chair, Tempe

SUBJECT: **MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

Wednesday, April 10, 2019 – 11:00 a.m.
AMWUA Office - Boardroom
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 1550
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

The next meeting of the Sub-Regional Operating Group Committee will be held at the above time and place. If you have any questions, please call the AMWUA office.

AGENDA – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes of the February 13, 2019 Meeting
3. Set Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 8, 2019, at 11:00 a.m.

4. Consideration of Items for Consent

The following items listed under the consent agenda will be considered as a group and acted upon by one motion with no separate discussion of said items unless a Committee member so requests. In that event, the item(s) will be removed from the agenda for separate action.

A. Recommendation to Enter into a Contract with RFI - Pipe/Equipment Coating CA&I

At their March 21, 2019 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee authorize the City of Phoenix to enter into a contract with RFI for an amount not to exceed \$500,000 to provide CA&I services related to the 91st Avenue Pipe and Equipment Coating Project.

Please refer to Agenda Item #4A.

5. Joint Exercise of Power Agreement (JEPA) Negotiations

This is a standing item on the agenda in the event the Committee would like to discuss the JEPA negotiations.

6. Meeting of the SROG Advisory Committee

Please refer to the agenda and minutes from the March 21, 2019 SROG Advisory Committee meeting.

7. Future Agenda Items

8. Adjournment

*The order of the agenda may be altered or changed by the SROG Managers Committee. More information about AMWUA and SROG public meetings is available in the AMWUA office, online at www.amwua.org/what-we-do/public-meetings, or by request.

SUB-REGIONAL OPERATING GROUP COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

February 13, 2019

MEMBERS

Steven White for Holly Rosenthal, Tempe, Chair
Brian Biesemeyer, Scottsdale
Craig Johnson, Glendale
Brandy Kelso, Phoenix
Jake West, Mesa

OTHERS

Jesus Anguelo, PCL	John Masche, Phoenix
Michelle Barclay, AMWUA	John Matta, Arcadis
Brian Draper, Mesa	Steven Townsend, Arcadis
Tara Gonzales, Phoenix	Peter Tymkiw, Arcadis

1. Call to Order

Mr. White called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the January 9, 2019 Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Biesemeyer, a second by Mr. Johnson, and unanimous approval, the SROG Committee approved the minutes of the January 9, 2019 meeting.

3. Set Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 13, 2019.

4. Consideration of Items for Consent

Mr. Biesemeyer requested item G be pulled from the consent agenda.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the following item for consent:

- A. Recommendation to Approve the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019-20 Operations and Maintenance Budget and Operating Fund Reserve Balance for the 91st Avenue WWTP

At their December 20, 2018 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee approve the proposed Fiscal Year 2019-20 Operations and

Maintenance Budget base request of \$51,067,670 and that the Operating Fund Balance Reserve be increased \$182,863 in order to maintain the required 12.5% of the Fiscal Year 2019-20 budget.

B. Recommendation to Approve the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019-20 Multi-City SROG User Charge Rates

At their January 17, 2019 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee approve the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Multi-City SROG User Charge Rates based upon the sewage volumes and strengths as presented.

C. Recommendation to Approve the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Capital Improvement Projects Cash Flow Estimate for the 91st Avenue WWTP

In lieu of their November meeting, on November 15, 2018, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended via email that the SROG Committee approve the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Capital Improvement Projects Cash Flow Estimate for the 91st Avenue WWTP as presented.

D. SROG Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2018, and Year-End Settlement

In an email dated January 28, 2019, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee accept the SROG Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2018, and Year-End Settlement, as presented, for the same fiscal year.

E. Recommendation to Adopt the 91st Avenue WWTP Influent Flow and Loading Projections for Fiscal Year 2019-20

At their January 17, 2019 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee adopt the revised 91st Avenue WWTP influent flow and loading projections for Fiscal Year 2019-20.

F. Solar Drying Bed, Pump Station Force Main – Design and CA&I

At their January 17, 2019 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that the SROG Committee authorize the City of Phoenix to select, negotiate a scope of work and fee, and enter into an on-call contract with Stantec for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 for design and construction administration and inspection services related to the Solar Sludge Drying Beds project number WS90100098 at the 91st Avenue WWTP.

Ms. Kelso seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

G. 91st Avenue WWTP Facilities Assessment and Initial Prioritized 10-year Plan Acceptance

Mr. Townsend of Arcadis gave a brief presentation of the Facilities Assessment project and how Arcadis came to the conclusions presented in the report. He stated that their team reviewed over 8,000 assets and reviewed findings. They developed 20 programs consisting of 104 projects based on the recognition that it is only possible to take down one treatment train at a time.

Mr. Biesemeyer stated that he is willing to accept the report but not the entire 10-year prioritized plan as there are too many unknowns. He is more comfortable with a 5-year plan and assessing the progress before adopting a second 5-year plan. Mr. Masche stated that the first five years addresses Plant 2B and some joint facilities. Mr. White asked if by approving the first five years of the plan we are also obligating implementation of the first five years. Ms. Kelso responded that would not necessarily be the case as the projects would still proceed through the normal process and each piece would need to be approved. This is just allowing Arcadis to close out their project. The plan is that if this is approved today, the team will put together the first package for presentation to the SROG committees.

Mr. Johnson stated that by approving the plan we are not approving the financials. Ms. Kelso responded that is correct, that this approval would just be for the way the plan is laid out but as it progresses of course it is subject to updates. Mr. Johnson stated his desire to approve this plan and then work together as to which chunks are tackled and when. Ms. Kelso agreed, and stated that we will have to update and review the plan together as we proceed. Mr. Masche stated that the intention throughout this process has always been that the condition of the assets will be continually updated and assessed allowing for adjustment as needed. Mr. Masche stated from a project management standpoint, the ten year prioritization plan is part of the report, and does not matter if the ten year plan is specifically approved.

Upon a motion by Mr. Johnson, a second by Mr. Biesemeyer, and unanimous approval, the Committee accepted the 91st Avenue WWTP Facilities Assessment results.

5. Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) Negotiations

There was no discussion on this item.

6. Meeting of the SROG Advisory Committee

There was no discussion on this item.

7. Future Agenda Items/Comments

There were no items requested for future agendas.

8. Adjournment

Mr. White adjourned the meeting at 11:39 a.m.

MB:dsp
h:/srog/srog-minutes/fy18/02-13-19 managers minutes.doc



AGENDA ITEM #4A

April 4, 2019

TO: Members of the SROG Committee

FROM: Michelle Barclay, SROG Program Coordinator

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH RFI FOR PIPE/EQUIPMENT COATING CS&I

This request would authorize the City of Phoenix to enter into a contract with RFI Consultants for an amount not to exceed \$500,000 for Construction Administration and Inspection services related to the protective coating of pipes and equipment at the 91st Avenue WWTP.

The purpose of this work is to extend the life of existing piping and equipment by protecting it from corrosion due to environmental conditions inherent to wastewater treatment facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

At their March 21, 2019 meeting, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended that:

the SROG Committee authorize the City of Phoenix to enter a contract with RFI Consultants for an amount not to exceed \$500,000 to provide CA&I services related to the 91st Avenue Pipe and Equipment Coating Projects. Funds for these services are available in the SROG CIP Cash Flow in Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2021-22. The Project Number is WS90100093 and will be billed per Billing Schedule 56 (6.45% Glendale, 14.29% Mesa, 55.16% Phoenix, 9.9% Scottsdale, and 14.20% Tempe).

MB
h:\srog\pipe & equipment coating 2019.doc

SROG ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2019

MEMBERS

Phil Brown, Chair, Tempe
Patty Kennedy, Phoenix
Richard Sacks, Scottsdale
Ron Serio, Glendale

OTHERS

Blaine Akine, Phoenix	Karla Camou Guerra, Glendale
Michelle Barclay, AMWUA	Dan Hatch, Glendale
Andy Baumgardner, Phoenix	Samantha Hope Jaskolski, AMWUA
Jerry Bish, Greeley & Hansen	John Masche, Phoenix
David Dieffenbach, Carollo Engineers	Steve Todd, Wilson Engineers
Tara Gonzales, Phoenix	Peter Torres, Phoenix
Joe Gorgan, Greeley & Hansen	Steven Townsend, Aracadis

A. Call to Order

Mr. Brown called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

B. General Business – Items for Discussion and Possible Action

1. Approval of the Minutes from the January 17, 2019 Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Sacks, a second by Mr. Serio, and unanimous approval, the SROG Advisory Committee approved the minutes from the January 17, 2019 meeting.

2. The next SROG Advisory Committee meeting was scheduled for Thursday, May 16, 2019, 1:30 p.m., at the AMWUA Office

3. Information Items

There were no comments on Items A, B, C or D.

4. Pipe/Equipment Coating CA&I Contract

Mr. Baumgardner of Phoenix stated that RFI Consultants was selected to provide CA&I services for pipe and equipment coatings. The City of Phoenix is requesting approval to execute a contract not to exceed \$500,000. Funds for these services are budgeted in WS9010093 in Fiscal Year 2018-19 through 2021-22, and will be billed according to Billing Schedule 56.

Upon a motion by Ms. Kennedy, a second by Mr. Sacks and unanimous approval, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended to the SROG Committee that Phoenix be authorized to enter a contract with RFI for an amount not to exceed \$500,000 to provide CA&I services related to the 91st Avenue Pipe and Equipment Coating Projects. Funds for these services are available in the SROG CIP Cash Flow in Fiscal Years 2018-19 through 2021-22. The Project Number is WS9010093 and will be billed per Billing Schedule 56 (6.45% Glendale, 14.29% Mesa, 55.16% Phoenix, 9.9% Scottsdale, and 14.20% Tempe).

5. SROG 91st Avenue Plant 2 Rehabilitation Design and CA&I Services

Mr. Masche of Phoenix stated that this is the first of the projects resulting from the Facility Assessment. The City of Phoenix is requesting authorization to advertise, select and negotiate a scope of work and fee for professional services for the Construction Manager at Risk for the Plant 2 Rehabilitation. This includes preconstruction and construction phase services, multiple GMPs, and long lead equipment and material procurement. Funds are currently budgeted under WS90100109, funds for this particular project will be moved to a new project number which is not to exceed \$34.65 million. Funds are currently budgeted in FY 2020-21 through FY 2023-24.

Mr. Masche stated that going along with that, the City of Phoenix is also requesting authorization to advertise, select and negotiate a scope of work and fee for professional services for design and CA&I services for the same scope of work on Plant 2, which includes rehabilitation of Plant 2, blower capacity and optimization, and IMLR optimization. The services will include engineering analyses, designs, preparation of construction documents, permitting and construction administration and inspection services. Funds will be moved from the WS90100109 project to the same new project number, not to exceed \$6.15 million in FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22.

Mr. Brown asked if the blower capacity and optimization would be specific to Plant 2. Mr. Masche responded that the blower evaluation would be for all of the plants, to make sure we have the right capacity and equipment for Plants 1, 2 and 3. He stated that the first consultant gets to look at all the blowers plus Plant 2 work.

Mr. Serio asked if when Mr. Masche refers to Plant 2 if he is referring to both 2A and 2B. Ms. Kennedy stated that they are only referring to Plant 2B, it is on record that we are not

rehabilitating Plant 2A. Mr. Masche said when we are done, what is currently Plant 2B will be the only Plant 2.

Mr. Brown asked if the CA&I number is a subset of the larger number. Mr. Masche responded that it is not, that the CMAR number and the CA&I numbers he is presenting are separate. Mr. Brown clarified that the two added together are then the budget numbers. Mr. Masche stated that is correct.

Mr. Brown asked what happens if the consultant says we need all new blowers. Mr. Masche responded that the blowers aren't that old and have been maintained. He suspects we have too much blower capacity, and there is a question if we need to do rehabilitation on blower building 2 and what additional controls are needed to meet the range of air needs. The questions have to do with rehab and controls, the blowers are not identified for replacement at this time.

Mr. Sacks asked why engineering is 18% of construction. Mr. Masche stated that he needs to double check the source of the numbers, however this is not encumbering any money, it is just advertising and will go through the normal SROG process.

Mr. Serio stated his concern is when we moved the plan forward at the SROG Advisory Committee meeting, he asked if we were just approving the report and not how we are going to tackle the projects. The answer was yes there would be more discussion about how we are spending money and how we move forward. He stated that the SROG Managers Committee just agreed to approve the report with the understanding that as a group there would be further discussion about how to go forward, and so this conversation happened at both the Advisory and Managers meetings. He feels that is not what is happening now. Mr. Serio stated that in asking for approval of \$40 million dollars it has already been decided what we are moving forward without discussion. Mr. Masche stated that at the Managers meeting, the response to that question was that we would follow the SROG process while going down the list of projects that were identified in the report. Plant 2 and the solids rehabilitation are the first two major projects that require new design and new CM at risk services, and they are now coming to discuss moving forward.

Mr. Serio said that is not the understanding that he had from his boss. In looking at the draft minutes Mr. Serio noted that Mr. Johnson stated his desire to work together regarding which chunks are tackled and when, and Ms. Kelso agreed and stated we will have to update and review the plan together as we proceed. Ms. Gonzales responded that since that meeting we had a special finance meeting as requested for everyone to get together. It was open to anyone that needed to be part of this process and there wasn't much discussion. She pointed out that we have also had a SPEC meeting since then to discuss this as well. So without a lot of discussion at either of those meetings, Phoenix is moving forward in hopes of getting started. Ms. Kennedy stated that there will be multiple GMPs that come out of this. Mr. Serio asked about the approval of funds for these projects. Ms. Kennedy responded that the money is not authorized until after the negotiations and consultant selection. When

Phoenix comes back for approval to enter into a contract is when the money is approved, which will be a good year down the road.

Mr. Serio stated that Glendale is under a different understanding of how we were going to proceed with the Facility Rehab work. Based on that he is not comfortable proceeding in this manner. However, in the interest of moving forward he is comfortable with selecting the consultant and having them provide more details about this project and then maybe bringing the CMAR in at the 10-30% phase. Mr. Serio believes at that point we would have a better understanding of what the needs really are. Then we could proceed together unified. Ms. Kennedy responded if we just move forward with the design firm and wait until the 10-30% stage, in the amount of time it takes to get the CMAR on board, the design would be done. Mr. Serio responded in that case he would be comfortable doing CMAR pre construction services. Ms. Kennedy stated that is what we do. Ms. Kennedy said we go to council for the full amount, then we write the contract for design phase services. But having gone to council for the full amount, every time we do a GMP that money is there. Then SROG has to approve the GMPs.

Mr. Brown stated this authorization would create the line item in the cashflow and will allow us to advertise for services and that is all that this authorization is. Ms. Kennedy responded that is correct. Mr. Brown asked Ms. Kennedy to talk about the milestones involved in getting an engineer under contract. Ms. Kennedy responded that after approval from the SROG Advisory Committee we have to advertise, the SPEC Committee would be involved in the advertising process. Mr. Brown stated it is approximately three months to get the advertisement to the street. Ms. Kennedy responded then SOQs come back, then we have a meeting to discuss the SOQs, have a meeting to score them, schedule and hold interviews, negotiate a scope and fee which takes multiple months, then back through the SPEC and SROG Advisory Committees and SROG Managers Committee before entering into a contract. Then wait for procurement to issue a notice to proceed because the contract has to go through law and through council. Mr. Brown said that if we started today it is optimistic that it would take a year before we have anyone under contract.

Mr. Sacks asked in light of that timetable why we are in a hurry to get the CMAR on board. Mr. Masche responded we have to go through the same process for the preconstruction services contract to get the CMAR on board and have them available to participate in design. Mr. Sacks stated that Scottsdale doesn't involve the CMAR at the beginning, more like 30% on up. He asked how long it would take to get to 30% design, maybe a year? Mr. Masche stated that the scope of this project is basically determining whether an asset is a condition 4 or 5 and gets replaced, or if the asset instead needs to be rehabilitated - that is the scope. There isn't much design in this project, he thinks it will be at the 30% stage much quicker than a year.

Mr. Serio stated that he is comfortable moving forward with pre construction service. Mr. Serio stated once you select the consultant, negotiating the GMP and entering into the contract is not any different. Ms. Kennedy responded as long as it is written into the

contract, so it is all one contract with the increased dollar amount. Otherwise, it has to go to council for every GMP. The process now is to make it all one contract, it used to be separate but now it is combined.

Mr. Sacks asked what the harm is in waiting six months. Ms. Gonzales responded that the design and CMAR contracts will not happen at the same time anyway, so they won't both hit at the exact same time. Mr. Sacks asked if we would want the engineer involved at the interview of the CMAR. He stated that he thinks this is rushing the CMAR. Mr. Brown stated that Tempe has had a policy in the past where they do not include the engineer in the CMAR selection.

Mr. Serio asked how Plant 2B was determined to be the highest priority. Mr. Masche responded that was the result of the ranking that came from the facility assessment. Mr. Sacks stated that he feels this is unclear. Mr. Masche directed his attention to project 15-16. Mr. Sacks asked what happened to projects 1-14. Mr. Masche stated that Plant 2B is the first big project requiring additional major design or construction services, and that 1-14 are being addressed through the JOC support services and JOC contract. He said that project 109 is where projects that came out of the assessment are being addressed. Mr. Sacks stated that he did not understand that, and while he is fine with that approach he now understands how Plant 2 got moved up so quickly. Ms. Gonzales stated that we already came and asked permission for independent items and we budgeted for them and we are on schedule for those. Mr. Masche stated that moving forward, he will indicate the items that are being worked on under the JOC program in the report and tie them back to the facility assessment. He pointed out that the 109 project number is where you would see projects that come out of the assessment. Mr. Serio asked what on the project list is being included in this request. Mr. Masche responded that anything that says Plant 2B is being included.

Mr. Serio stated that he supports the rehabilitation of the plant and believes it is in all of our best interest to rehabilitate the plant, but in terms of the process he feels the partners aren't having a say in how we move forward as was promised. He doesn't support the CMAR at this moment. He is ok with with design, and believes the design will help better determine what needs to be done and when. Mr. Serio feels this decision process needs to be done together.

Ms. Gonzales stated that we talked about the ranking of projects in the workshops where all the partners could have a say, we talked about the criteria that is used in the ranking, and once they were ranked everyone was asked if they were comfortable with the results. All of this was done within the SROG group, and when that was finalized Phoenix moved ahead knowing that SROG had discussed the criteria, the ranking, and the proposed implementation roll out. Ms. Gonzales stated there were 10-12 workshops where it was discussed. Mr. Serio stated that he understands that was the case regarding the study and the asset assessment project and he is not disputing that. But then when you move forward you have to look at systems and how that fits together and it is not as easy as a ranking

system. He feels that is a separate discussion, and he thought at the SROG Advisory Committee meeting and the SROG Managers Committee meeting we had agreed we are going to have the next discussions, but now he feels like Phoenix is just moving forward and didn't intend to proceed that way.

Ms. Kennedy stated that Plant 2 is critical, we have asked staff to do more with less for years and years and years. This is our facility and we need to take pride in it and we are not, and plant staff is not now because it is literally falling apart. They are having to make decisions daily on which major crisis is worse, and we need to move forward and fix some of the problems. We need to take pride in it for us, for our operators, for public health and safety. Mr. Serio stated that he agrees but feels we all need to be on the same page. Ms. Kennedy stated that if he has a differing opinion about what needs to be done than the studies and the staff suggest we can talk about it, but Phoenix goes on the record saying these are the two most critical things that need to be done, fully supports this, and feels it needs to be done sooner than later.

Ms. Gonzales reminded the committee that we had a workshop where we looked at each individual item, but then in a later workshop we looked at it as programs and which ones made sense to lump together so we aren't just going down the list. The SROG Advisory Committee agreed this makes the most sense as the program priority. Mr. Masche said that there are 8,000 assets grouped into a hundred and some odd projects that are then grouped into about 20 programs. The projects and programs were ranked. The ranking and grouping was done to maximize the budget and the plan they are moving ahead with is the plan that came from this process. Ms. Kennedy stated that Phoenix has heard everyone say that money is an issue, and they have paid attention to that and as a result there isn't a cash flow increase until 2021, but we can't wait until 2021 to get started.

Mr. Sacks asked about the status of the first 14 projects on the list. Mr. Masche said that we have a 15-month process to get a design engineer on board for Plant 2B, and while we are doing this we will also be working on the 14 higher priority projects. Mr. Masche said we are not sitting doing nothing for the 15 months while we wait for Plant 2B. Mr. Sacks said that his understanding was that the SROG Managers Committee had only approved a 5-year plan. Mr. Masche responded that Mr. Biesmeyer stated that he was comfortable moving forward with things inside the first 5-year window, and none of this exceeds that 5-year window. Mr. Sacks said then they are in agreement.

Mr. Brown stated that Tempe agrees and understands that Plant 2 is the first big project and they support moving forward. Understanding the time it takes to get someone under contract they support starting that process to do the selection of the engineer and the CMAR. He would like to start the conversation during SPEC about what this big project is really going to address, we could talk about schedule and why and where Phoenix sees the CMAR plugging into the schedule so everyone understands how this all goes together. He thinks it would be best to start this conversation sooner than later.

Mr. Serio said that all he is asking for is some additional details and some input into how we move forward. Mr. Sacks stated he is good on the engineering, but not enthusiastic about bringing in the CMAR until we have something on paper, and he feels we could wait almost a year before involving the CMAR. Ms. Kennedy responded that she disagrees and would like the CMAR to give input on design. Mr. Sacks said that he feels that we need a little engineering first, that we should wait some period of time until we understand what's involved. He wouldn't do design and CMAR at once.

Upon a motion by Ms. Kennedy, and a second by Mr. Sacks, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended to the SROG Committee that the City of Phoenix be authorized to advertise, select consultant, and negotiate scope of work and fee for professional services for an amount not to exceed \$6,150,000 to provide professional consultant services for design and CA&I services related to the 91st Avenue Plant 2B Rehabilitation Project. Funds for these services will be budgeted in a new project number in the SROG CIP Cash Flow beginning Fiscal Years 2020-21. New Project Number to be determined will be billed per Billing Schedule 56 (6.45% Glendale, 14.29% Mesa, 55.16% Phoenix, 9.9% Scottsdale, and 14.20% Tempe).

Mr. Brown stated that as the chairman he would like to honor the fact that Mesa said no to this motion, although they are not in attendance.

Ms. Gonzales requested a roll call vote. Mr. Brown stated that Mesa said no. Ms. Kennedy voted yes on behalf of Phoenix. Mr. Serio voted yes on behalf of Glendale. Mr. Sacks voted yes on behalf of Scottsdale. Mr. Brown voted yes on behalf of Tempe.

6. SROG 91st Avenue WWTP Plant 2 Rehabilitation Construction Manager at Risk Services

Ms. Kennedy stated that she thinks we should move forward with the CMAR. Mr. Serio responded that he would like to delay this a few months and have more discussion about the details. Ms. Gonzales stated that Phoenix could just wait on the advertisement until SPEC is comfortable and has been involved in design. Mr. Masche agreed that if this were approved today they could wait and hold on advertising until the SPEC and SROG Advisory Committee agree. Mr. Serio responded that he appreciates that but he would rather just bring the CMAR back for approval, particularly when Mesa can be involved.

Mr. Brown asked if there was any difference in the timeline to get a CMAR selected compared to an engineer. Ms. Kennedy said there is not, and that as a compromise she agreed to bring the CMAR back in a couple of months.

7. SROG 91st Avenue WWTP Solids Rehabilitation Phase 1 Design and CA&I Services

Mr. Masche presented Phoenix's request for approval to advertise, select, and negotiate a scope of work and fee for professional consultant services for design and CA&I services for solids thickening, solids handling, and solids digester projects in FY 2020-21 through FY 2023-

24. Services will include engineering analysis, designs, preparation of construction documents, permitting and CA&I services. Funds will be budgeted in a new project number, not to exceed \$8.15 million. FY 2020-21 will be design services, and FY 2021-22 will be CA&I services.

Upon a motion by Ms. Kennedy, and a second by Mr. Sacks, the SROG Advisory Committee recommended to the SROG Committee that the City of Phoenix be authorized to advertise, select consultant, and negotiate scope of work and fee for professional services for an amount not to exceed \$8,150,000 to provide professional consultant services for design and CA&I services related to the 91st Avenue Solids Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project. Funds for these services will be budgeted in a new project number in the SROG CIP Cash Flow beginning Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22. New Project Number to be determined will be billed per Billing Schedule 56 (6.45% Glendale, 14.29% Mesa, 55.16% Phoenix, 9.9% Scottsdale, and 14.20% Tempe).

Mr. Brown noted that Mesa was opposed to this motion.

8. [SROG 91st Avenue WWTP Solids Rehabilitation Phase 1 Construction Manager at Risk Services](#)

Ms. Kennedy stated that Phoenix will bring this item back at a future date.

C. Future Agenda Items

There was no discussion on this topic.

Mr. Serio requested more information before the meetings and suggested sending slides out in advance.

D. Adjournment

Upon a motion by Ms. Kennedy, a second by Mr. Serio and unanimous approval, the meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

MB:dsp
03-21-19 advisory minutes