

**NORTH BAY WATER REUSE AUTHORITY
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Monday, March 21, 2016

Agenda

Teleconference

Phone +1 (602) 567-4030 Access code: 1980#;

<https://conferencing.brwncaid.com/conference/1980>

4:00 p.m.

	1.		Call to Order and Self Introductions
Page 1	2.	Action	Approval of Agenda
	3.		Public Comments
Pages 2 – 4	4.	Action	Consent Items a. March 10, 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes
Page 5 Page 6	5.	Information	Report from the Program Manager a. Action Items from March 10, 2016 Meeting
Pages 7 - 12	6.	Discussion	Phase 2 Projects and Draft 2-Year Budget
	7.	Information	Items from Committee, Agency Staff, or Consultants
	8.	Information	Items for Next Agenda (March 28, 2016 at Novato City Hall Council Chambers)

The North Bay Water Reuse Authority complies with ADA requirements and will attempt to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities upon request. Please contact **Chuck Weir at 510-410-5923** with any questions. .

**North Bay Water Reuse Authority
Technical Advisory Committee
Web Conference Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2016**

1. Call to Order and Self Introductions

Chair Healy called the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2016. The meeting was a web conference only and attendees participated via telephone, 1 (602) 567-4030, passcode 1980;

<https://conferencing.brwnald.com/conference/1980>.

Committee Members Present

Tim Healy, Chair	Napa Sanitation District
Kevin Booker	Sonoma Valley Water Agency
Sandeep Karkal	Novato Sanitary District
Susan McGuire	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District
Drew McIntyre	North Marin Water District
Paul Sellier	Marin Municipal Water District
Jake Spaulding	Sonoma Valley County Sanitary District
Leah Walker	City of Petaluma

Others Present

Chuck Weir, Program Manager	Weir Technical Services
Ginger Bryant	Bryant & Associates
Jim O'Toole	ESA
Mike Savage	Brown and Caldwell
Jeff Tucker	Napa Sanitation District

2. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was unanimously approved.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4. Consent Calendar

4.a February 18, 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes

The February 18, 2016 Meeting Minutes were unanimously approved.

5. Report from the Program Manager

The Report from the Program Manager included the following items:

5.a Action Items from the February 18, 2016 Meeting

The TAC reviewed the Action Item List and noted that all items were current. There was discussion regarding the amendment to the Brown & Caldwell agreement. Jake Spaulding indicated that once all changes had been made it would be taken to the SCWA Board for approval. Drew McIntyre asked if completed items could be deleted from the list and the Program Manager responded in the affirmative.

6. Budget Impacts for FY2016/17 and FY2017/18 and Draft 2-Year Budget

The consultant team provided a PowerPoint presentation detailing budget issues. Mike Savage and Jim O'Toole described impacts on engineering, environmental, and public involvement. Since the last meeting three different scenarios have been developed:

Scenario 1. Project-Level and Program Level: Includes all projects identified.

Scenario 2. Project-Level Projects Only: Drop the programmatic-level elements, which are primarily storage.

Scenario 3. Project-Level Projects plus Lower Novato Creek at programmatic level.

All scenarios are at least \$100,000 less than the February 18, 2016 costs and Scenario 1 is recommended. Scenario 1 is approximately \$100,000 more than Scenario 2, which is the least cost option.

Ginger Bryant described impacts on program development and state and federal advocacy and indicated that there are no changes from the costs described at the February 18, 2016 meeting. She discussed the support participants for S. 2533 and the rationale for including Lower Novato Creek in the list to increase the scoring for grant applications. Sandeep Karkal indicated that he thought Marin County believed that the cost for Lower Novato Creek was high as it was included in the original estimate. Mike Savage and Jim O'Toole stated that the scope of the project has changed significantly from the original estimate.

Chuck Weir described impacts on program management and indicated that there were no changes from the February 18, 2016 meeting.

Kevin Booker and Jake Spaulding described impacts on SCWA administration, grant management, and EIR/EIS management. There are no changes in the total cost, but the cost of the EIR/EIS is now being included in FY2016/17.

The Program Manager described the cost sharing options including the previously discussed option of averaging the two percentages from May 2014 and January 2016.

Tim Healy noted that Napa County would not be doing the MST projects and that Napa San may not need storage. Deleting these projects would revise the scope and costs. Sandeep Karkal noted that he was not sure if they needed their non-Title XVI projects.

The TAC discussed various issues and as an action item it was agreed to hold another TAC web conference to discuss the Phase 2 Project List. A Doodle Poll will be distributed for the morning of March 17 and the afternoon of March 21, 2016. There was additional discussion noting that a budget needs to be presented to the Board at the April 25, 2016 meeting to ensure that ongoing tasks can continue.

7. Items from Committee, Agency, Staff, or Consultants

There were no additional items.

9. Items for Next Agenda, March 17 or 21, 2016 Web Meeting

Action items included the following:

1. Doodle Poll for March 17 or 21, 2016.
2. Review the Phase 2 Project List such that the consultant team can finalize the two-year budget at the March 28, 2016 TAC meeting.

There being no further business, Chair Healy adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

C:\Users\Chuck\Documents\Weir Technical Services\NBWRA\Agendas\2016\2016-03\2016_03_10_NBWRA_TAC_Minutes.docx

ITEM NO. 5 REPORT FROM THE PROGRAM MANAGER

The Report from the Program Manager includes the following items:

5.a Action Items from March 10, 2016 Meeting

The list of Action Items is attached for the TAC's information. All items are completed or in progress.

6. Phase 2 Projects and Draft 2-Year Budget

Please refer to the separate agenda item for this report.

NBWRA Board and TAC Short-Term Action Item List

Meeting Date: March 10, 2016

Task	Responsible Party	Due Date	Status	Completion Date
Joint Board/TAC Work session on March 28, 2016 to focus on MOU issues	Consultants (Weir lead)	2/10/2016	TAC discussed changes to purpose and objectives and added one more objective: "Maximize the development of recycled water projects to the extent practicable." To be presented to Board at March 28, 2016 work session.	2/16/2016
Amend the agreement with Brown and Caldwell to delete the Triple Bottom Line section in the scope and to reduce the agreement by \$24,000 for the previously approved transfer of funds to the Bryant & Associates agreement	SCWA	11/30/2015	In process.	
Finalize List of Phase 2 Projects for Feasibility Study	Board, TAC, Consultants	1/19/2016	List approved by Board on January 25, 2016. TAC to revisit at March 21, 2016 web conference meeting	
Present possible budget impacts and draft 2-year budget for FY16/17 and FY17/18 to TAC at February 18, 2016 web meeting	Consultants/SCWA	2/25/2016	Revised two-year budget presented to TAC at March 10, 2016 web conference. Three scenarios discussed with Scenario 1 recommended. Cost sharing discussed using original May 2014 percentages as well as average of May 2014 and January 2016 for FY16/17 and FY17/18.	
Consider topics and tours for the 2016 WateReuse Conference in Santa Rosa as well as consider sponsorship opportunities. NBWRA sponsorship. TAC service in NBWRA booth.	TAC and Consultant Team	Ongoing	Conference held March 13-15, 2016.	

ITEM NO. 6 PHASE 2 PROJECTS DRAFT 2-YEAR BUDGET

Recommendation

It is recommended that the TAC finalize the Phase 2 Project List such that the consultant team can finalize the draft 2-year budget for consideration at the March 28, 2016 TAC meeting.

Pros and Cons of Deleting Phase 2 Projects from the EIR/EIS Process

The list of Phase 2 Projects that was approved by the Board on January 25, 2016 is below:

Agency	Project Type	Project Title	Total Project Capital Costs (\$mil)	Title XVI Project Level EIR/ES	Non- Title XVI Project Level EIR/ES	Programmatic Level	
Novato SD	Treatment	Novato SD WRP Capacity - 1st Expansion (+0.85 MGD)	\$4.8	\$4.8	\$6.2		
		Novato SD WRP Capacity - 2nd Expansion (+0.85 MGD)	\$4.8			\$4.8	
	Seasonal Storage	Option 1: Site Near Highway 37 (Tertiary) 150 AF	\$5.6			\$5.6	
		Option 2: Site Near Highway 37 (Secondary) 150 AF	\$8.0			\$8.0	
		Option 3: Hamilton Site (Secondary) 150AF	\$14.2			\$14.2	
	Environmental Enhancement	Marin County Lower Novato Creek Project - Distribution	\$0.9	\$0.9			
		Marin County Lower Novato Creek Project - Restoration	\$21.5			\$21.5	
		Turnout to Transitional Wetlands	\$0.6	\$0.6			
SVCSD	Seasonal Storage	Option 1: Mulas Site (Tertiary) 49 AF	\$2.4			\$2.4	
		Option 2: Robledo Site (Tertiary) 49 AF	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$6.2		
	Distribution	Napa Road Pipeline	\$3.6	\$3.6			
SCWA	Groundwater Management	Valley of the Moon ASR	\$3.4	\$3.4	\$7.0		
		Sonoma ASR	\$3.6	\$3.6			
		Sonoma Valley Groundwater Management and Recharge Study	TBD			TBD	
Petaluma	Treatment	Increase ECWRF Capacity	\$9.0	\$9.0	\$30.6		
	Seasonal Storage	Option 1a: Site South east of ECWRF (Secondary) 300 AF	\$14.3			\$14.3	
		Option 1b: Site South east of ECWRF (Secondary) 150 AF	\$7.3			\$7.3	
	Distribution	Urban Recycled Water Expansion	\$11.4	\$11.4			
		Agricultural Recycled Water Expansion Phase 1	\$4.2	\$4.2			
		Agricultural Recycled Water Expansion Phase 2	\$6.0	\$6.0			
		Agricultural Recycled Water Expansion Phase 3	\$6.5		\$6.5		
Napa SD	Treatment	Soscol WRF Increased Filter Capacity	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$33.2		
	Operational Storage	Additional Soscol WRF Covered Storage	\$2.9	\$2.9			
		Napa State Hospital Storage Tank	\$7.4			\$7.4	
	Seasonal Storage	Option 1a: Raise Existing Pond Levees (Secondary) 300 AF	\$9.9			\$9.9	
		Option 1b: Raise Existing Pond Levees (Secondary) 1,100AF	\$30.2				
		Option 2: Somky Ranch Site (Secondary) 300AF	\$15.3				
		Option 3a: Jameson Ranch Site (Tertiary) 600 AF	\$17.3	\$17.3			
		Option 3b: Jameson Ranch Site (Tertiary) 300 AF	\$11.8				
	Distribution	MST Northern Loop	\$6.9	\$6.9			
		MST Eastern Extension	\$3.9	\$3.9			
			\$242	\$83	\$83	\$15	\$87

TAC members discussed deleting some projects at the March 10, 2016 web conference meeting since there may no longer be a need for the projects or partners had not stepped up to support future design and construction costs. TAC members noted that in five years the situation may change and it is possible deleting projects could be viewed as short-sighted. Following is a straw-man list of pros and cons of deleting projects from the current list

Pros	Cons
Reduces costs for the EIR/EIS.	Total cost savings will be on the order of \$200,000, which averages \$40,000 per agency over two years.
Reduces costs for future design and construction.	Agencies are not obligated to design and build projects that have gone through the full EIR/EIS process.
Provides funding for other needed projects not related to water recycling.	Agencies have up to 10-20 years to implement projects as partners step up to assist with costs.
Projects could be moved from the full Title XVI analysis to Programmatic only analysis. This reduces total costs and avoids many of the cons.	Adding projects at a later date will likely cost much more even if NBWRA is still a viable option.
Other reasons.	If NBWRA is not a viable option in the future, the costs on an individual basis could be prohibitive.
	Deleting projects increases the cost sharing percentages for other agencies, which could put them in the position of deleting additional projects to reduce their costs. There is a risk of real harm to the overall program.
	Other reasons.

The TAC should discuss the above list prior to officially deleting projects from the Phase 2 list. From a practical perspective if there is any chance that a project could be constructed in the next 20 years it should probably not be completely deleted from the Phase 2 project list. A possible option is to move to the programmatic-only list to ensure easier environmental analysis at a future date either through NBWRA or on an individual basis.

Additional changes to the Draft 2-Year Budget

Please refer to the attached table representing Scenario 1 that was discussed at the March 10, 2016 meeting. The B&C team has determined that \$194,443 can be moved from FY16/17 to FY17/18. This spreads the total cost more evenly over the two years.

This change also allows SCWA to spread its \$260,000 for Administration, Grants, and the EIR/EIS on a 70%/30% basis between the two fiscal years. Thus \$182,000 will be in the first year and \$78,000 will be in the second year. These changes are reflected in the attached four-year budget and four-year member agency cost sharing using the average percentages.

Agenda Explanation
North Bay Water Reuse Authority
Technical Advisory Committee
March 21, 2016

Task		Total Amended Contract	Contracted FY16/17 Budget	Additional FY 16/17	New FY17/18	FY 16/17 & 17/18 Increase	New Total Contract
	Workshops/Public Outreach/Management	744,288	198,954	51,872	217,670	269,542	1,013,830
1.1	Workshops	196,860	30,230	26,872	63,624	90,496	287,356
1.3	Public Involvement	316,276	97,092	25,000	97,092	122,092	438,368
1.4	Administration	231,152	71,632		56,954	56,954	288,106
2	Title XVI Feasibility Study/Report	1,135,778				0	1,135,778
2.1	Introductory Information	34,728				0	34,728
2.2	Statement of Problems/Needs	43,231				0	43,231
2.3	Water Reclamation/Reuse Opps	54,257				0	54,257
2.4	Analysis of Alternatives/FS Report	1,003,562				0	1,003,562
3	Environmental Evaluation	796,450	796,450	301,299		301,299	1,097,749
3.1	Environmental Constraints Analysis	279,178		106,817		106,817	385,995
3.2	Environmental Compliance-NEPA/CEQA	517,272			194,443	194,443	711,715
4	Financial Capabilities Determination	56,590	56,590			0	56,590
5	Phase 2 Grant Applications & Management	67,655	13,795	14,723		14,723	82,378
6	Phase 1 Grant Application & Management	197,619	46,993			0	197,619
6.1	Program Support and Coordination	61,340	20,447			0	61,340
6.2	State Grant Support	38,254	12,751			0	38,254
6.3	Phase 1 Grant Application & Management	92,655	13,795			0	92,655
6.4	Additional Services	5,370					
TOTAL		2,998,380	1,112,782	367,894	217,670	585,564	3,583,944

Page 4

Agenda Explanation
North Bay Water Reuse Authority
Technical Advisory Committee
March 21, 2016

The budget sheets are shown as examples only. Once the TAC decides on a final list of Phase 2 projects and a cost sharing approach the budget will be presented at the March 28, 2016 meeting.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the TAC discuss the pros and cons of deleting projects from the Phase 2 project list and develop a final list such that the consultant team can develop a final two-year budget for consideration at the March 28, 2016 meeting.

North Bay Water Reuse Authority
Proposed Fiscal Year Budgets
Fiscal Year 2014/15 through Fiscal Year 2017/18

March 18, 2016

Scenario 1

	Approved 5/14/14	Approved 4/27/15	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed
Phase 1 Support	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	4-Year Total
Grant Applications and Management - B&C	72,628	77,998	46,993	-	197,619
Program Development (40% of \$190,200 total) - Bryant	76,080	76,080	76,080	76,080	304,320
Federal Advocacy (30% of) - TFG sub to Bryant	26,400	26,400	39,000	33,600	125,400
Total Costs for Phase 1 Support	175,108	180,478	162,073	109,680	627,339

TFG proposed \$130,000 for FY16/17 and \$112,000 for FY17/18

Phase 2 Support	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	4-Year Total
Program Development (60% of \$190,200 total) - Bryant	114,120	114,120	114,120	114,120	456,480
Federal Advocacy (70% of \$88,000 total) - TFG sub to Bryant	61,600	61,600	91,000	78,400	292,600
Total Costs for Phase 2 Support	175,720	175,720	205,120	192,520	749,080

Phase 2 Feasibility Study - Three Years	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	4-Year Total
Engineering, Environmental, and Outreach Services - B&C	823,335	931,636	1,239,201	412,113	3,406,285
SCWA Administration - Grants and EIR/EIS	96,684	109,402	332,958	78,000	617,044
Total Costs for Study	920,019	1,041,038	1,572,159	490,113	4,023,329

Total Costs for Phase 2	1,095,739	1,216,758	1,777,279	682,633	4,772,409
--------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	------------------

Joint Use	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	4-Year Total
Program Management - Weir	70,500	75,500	37,750	37,750	221,500
State Advocacy - The Oñate Group (Sub to Bryant)	36,000	36,000	45,000	45,000	162,000
SCWA Administration	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	540,000
Total Costs for Joint Use	241,500	246,500	217,750	217,750	923,500

Total Costs	FY2014/15	FY2015/16	FY2016/17	FY2017/18	4-Year Total
Weir	70,500	75,500	37,750	37,750	221,500
Bryant & Associates (Includes TFG & Oñate)	314,200	314,200	365,200	347,200	1,340,800
Brown & Caldwell (Includes ESA & Data Instincts)	895,963	1,009,634	1,286,194	412,113	3,603,904
SCWA Administration - Grants and EIR/EIS	231,684	244,402	467,958	213,000	1,157,044
Total Costs for NBWRA	1,512,347	1,643,736	2,157,102	1,010,063	6,323,248

North Bay Water Reuse Authority
Proposed Agency Cost Allocations

Member Agency Cost Allocations Scenario 1

March 18, 2016

Four Fiscal Year 2014/15, 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18

Based on Average of Original and January 2016 Project Costs

Phase 1 Support										
25% Shared Equally Between 7 Agencies/ 75% Shared By Phase 1 Benefit	Total Budget	NBWRA Share	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Napa Sanitation District	Novato Sanitary District	Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Sonoma County Water Agency	North Marin Water District	Napa County	
<i>MOU Percent for Phase 1</i>			7.239%	31.894%	8.611%	27.473%	3.571%	17.640%	3.571%	100.000%
Grant Applications and Management - B&C	197,619	197,619	14,305	63,029	17,017	54,292	7,058	34,860	7,058	
Program Development (40% of \$221,110 total) - Bryant	304,320	304,320	22,029	97,061	26,205	83,605	10,869	53,682	10,869	
Federal Advocacy (30% of \$157,900 total) - TFG sub to Bryant	125,400	125,400	9,078	39,996	10,798	34,451	4,479	22,120	4,479	
Total	\$627,339	\$627,339	\$45,412	\$200,086	\$54,021	\$172,348	\$22,405	\$110,662	\$22,405	

Phase 2 Support											
Shared on the Basis of Phase 2 Project Cost in Feasibility Study	Total Budget	NBWRA Share	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Napa Sanitation District	Novato Sanitary District	Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Sonoma County Water Agency	North Marin Water District	Napa County	City of Petaluma	MMWD, Marin County, American Canyon
<i>Percent for Phase 2 Support</i>			0.000%	35.188%	26.682%	3.911%	10.886%	0.000%	0.000%	23.333%	0.000%
Program Development (60% of \$221,110 total) - Bryant	456,480	456,480	-	170,709	104,170	20,618	45,429	-	-	115,554	-
Federal Advocacy (70% of \$157,900 total) - TFG sub to Bryant	292,600	292,600	-	110,444	64,988	13,496	28,688	-	-	74,984	-
Total	\$749,080	\$749,080	\$0	\$281,153	\$169,158	\$34,114	\$74,117	\$0	\$0	\$190,538	\$0

Note: Revised percents shown. Costs are based on actual from FY14/15 and FY15/16 and revised percentages for FY16/17 and FY17/18

Phase 2 Feasibility Study - Four Years											
Shared on the Basis of Phase 2 Project Cost in Feasibility Study	Total Budget	NBWRA Share	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Napa Sanitation District	Novato Sanitary District	Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Sonoma County Water Agency	North Marin Water District	Napa County	City of Petaluma	MMWD, Marin County, American Canyon
<i>Percent for Phase 2 Feasibility Study</i>			0.000%	35.188%	26.682%	3.911%	10.886%	0.000%	0.000%	23.333%	0.000%
Engineering, Environmental, and Outreach Services - B&C	3,406,285	3,406,285	-	1,271,555	781,325	153,228	339,960	-	-	860,217	-
SCWA Administration - Grants and EIR/EIS	617,044	617,044	-	235,281	132,900	29,111	59,495	-	-	160,257	-
Total	\$4,023,329	\$4,023,329	\$0	\$1,506,837	\$914,226	\$182,339	\$399,455	\$0	\$0	\$1,020,474	\$0

Note: Revised percents shown. Costs are based on actual from FY14/15 and FY15/16 and revised percentages for FY16/17 and FY17/18

Joint Use											
Shared Equally Between Current and New Members	Total Budget	NBWRA Share	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Napa Sanitation District	Novato Sanitary District	Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Sonoma County Water Agency	North Marin Water District	Napa County	City of Petaluma	MMWD, Marin County, American Canyon
<i>Percent for Joint Use</i>			12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	12.500%	0.000%
Program Management - Weir	221,500	221,500	27,688	27,688	27,688	27,688	27,688	27,688	27,688	27,688	-
State Advocacy - The Oate Group (Sub to Bryant)	162,000	162,000	20,250	20,250	20,250	20,250	20,250	20,250	20,250	20,250	-
SCWA Administration - Grants and EIR/EIS	540,000	540,000	67,500	67,500	67,500	67,500	67,500	67,500	67,500	67,500	-
Total	\$923,500	\$923,500	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$115,438	\$0

Total Cost per Agency for FY2014/15, FY2015/16, FY2016/17, and FY2017/18											
	Total Budget	NBWRA Share	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Napa Sanitation District	Novato Sanitary District	Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Sonoma County Water Agency	North Marin Water District	Napa County	City of Petaluma	MMWD, Marin County, American Canyon
Three FY Proposed	\$6,323,248	\$6,323,248	\$160,850	\$2,103,514	\$1,252,842	\$504,238	\$611,414	\$226,100	\$137,842	\$1,326,450	\$40,000