North Bay Water Reuse Authority Technical Advisory Committee Web Conference Meeting Minutes February 18, 2016

1. Call to Order and Self Introductions

Chair Healy called the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. on Thursday, February 18, 2016. The meeting was a web conference only and attendees participated via telephone, 1 (602) 567-4030, passcode 1980; https://conferencing.brwncald.com/conference/1980.

Committee Members Present

Tim Healy, Chair Napa Sanitation District

Kevin Booker Sonoma Valley Water Agency

Pam Jeane Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District

Sandeep Karkal Novato Sanitary District

Liz Lewis Marin County

Drew McIntyre North Marin Water District

Leah Walker/Dan St. John City of Petaluma

Others Present

Chuck Weir, Program Manager
Ginger Bryant
Jim Graydon
Mark Millan
Weir Technical Services
Bryant & Associates
Brown and Caldwell
Data Instincts

Jim O'Toole ESA

Mike Savage Brown and Caldwell

Jake Spaulding Sonoma County Water Agency

Dawn Taffler Kennedy Jenks

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 January 25, 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes

The January 25, 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 January 25, 2016 Meeting

The TAC reviewed the Action Item List and noted that all items were current.

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

The consultant team provided a PowerPoint presentation detaining budget issues. Mike Savage and Jim O'Toole described impacts on engineering, environmental, and public involvement. Ginger Bryant described impacts on program development and state and federal advocacy. Chuck Weir described impacts on program management. Kevin Booker and Jake Spaulding described impacts on SCWA administration, grant management, and EIR/EIS management.

The TAC discussed the issues and had questions regarding the level of effort for federal advocacy, particularly with respect to the RE-Act legislation. As an <u>action</u> item the TAC requested a list of participating organizations in sponsoring RE-Act and cost sharing, if available.

The TAC also discussed the increased costs for environmental analysis and requested additional detail on the costs. The TAC also inquired as to possible cost reductions if programmatic-only analysis was omitted. As an <u>action</u> item, the environmental costs will be revisited and estimate the cost savings for not conducting the programmatic-only analysis.

The Program Manager discussed the current draft 2-year budget and cost sharing possibilities. The TAC discussed cost sharing, truing up of Phase 2 costs, and applicable percentages. Following discussion additional <u>action</u> items included: 1) SCWA will review its costs and determine if the split between the two years should be modified; 2) cost sharing will be shown using both the current percentages and revised percentages based on the average of the project costs from May 2014 and January 2016.

Lastly, and as an <u>action</u> item a revised two-year budget with both cost sharing options will be distributed to the TAC as soon as revised costs are available from the consultants and SCWA. The intent is that a revised budget can be discussed by the TAC at the March 28, 2016 meeting, which will provide adequate time for agencies to discuss with their Boards/Councils such that the NBWRA Board can consider the two-year budget at its April 25, 2016 meeting.

7. MOU Issues – Purpose and Objectives

The TAC discussed the history of the proposed modifications to the purpose and objectives and how the modifications are helpful in obtaining future funding. The issue of reducing discharges to receiving waters was also discussed. Following discussion and as an <u>action</u> item, the TAC agreed with the current changes with the addition of a new objective: "*Maximize the development of recycled water projects to the extent practicable*." The revised purpose and objectives will be presented to the Board for consideration at the March 28, 2016 work session.

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

Mike Savage informed the TAC that the consultant team would be contacting the agencies to develop ongoing operation and maintenance costs for the Phase 2 projects in order to do proper life cycle analysis.

9. Items for Next Agenda, March 28, 2016 Web Meeting

Action items included the following:

1. Prepare a list of organizations and agencies sponsoring the RE-Act legislation and cost sharing, if possible.

- 2. Review the costs for environmental analysis, provide additional detail on the costs, and estimate the cost savings for not conducting the programmatic-only analysis.
- 3. Review the costs and split between years for SCWA administration, grant management, and EIR/EIS management.
- 4. Prepare a revised two-year budget using the revised costs and present member agency cost sharing using both the current percentages and revised percentages that are based on an average of the May 2014 and January 2016 project costs.
- 5. Add a new objective to the revised purpose and objectives from the MOU and present to the Board for consideration at the March 28, 2016 work session.

There being no further business, Chair Healy adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

 $C: \label{locality} C: \label{locality} C: \label{locality} We in Technical Services \label{locality} NBWRA \label{locality} Algendas \label{locality} 2016-02\label{locality} 2016-02\label{localit$