

# CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Karen Dean, Chair of the Resources & Infrastructure Committee, hereby calls a Special Meeting pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956. The Special Meeting will be held: **Monday, October 2, 2023, 2:00 PM, 1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428**. The purpose of Special Meeting is to discuss or transact the following business:

### NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

### CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Monday, October 2, 2023 2:00 PM 1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428

In person at: Cambria Veterans' Memorial Hall 1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428

AND via Zoom at: Please click the link below to join the webinar: Please click the link below to join the webinar: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87606686384? pwd=ajdUNXpkRnpRREVDOGhNNjZYbDV1dz09 Passcode: 624729 Or One tap mobile: US: +16694449171,,87606686384# or +16699006833,,87606686384# Or Telephone:

Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): US: +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 507 473 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325 Webinar ID: 876 0668 6384

International numbers available: https://us06web.zoom.us/u/kei3KXOTCU

Copies of the staff reports or other documentation relating to each item of business referred to on the agenda are on file in the CCSD Administration Office, available for public inspection during District business hours. The agenda and agenda packets are also available on the CCSD website at https://www.cambriacsd.org/. In compliance with the

Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or if you need the agenda or other documents in the agenda packet provided in an alternative format, contact the Confidential Administrative Assistant at 805-927-6223 at least 48 hours before the meeting to ensure that reasonable arrangements can be made. The Confidential Administrative Assistant will answer any questions regarding the agenda.

### 1. OPENING

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ESTABLISH QUORUM
- C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

### D. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

Any Committee Member may make an announcement, report briefly on his or her activities, or ask a question for clarification.

# E. UTILITIES DEPARTMENT MANAGER'S REPORT

## 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS

Members of the public may now address the Board on any item on its agenda today.

## 3. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to Approve the September 11, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

# 4. **REGULAR BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion Regarding CIP List Review Format
- B. Discussion and Consideration to Choose Dates to Schedule a Joint Finance Committee and Resources & Infrastructure Committee Special Meeting in October 2023
- C. Discussion of Final Ad Hoc Committee Report on Water Supply and Long Term Off Stream Storage and Approve Recommendation to Forward the Water Supply and Long Term Off Stream Storage Ad Hoc Report to the Board

### 5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6. ADJOURN

#### **RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

REGULAR MEETING Monday, September 11, 2023 - 2:00 PM 1000 Main Street Cambria, CA 93428

#### **MINUTES**

#### 1. **OPENING**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Dean called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

B. ESTABLISH QUORUM

A quorum was established.

Committee members present: Karen Dean, Juli Amodei, James Webb, Mark Meeks and Steve Siebuhr.

Committee members absent: Derrik Williams.

Staff present: General Manager Matthew McElhenie, Utilities Department Manager/District Engineer Ray Dienzo, Program Analyst Tristan Reaper, and Confidential Administrative Assistant Haley Dodson.

#### C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

No report.

#### D. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

No reports.

#### E. DISTRICT ENGINEER REPORT

Mr. Dienzo highlighted various items in the Engineers Report. Mr. Dienzo announced that this was his last R&I Committee meeting, and that James Green will be taking over the position of Utilities Manager, and that Mr. Green and Mr. Reaper will be involved with this committee moving forward.

#### 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment:

Chair Dean read written public comment from Aleta Francis and Linda Prentice.

#### 3. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Consideration to Approve the August 14, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Webb moved to approve the minutes.

Committee Member Amodei seconded the motion.

The motion was approved: 4-Ayes; 0-Nays; 0-Abstain; 1 Absent (Williams)

#### 4. **REGULAR BUSINESS**

A. Discussion of Final Ad Hoc Committee Report on Brine Waste Disposal Options and Approve Recommendation to Forward the Brine Waste Disposal Ad Hoc Report to the Board

Committee Member Webb summarized the past brine waste options that had been previously considered, and possible other options such as combining the needs of San Simeon and Cambria, the San Simeon Outfall, deep well injection, and Zero Liquid Discharge.

Public comment was received from Tina Dickason regarding the Flag Lot pipeline.

Committee Member Webb moved to have the AdHoc Committee continue to research options and wait for results of the Zero Liquid Discharge Pilot project.

Committee Member Siebuhr seconded the motion.

The motion was approved: 4-Ayes; 0-Nays; 0-Abstain; 1-Absent (Williams)

B. Discussion and Consideration of a Recommendation to the CCSD Board of Directors
 Regarding Approval of an Agreement for Consultant Services with Miller Drilling
 Company for an Upgrade to San Simeon Well 3 Pump

Program Analyst Tristan Reaper presented the proposed project for the repair of the San Simeon Well 3, he discussed the options of replacing the well pump with a new submersible pump or rebuilding and reinstalling the current pump, as well as video inspecting the well casing. Committee members asked many questions regarding the well casing, if cost to upgrade the motor and electrical was included in the estimate, the brand of pump, age of current pump, life expectancy of the new pump, etc.

It was requested that this item be brought back to a future meeting with more detail.

#### 5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairperson Dean asked for any future agenda items. None suggested.

# 6. ADJOURN

5

Chairperson Dean adjourned the meeting at 2:53 pm.

	В	С		D	E	F		G	H	I		J
1	General Fund CIP (FY 23/24 Rev	ised 09/18	/20	23)								
2	General Fund Projects	Ranking		Project Estimate		Current FY penditures	Prior Expenditures		Total Project Expenditures to Date		R	Project Estimate Remaining
3	Administration Department Projects						•					
4												
5	Update Sound System - Vets Hall	1	\$	20,000	\$	-			\$	-	\$	20,000
6	Replace District Car	3	\$	30,000	\$	-			\$	-	\$	30,000
7												
8		Subtotal	\$	50,000	\$	-					\$	50,000
9	Facilities & Resources Projects											
10	Skate Park Improvements	1	\$	1,200,000	\$	35,000	\$	20,000	\$	55,000	\$	1,145,000
11	East Ranch Restroom	1	\$	371,480	\$	-	\$	21,776	\$	21,776	\$	349,704
12	EV Charging Station - Vets Hall	1	\$	24,831								
13	Replace Dump Trailer	2	\$	15,000	\$	-					\$	15,000
14	Replace 2012 F-350	2	\$	45,000	\$	-					\$	45,000
15	New Office Space and Shop Space	2	\$	500,000	\$	-					\$	500,000
16	Replace Wood Chipper	2	\$	70,000	\$	-					\$	70,000
	Electric Vehicle Charging Station (East											
17	Village Parking Lot)	3	\$	17,000	\$	-					\$	17,000
18	Vets Hall Sewer Line	3	\$	40,000	\$	-					\$	40,000
	Vets Hall Electrical Emergency (Generator											
19	& Equipment)	3	\$	80,000	\$	-					\$	80,000
20	Vets Hall Water Line	3	\$	10,000	\$	-					\$	10,000
21	Re-Roof - Entire Vets Hall Building	3	\$	55,000	\$	-					\$	55,000
22	Vets Hall Kitchen Improvements	3	\$	20,000	\$	-					\$	20,000
23	Vets Hall Restroom Improvements	3	\$	17,500	\$	-					\$	17,500
24		Subtotal	Ś	869.500	Ś	_			Ś	76.776	Ś	792.724
25	Fire Department Projects			,							<u> </u>	,
26	Radio System Upgrade Phase 2	1	\$	79,097	\$	-	\$	30,000	\$	38,000	\$	41,097
	Fire Statio Dry Rot Repair/Rain Gutter											
27	Repair/Paint	2	\$	40,000	\$	-			\$	-	\$	40,000
	Fire Station Turnout Lockers and Storage			,	<u> </u>				· ·			,
28	Room	2	Ś	45.000	Ś	-			Ś	-	Ś	45.000
	Ballistic Vests for Active Shooter		Ŧ	,	Ŧ				- <del>-</del>		<b>•</b>	,
29	Response	2	Ś	15.000	Ś	-			Ś	-	Ś	15.000
			Ŧ		Ŧ				- <del>-</del>		<b>•</b>	
30	Fire Station Sleeping Quarters Addition	3	Ś	450.000	Ś	-			Ś	-	\$	450.000
50			<b>•</b>	150,000	Ŷ				Ŷ		Υ	130,000
	Fire Department Metal Building											
31	(Apparatus Bays/Storage/Gym Relocation	3	Ś	220 000	Ś	-			\$	-	\$	220.000
32	Replace Water Tender (21 years old)	3	Ś	600,000	Ś				\$	-	\$	600,000
22	Fire Annaratus Rust Renair and Paint	3	ې د	35,000	<del>ب</del> ح				ې د	-	ې د	35,000
34	Sattelite Phones	3	ې د	6,000	<del>ب</del> ح				ې د	-	ې د	6,000
34	Fire Hose and Nozzles	3	ب د	32 000	ې د	-			ې د	-	ې د	32 000
36	Fire Station Bathrooms Remodel x 3	<u>२</u>	ب د	45 000	ب د	-			ې د	-	- ح	45 000
30	Fire Training Building	्र २	ب د	475 000	ب د				ب د		े २	475 000
51		5	ر ر	+75,000	ر ب	-			ې		ڊ ا	
20	Replace old rescue hoat and Pescue ski	2	4	21 000	ć				ć		ć	21 000
38	4 Gas Detector	2	ې د	5 000	ې د	-			ب خ	-	ې د	5 000
39	Fire Station Computers Upgrades	2	ې د	5,000	ې د	-			ب خ	-	ې د	5,000 £ 000
40	Fire Department Gate and Fencing	2	ې د	40,000	ې د	-			ې د	-	ې د	40.000
41	Fire Station Kitchen Remodel	2	ې د	70,000	ې د	-			ې د	-	ې د	70,000
42		Э	د	70,000	د	-			ڊ ا	-	د	70,000

					-			-				
	В	С		D	E	F	G	H	I		J	
1	General Fund CIP (FY 23/24 Rev	ised 09/18	/20	23)								
2	General Fund Projects	Ranking		Project Estimate		urrent FY penditures	Prior Expenditures	Tota Expo t	al Project enditures o Date	Project Estimate Remaining		
43	Fuel Station Computer Replacement	3	\$	7,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	7,000	
44	CERT Team Respnse Vehicle	3	\$	40,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	40,000	
45	Refurbish Antique Fire Engine	3	\$	30,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	30,000	
46	Replace Rescue Boat	3	\$	14,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	14,000	
	Fire Marshal Vehicle (pending approval											
47	for a Fire Marshal Position)	3	\$	71,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	71,000	
48		Subtotal	\$	2,275,097	\$	-		\$	38,000	\$	2,237,097	
49					\$	-						
50	Priority 1 Total				\$	-						
51	Priority 2 Total				\$	-						
52	Priority 3 Total				\$	-						
53	Priority 4 Total		\$	-	\$	-						
54			\$	-	\$	-						
55	Completed Projects	Ranking	Project Estimate		Exj	FY penditures	ures		Project to Date Expenditures		Y Budget Amount emaining	
56	F350 Truck - Replace 1999 F150 Truck	1	\$	40,000	\$	-		\$	40,000			
	Electric Vehicle Charging Station (Vets											
57	Hall)	1	\$	22,272	\$	-		\$	22,272			
	Re-Roof - Vets Hall American Legion											
58	Kitchen Area	1	\$	8,446	\$	-		\$	8,446			
59	Tyler Incode	1	\$	76,050	\$	-		\$	76,050			
60	Zoll X Series EKG	1	\$	40,000	\$	-		\$	41,776			
61	Utility Truck F-350	1	\$	79,800	\$	-		\$	76,964			
62	Extrication Tool	1	\$	60,000	\$	-		\$	42,234			
63	Purchase New Fire Truck - Engine Type 3	1	\$	450,000	\$	-		\$	446,506			

	В	С		D	E	F	G	н	I		J
1	Waste Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09	/18/2023)									
				Project				Т	otal Project		Project
				Estimate		Current FY	Prior	Exp	enditures to		Estimate
2		Panking		LStimate	L F	vnenditures	Evnenditures		Date	R	emaining
2	Treatment Plant Prejects in SST (All SST Cost Estimates	nalikilig			LL -	.xpenuitures	Experiances				
	Treatment Plant Projects in SST (All SST Cost Estimates										
3	Current as of IGA Final Report									-	
4	Investment Grade Audit (30% Design for all ECMs)	1	Ş	528,404	Ş	-		Ş	-	Ş	528,404
5	(ECM 1) Influent Flow Equalization	1	\$	3,791,224	\$	466,696		\$	1,076,702	\$	2,714,522
6	(ECM 2) Influent Lift Station	1	\$	46,512	\$	13,759		\$	26,224	\$	6,530
7	(ECM 3) Modified Ludzak-Ettinger Process Upgrade	1	\$	2,419,093	\$	322,080		\$	371,214	\$	1,725,799
8	(ECM 4) Blower Improvements	1	\$	603,329	\$	89,942		\$	107,143	\$	406,244
9	(ECM 5) RAS and WAS Pumping Improvements	1	\$	1,290,972	\$	153,516		\$	230,389	\$	907,067
10	(ECM 7) Electrical Upgrades	1	\$	554,687	\$	22,400		\$	100,139	\$	432,148
11	(ECM 8) Generator Replacement	1	\$	925,404	\$	28,674		\$	153,675	\$	743,055
12	(ECM 9) SCADA System	1	\$	1,148,557	\$	32,512		\$	185,587	\$	930,458
13	(FCM 12) Sewer Lift Stations	1	Ś	1.320.222	Ś	, ; -		Ś	54.511	Ś	1.265.711
	(ECM 10) Secondary Water System (3W) Improvements			,,				<u> </u>	- ,-		,,
14		2	Ś	318 202	Ś	-		Ś	-	Ś	318 202
15	(ECM 11) Effluent Dump Station Improvements	2	¢	374 580	Ċ			ć		ć	374 580
15	Dede for electrical ECMs	2	ې د	212 902	ب ح	, <u> </u>		ې خ		ې د	212 002
16		2	ې د	313,893	ې د	-		Ş	-	ې د	313,893
17	Final Design	2	Ş	308,394	ļ	, -		Ş	-	Ş	308,394
10	Tortiany Troatmont	1	¢	889 / 36	Ċ			¢	-	¢	889 136
19		7	ې د	120 521	- -			ب ح		ې د	120 521
20		2	ې د	150,521		-		ې د	-	ې د	150,521
21	Demolish Old Tanks	2	Ş	567,815	Ş	-		Ş	-	Ş	567,815
22			Ş	15,531,245	Ş	5 1,129,578		Ş	2,305,583		
23	Treatment Plant Projects				-						
24	Security Improvements	1	\$	15,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	15,000
25	New polymer skid for sludge press	1	\$	25,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	25,000
26	PFAS Treatment (Design Phase)	2	\$	50,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	50,000
27	Van Gordon House Demolition (Split with Water)	2	\$	50,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	50,000
28	Clarifier Improvements										
29	Eastern clarifier - Replace chain drive	2	\$	40,000	\$	-		\$	37,552	\$	2,448
	Eastern clarifier - Replace drive unit's metalic hubs			,				<u> </u>			,
30	with non-corrosive hubs	2	Ś	35.000	Ś	-		Ś	-	Ś	35,000
50	Eastern clarifier - Benlace clarifier wear shoes skid		- <del>-</del>	00,000	- <b>-</b>	, 		<u> </u>		Ŧ	00,000
21	platos & sprockats	2	ć	40.000	ć	_		ć	_	ć	40.000
51	Mostern clarifier - Benlace clarifier chain wear choos	2	<u>ر</u>	40,000	<u>ب</u>	-		<u>ې</u>		ڔ	40,000
22	western clariner - Replace clariner chain, wear shoes,	2	ė	40.000	ć			ć		ć	40.000
32		2	ې د	40,000	د د	-		ې د	-	ې خ	40,000
33	Cover for Sheltering of Equipment @ Plant ( 50%)	2	\$	15,000	Ş	-		\$	-	\$	15,000
34	Secondary Water System	2	Ş	4,100	ļ ļ	> -		Ş	4,053	Ş	47
35	Blower Replacement	2	Ş	9,200				Ş	-	\$	9,200
36	Redundant Blower for Plant	3	\$	400,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	400,000
37	Repaint the handrails on the digester	3	\$	30,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	30,000
38	Walkway Grating on Digester Tanks	3	\$	30,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	30,000
39	Cargo Box for Storage	3	\$	10,000	\$	; -		\$	-	\$	10,000
40											
41			\$	753,300	\$	-		\$	41,605	\$	711,695
42	Collection System Projects			-					-		-
43	Lift Station A (Nottingham & Leighton/Park Hill)										
	New Submersible Pumps MCC Bynass Pining Control										
44	Panel at Grade Elevation	1	¢	490 000	ć			¢	-	¢	190 000
44	Lift Station A_1 (Shanwood & Harvoy/Marine Terrace)	L +	ب	-30,000	<del>ر</del>			ې	-	Ŷ	-30,000
	LITE STATION A-1 (SHELWOOD & HALVEY/MARINE LERRACE)										
45	New Colors and black and the Design of Design of the	1	~	205.000			I	~		~	205 000
46	Ivew Submersible Pumps, Bypass Piping	<u> </u>	Ş	205,000	Ļ			Ş	-	Ş	205,000
47	LITT Station B - (SK Creek/Behind Park Hill)										
1	New Control Panel, Generator, Wet Well, Submersible		.								
48	Pumps, and Valve Vault	3	\$	435,000	\$	; -		\$	-	\$	435,000
49	Lift Station B-1 (Burton Dr at Tin City)	1									
50	Convert to gravity flow	1	\$	600,000	\$	-		\$	-	\$	600,000

Waste Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/112/2023)         D<					1			_				
Image: Construct on process of p	1	B Waste Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09	د (18/2023)		D	E F	G	Н	I		J	
si Lift Station B-2 (Wood Dr./E. Lodge Hill) ■ New Control Panel at Green SL/W. Lodge Hill) ■ New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping UT Station B 3 (Green SL,W. Lodge Hill) UT Station B 3 (Green SL,W. Lodge Hill) UT Station B 3 (Green SL,W. Lodge Hill) New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping New Submersible Pumps, MCC, MCC, Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Submersib	2		Ranking		Project Estimate	Current FY Expenditures	Prior Expenditures	Tot Expe	al Project nditures to Date	R	Project Estimate Remaining	
New Control Panel at Grade Elevation         1         \$ 425,000         \$         -         \$         \$ 425,000           1UH Station AS Green S.Y., Voldge Hill)         1         \$ 750,000         \$         -         \$         \$         250,000           2         New Control Panel         1         \$ 750,000         \$         -         \$         \$         250,000           3         New Control Panel         2         \$ 500,000         \$         -         \$         \$         250,000           3         Phased Manhole and Sever Main Replacement         2         \$ 1,000,000         \$         -         \$ <td>51</td> <td>Lift Station B-2 (Wood Dr./E. Lodge Hill)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	51	Lift Station B-2 (Wood Dr./E. Lodge Hill)										
SI         Lift Sation B-3 (Green S1,W. Lodge Hill)         Image of the set of	52	New Control Panel at Grade Elevation	1	\$	425,000	\$ -		\$	-	\$	425,000	
Sew Control Panel         1         5         250,000         S         -         S         -         S         250,000           Sin New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bygass Piping         3         S         250,000         S         -         S         -         S         -         S         S         250,000           Disk difficultion B         1         S         95,000         S         -         S         -         S <ths< th="">         S         <ths< th=""> <th< td=""><td>53</td><td>Lift Station B-3 (Green St./W. Lodge Hill)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<></ths<></ths<>	53	Lift Station B-3 (Green St./W. Lodge Hill)										
New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping         3         5         250,000         5         -         5         250,000           10         Iff Station 8         1         5         95,000         5         -         5         -         5         250,000           20         Replace Pumps         1         5         95,000         5         -         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         1,000,000         5         -         5         5,00,000         6         -         5         5,00,000         5 <t< td=""><td>54</td><td>New Control Panel</td><td>1</td><td>\$</td><td>250,000</td><td>\$ -</td><td></td><td>\$</td><td>-</td><td>\$</td><td>250,000</td></t<>	54	New Control Panel	1	\$	250,000	\$ -		\$	-	\$	250,000	
bit ft station 8       1       5       9       1       5       9       1       5       1       1       5       1       5       1       1       5       1       1       5       1       1       5       1       1       5       1       1	55	New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping	3	Ś	250.000	\$ -		Ś	-	Ś	250.000	
Produce Pumps         1         \$ 95,000         \$         -         \$         \$ 95,000           10         Pased Manhole and Sewer Main Replacement         2         \$ 1,000,000         \$         -         \$         -         \$         \$         95,000           10         New generators at L5, 4, 8         2         \$ 10,000,000         \$         -         \$ <td>56</td> <td>Lift Station 8</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td> ,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	56	Lift Station 8	_		,							
Important Product	57	Benlace Pumps	1	Ś	95.000	<u>s</u> -		Ś	-	Ś	95.000	
Induction         S	5.8	Phased Manhole and Sewer Main Replacement	- 2	¢ ¢	1 000 000	¢ -		Ś		Ś	1 000 000	
New generators at 137, 0         2         3         1,2,000         3         1         3         1,2,000           61         Push camera         2         \$         10,000         \$         -         \$         \$         \$         \$         10,000         \$         -         \$	50	Now goporators at LS 4, 8	2	¢	12 000	¢		ć		¢	12 000	
20         2         3         10,000         3         1         3         1,000         3         1         3         1,000         3         1         3         10,000         3         1         3         10,000         3         1         3         10,000         3         1         3         10,000         5         1         5         1         5         10,000         5         1         5         20,000         5         1         5         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         2,000,000         5         1         5         2,000,000         6         4         4         2,000,000         3         5         5,000         1         5         5         5,000         1         5         5         5,000         1         5         5         5,000         1         5         5         5         5,0,000         1         5 <td>59</td> <td>Duch comoro</td> <td>2</td> <td>ې د</td> <td>12,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ې د</td> <td>_</td> <td>ې د</td> <td>10,000</td>	59	Duch comoro	2	ې د	12,000			ې د	_	ې د	10,000	
11       0 Priority 1 Total       1       5       2,000,000       5       -       5       -       5       2,000,000         63       exerut effluent line around State Parks       2       \$       2,000,000       \$       -       0       \$       5       2,000,000         64       -       \$       \$       -       \$       \$       5       5       2,000,000         64       -       \$	60	Push callela		ې د	10,000	ې - د		ې د		ې خ	10,000	
Masset Wanagement Software         2         3         1,0000         3         -         1         5         -         3         1,0000         5         -         1         5         1,0000         5         -         1         5         1,0000         5         -         1         5         1,0000         5         -         1         5         1,0000         5         -         1         5         2         0,000,000         5         -         1         5         2,000,000         5         -         1         5         2,000,000         5         -         1         5         2,000,000         5         -         1         5         2,000,000         5         -         5         5,862,000         6         7         7         7         5         5,862,000         5         7         5         5,862,000         6         6         7 <td>61</td> <td>Portable Generator</td> <td>1</td> <td>ې د</td> <td>20,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Ş</td> <td>-</td> <td>ې د</td> <td>20,000</td>	61	Portable Generator	1	ې د	20,000			Ş	-	ې د	20,000	
cal       Reflacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and Backhoe       \$       \$       -       \$       \$       -       \$       \$       5       \$	62	Asset Management Software	2	> ¢	10,000	Ş -		>	-	>	10,000	
interm         interm<	63	Refoule enfuent line around state Parks	2	Ş	2,000,000	Ş -		\$	-	Ş	2,000,000	
Selection of 12 PS John Deere Loader and Backhoe         1         \$ 75,000         \$ \$ 69,054           6         \$ \$ 69,054           Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2"           Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"          Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"          Colspan="2"           Colspan="2" <th cols<="" td=""><td>64</td><td></td><td></td><td>Ş</td><td>5,862,000</td><td>Ş -</td><td></td><td>Ş</td><td>-</td><td>Ş</td><td>5,862,000</td></th>	<td>64</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Ş</td> <td>5,862,000</td> <td>Ş -</td> <td></td> <td>Ş</td> <td>-</td> <td>Ş</td> <td>5,862,000</td>	64			Ş	5,862,000	Ş -		Ş	-	Ş	5,862,000
Replacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and Backhoe         I         \$         75,000         \$         \$         69,054           Replace 2005 F250         3         \$         65,000         \$         \$         52,982            Image: Second	65	Vehicles and Trailer Mounted Equipment		<b>.</b>		-				r		
def Tractor         1         \$         75,000         S         69,054           e         Replace 2005 F250         3         \$         65,000         \$         \$         52,982           e		Replacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and Backhoe										
97         Replace 2005 F250         3         \$         65,000         \$	66	Tractor	1	\$	75,000			\$	69 <i>,</i> 054			
66       \$ 22,286,545       -       -         69       9       2       -       -         70       Priority 1 Total       \$ -       -       -         71       Priority 2 Total       \$ -       -       -       -         72       Priority 3 Total       \$ -       \$ -       -	67	Replace 2005 F250	3	\$	65,000			\$	52,982			
6a       \$ 22,286,545       Image: constraint of the second secon	68				· · ·				•			
71       Priority 1 Total       \$ - \$       \$ - \$         72       Priority 2 Total       \$ - \$       \$ - \$         73       Priority 3 Total       \$ - \$       \$ - \$         74       Priority 4 Total       \$ - \$       \$ - \$         75       SST Total       \$ - \$       \$ - \$         76       S       - \$       - \$         77       Replace Tractor       1 \$ 75,000       \$ \$ 69,054         78       Replace Tractor       1 \$ \$ 75,000       \$ \$ \$ 69,054         79       \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	69			Ś	22.286.545							
71       Priority 1 Total       \$       -         72       Priority 2 Total       \$       -         73       Priority 3 Total       \$       -         74       Priority 1 Total       \$       -         75       SST Total       \$       -         76       S       -       -         77       Ranking       10-Yr Cost       \$       FY Project Cost         77       Replace Tractor       1       \$       75,000       \$       \$         78       Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System       1       \$       5       \$       \$         79       \$       5       5,000       \$       \$       \$       \$         79       \$       65,000       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$         78       Replace Tractor       1       \$       30,000       \$       \$       \$         79       \$       65,000       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$         79       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$         79       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$ <td>70</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>т</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	70			т								
1       100 rty 2 Total       5       -         72       Priority 3 Total       \$       -         74       Priority 4 Total       \$       -         75       SST Total       \$       -         76       -       \$       -         77       -       Ranking       FY Project Cost         78       Replace Tractor       1       \$       75,000       \$       69,054         78       Replace Tractor       1       \$       75,000       \$       \$       69,054         79       S       65,000       \$       \$       \$       0       \$         79       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$       \$         79       \$	71	Priority 1 Total		Ś	- 1							
73       Priority 3 Total       \$       -         74       Priority 4 Total       \$       -         75       SST Total       \$       -         76       Image: Stress of the strest of the stress of the stress of the stress o	72	Priority 2 Total		¢	-							
12       Priority 4 Total       3 Total       3 Total       10-Yr Cost       Image: Cost of the second secon	72	Priority 2 Total		ې د								
1/4       Priority 4 rotal       3       -         75       SST Total       5       -         76       Total       5       -         77       Ranking       10-Yr Cost       FY Project Cost         78       Replace Tractor       1       \$ 75,000       \$ 69,054         78       Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System       1       \$ 65,000       \$ 52,982         80       Replace F150       1       \$ 30,000       0       0         79       \$ 65,000       \$ 52,982       0       0         80       Replace F150       1       \$ 30,000       0       0         9       \$ 65,000       0       0       0       0         9       \$ 75,000       0       0       0       0         9       \$ 75,000       0       0       0       0         11/20/2018.)       \$ 75,000       0       0       0       0         2       F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body       \$ 518,000       0       0       0         2       F-350 Service Truck (F-150)       \$ 24,193       0       0       0         8       Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)       \$	73	Priority 4 Total		ې د	-							
Image: Problem in the system in the syste	74			ې د	-							
10-Yr Cost       10-Yr Cost       FY Project Cost         77       Ranking       10-Yr Cost       FY Project Cost         78       Replace Tractor       1       \$ 75,000       \$ 69,054         78       Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System       1       \$ 65,000       \$ \$ 69,054         79       \$ \$ 65,000       \$ \$ 52,982       \$ \$ 69,054         8       Replace F150       1 \$ 30,000       \$ 0       0         9       \$ \$ 65,000       \$ \$ 0       0       0         9       \$ \$ 75,000       \$ 0       0       0         9       \$ \$ 75,000       \$ 0       0       0         11/20/2018.)       \$ \$ 75,000       0       0       0         12       F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body       \$ 518,000       0       0         14       Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets       8       8       0         8       Iemssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)       \$ 518,000       0       0         84       Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)       \$ 24,193       0       0         10       \$ 10,000       \$ 164,509       0       0         10       \$ 164,509       0       0<	75	331 10(a)		Ş	-							
78Replace Tractor1\$75,000\$\$69,054Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System1\$65,000\$\$\$\$79C\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$80Replace F1501\$\$30,000\$\$C0\$ <td>77</td> <td></td> <td>Ranking</td> <td>1</td> <td>10-Yr Cost</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>FY P</td> <td>roject Cost</td> <td></td> <td></td>	77		Ranking	1	10-Yr Cost			FY P	roject Cost			
Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System1Image: Comparison of Sewer Video Camera SystemImage: Comparison of Sewer System <thimage: comparison="" of<="" td=""><td>78</td><td>Replace Tractor</td><td>1</td><td>\$</td><td>75,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>\$</td><td>69,054</td><td></td><td></td></thimage:>	78	Replace Tractor	1	\$	75,000			\$	69,054			
79\$ 65,000\$ 52,98280Replace F1501\$ 30,000000Pearpoint or equal TV inspection camera (removed cost from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance, 8111/20/2018.)\$ 75,0000008111/20/2018.)\$ 75,000000082F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body\$ 57,040000Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)\$ 518,00000084Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)\$ 24,193000085Influent screen, support platform design, & installation 85\$ 164,50900086Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements\$ 45,000\$ 45,00000		Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System	1									
80Replace F1501\$ 30,0000Pearpoint or equal TV inspection camera (removed cost from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance, 8111/20/2018.)\$ 75,00008111/20/2018.)\$ 75,0000082F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body\$ 57,04000Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets 83\$ 518,0000084Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)\$ 24,1930084Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)\$ 164,5090085\$ 164,509000	79			\$	65,000			\$	52,982			
Pearpoint or equal TV inspection camera (removed cost from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance, B1 11/20/2018.)Image: Second State	80	Replace F150	1	\$	30,000				0			
from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance, B1 1/20/2018.)iiiiii81 1/20/2018.)\$ 75,000\$ 00082 F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body\$ 57,04000Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets\$ 57,0400083 emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)\$ 518,0000084 Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)\$ 24,1930095Influent screen, support platform design, & installation\$ 164,509086 Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements\$ 45,00000		Pearpoint or equal TV inspection camera (removed cost										
8111/20/2018.)\$ 75,0000082F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body\$ 57,04000Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets\$ 57,0400032emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)\$ 518,0000084Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)\$ 24,1930084Influent screen, support platform design, & installation\$ 164,5090086Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements\$ 45,00000		from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance,										
82       F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body       \$ 57,040       0         82       F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body       \$ 57,040       0         Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets       \$ 518,000       0         83       emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)       \$ 518,000       0         84       Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)       \$ 24,193       0         95       Influent screen, support platform design, & installation       \$ 164,509       0         86       Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements       \$ 45,000       0	81	11/20/2018.)		\$	75,000				0			
Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets       \$ 518,000       \$ 0         83 emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)       \$ 24,193       0         84 Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)       \$ 24,193       0         Influent screen, support platform design, & installation       \$ 164,509       0         86       Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements       \$ 45,000       0	82	F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body		\$	57,040				0			
83       emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)       \$ 518,000       Image: Constraint of the second se		Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets			,							
84     Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)     \$ 24,193     0       Influent screen, support platform design, & installation     \$ 164,509     0       85     \$ 45,000     0	83	emssion requirements (7 yr Ioan @ 4.5%)		Ś	518.000							
Influent screen, support platform design, & installation     \$ 164,509     0       86     Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements     \$ 45,000     0	84	Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)		Ś	24.193				0			
85         \$ 164,509         0           86         Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements         \$ 45,000         0	F	Influent screen, support platform design. & installation		-	,200				•			
86 Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements \$ 45,000 0	85			Ś	164.509				0			
	86	Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements		\$	45,000				0			

	A	В		C	D	E	F	G	Н		I
1	Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)										
2		Ranking	Pro	ject Estimate	( Ex	Current FY spenditures	Prior Expenditures		Total Project Expenditures To Date	Proj F	ject Estimate Remaining
3	Water Distribution System Projects							_			
	Cover for Sheltering of Equipment @ Plant (50%)	1	ć	15 000	ć					ć	15 000
4	Modular Office Building @ Plant	1	ې د	10,000	ې د	-		-		ې د	10,000
5		1	ې د	10,000	<u>ې</u> د	-		-		Ş	2 220 000
6	Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)	1	Ş	2,220,000	\$ ¢	-		-		Ş	2,220,000
/	Meter Install Design and Dermitting for SSWE Transmission Main	1	Ş	500,000	Ş	-		-		Ş	500,000
0	and Effluent Line at State Dark Wetlands	1	ć	600 000	ć					ć	600 000
0	and Endent Line at State Park Wellahus	1	ې د	20,000	Ş	-		-		ç	000,000
9 10	Source Water Assessment	1	ې د	10,000				-			
11	Piney Way Frosion Control - Design Permitting and	1	¢	10,000	ć			-		¢	10.000
	San Simeon Well Field Transmission Main at State	1	Ļ	10,000	Ŷ			-		Ļ	10,000
12	Dark Wotlands	2	ć	5 000 000	ć	_	¢ .		ć .	ć	5 000 000
12	SRI Generator	2	ې د	80,000	ې د	-	۔ ب	-		ې د	80,000
15	Well site nump replacements	2	7	00,000	<u> </u>			-		Ŷ	00,000
14	wen site pump replacements	2	\$	532,141	\$	-				\$	532,141
15	Vault upgrades (Rodeo Grounds, Charing, and	2	\$	60,000	\$	-		-		\$	60,000
	District Metered Areas (Phased - Design and			·				-			
	Permitting, Implementation cost TBD)	2	~	450.000	~					~	450.000
16	, , ,	2	Ş	150,000	\$	-		-		Ş	150,000
17	Upgrading undersized water mains	3	\$ ¢	130,000	<u>&gt;</u>	-		-		ې د	130,000
18	Pine Knolls - Iva Court zone 1 pipeline expansion	4	ې د	165,000	<u>&gt;</u>	-		-		Ş	165,000
19	Demo van Gordon House (Water Portion)	3	> ¢	50,000	> ¢	-	ć		ć	ې د	50,000
20	Subtotal		Ş	9,527,141	>	-	ş -	-	ş -	Ş	9,497,141
21	Tank & Booster Pump Station Projects							٦	4	-	
22	Stuart Street Tank Rehabilitation	1	Ş	550,000	Ş	-	\$	-	\$	Ş	458,000
23	Santa Rosa Well #4 Replacement	1	Ş	50,000	Ş	48,792					
				25 222							
24	Electrical transfer switch and conduit to well SS-3	1	Ş	25,000	Ş	-					
	SCADA System - Phased Upgrades (Phase III-Alarms,		<u>,</u>	225 222							
25	Flow Data, Monitoring Wells)	1	Ş	225,000	Ş	-		-			
26	Rodeo Grounds booster A pump	1	Ş	25,000	Ş	-		-			
	Rodeo Grounds Pump Station Replacement (aka	n	4	2 200 000	ć						
27	Zone 2 Booster pump station)	2	Ş	2,200,000	Ş	-					
20	Stuart Street and Leimert Booster Pump	2	e e	E00 000	ć						
20	Replacement Third Stuart Street Tank Installation	2	ې د	600,000	ې د			1			
29		3	ې د	4 175 000	ې د	19 702					
30	Vehicles and Trailer-Mounted Fauinment		Ş	4,173,000	Ş	48,752		-			
51	Replacement 2005 F-150 Truck with F-250 (for										
22	towing Ditch Witch)	1	¢	55 000	¢	-					
52	Truck Replacement Program (annual cost to build	<u> </u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	55,000	Ļ	-					
33	reserves)	3	Ś	55.000	Ś	-					
	Replacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and	2	-	22,230	Ť						
34	Backhoe Tractor	3	Ś	75.000	Ś	-					
	Dump trailer for storing and hauling spoils from road		<u> </u>	,	Ŧ						
35	repairs	3	\$	15,000	\$	-					
36	Subtotal		\$	200,000	\$	-					
37	Programs and Plans			,				-			
38	Hydraulic System Model Update	3	\$	75,000	\$	-					
39	Asset Management Plan	2	\$	25,000	\$	-		-			
4∩	Water Master Plan Amendment	3	Ś	35.000	Ś	-					
10		3		33,000	Ţ.						
	Database for water conservation program/tracking										
41	with parcel links & APN file conversion	3	\$	10.000	\$	-					
42	Subtotal		\$	145.000	Ś	-					
43				, <b>.</b>	<u></u>						
44			\$	14,047.141	GR/	ND TOTAL					
45				–							
46			\$	9,100,000	Prio	rity 1 Total					

		5	T	C C		-	-			
	A	В		2 625 000	D		F	G	Н	
47			Ş	2,625,000		Priority 2 Total				
48			\$	2,002,141		Priority 3 Total				
49			\$	165,000		Priority 4 Total				
50										
51	Completed Projects	Ranking		10-Yr Cost		FY Project Cost				
52	replacement @ SR Creek pedestrian bridge	1	\$	215,527		\$ -				
53	SR4 submersible pump replacement		\$	50,338						
54	SS2 Electrical Panel Upgrade		\$	25,000						
55	SCADA System - Phase I and II Upgrades		\$	99,371						
56	Replacement Dump Truck		\$	74,871		\$ -				
57	Trailer-Mounted Air Compressor		\$	22,557		\$ -				
58	Trailer-Mounted Vacuum Extractor		\$	46,169		\$ -				
59	San Simeon well field generator replacement		\$	50,449		\$-				
60										

	A	В		С	D	E		F	G	Н	
61	WRE CIP (EY 22/23 Revised 10/5/22)									•	
62		Panking	1	10 yr Cost	-	EV Drojoc	t Cost		-		
02	Denneitting & Disconing	Natiking		10 yr Cost	-	FIFIOJEC	COSC				
63	Permitting & Planning	4	ć	25.000	-	ć 4	0.674		-		
64	Groundwater modeling and consulting for CDP	1	\$	35,000	-	Ş 1	9,674				
	EIR consulting (follow up agency discussions to										
65	support the WRF's Regular CDP)	1	Ş	28,609	_	Ş	-		_		
	Section 7 ESA consulting, annual AMP report, &										
66	AMP update	1	\$	100,000	_	\$	-				
67	Subtotal		\$	128,609	_	\$	-		_		
68	Interim, short-term SWF Modifications				_				_		
69	Brine Tank Secondary Containment, Grading, Rock	1	\$	20,000		\$	-				
70	Subtotal		\$	20,000		\$	-				
71	Advanced Water Treatment Plant				-				-		
72	Distribution Panel	1	Ś	15.000		Ś 1	3.909				
	Membrane and Filter Replacement Program (annual			-,		,	-,				
73	cost to build reserves)	2	\$	30,000		\$	-				
74	Benlace CIP Tank (leaking)	2	ې د	15 000	-	<u> </u>	-				
74	Replace discontinued chemical numps	2	ې د	30,000	-	<u> </u>					
75	Replace discontinued enemical pumps	2	¢	10,000	-	ć	_				
76	Replace Chemical Storage tank (leaking)	2	ې د	10,000	-	<u>ې</u> د	-				
//	Replace frojan OV builds and ballasis	2	Ş	40,000	-	Ş	-		-		
	ungrados	2	4	25.000		¢.					
78		2	\$	25,000	-	\$	-		_		
79	Subtotal		Ş	150,000	_	Ş	-		_		
80	Long-Term Improvement Modifications				_				_		
81	Consulting assistance for coordination with Army	1	Ş	40,000	_	Ş	-		_		
	[transfer tanks, piping, & spill contrainment/loading										
82	pad]	2	\$	200,000		\$	-				
83	AWTP pull-barn style covers for outdoor equipment	2	\$	50,000		\$	-				
	Sems, Hach WIMS, or custom programmer for										
84	logging/reporting software and tablets	3	\$	25,000		\$	-				
	Installation of remote sensing instrumentation at SS										
85	creek (needs ROE agreement with State Parks)	3	\$	10,000		\$	-				
86	Solar Array System	3	Ś	375.000	_	\$	-				
87	Subtotal		Ś	700.000	-	Ś	-		-		
			Ŧ	,	-	Ŧ			-		
88			6	000.000	-				-		
89	GRAND TOTAL		Ş	998,609	-						
90					_						
91		Priority 1 Total	Ş	188,609	_				_		
92		Priority 2 Total	\$	275,000	_				_		
93		Priority 3 Total	\$	410,000	_				_		
94		Priority 4 Total	-								
95											
96	Completed Projects	Ranking		10 yr Cost		FY Project	t Cost				
	Filters / membrane replacements and build reserves										
97	for future		\$	59,639		\$	-				
98	Short-term flood damage mitigation		\$	12,566		\$	-				
	Hauling of last 18" of water and cleaning										
99	impoundment		\$	94,515		\$	-				
100	Urban Water Management Plan - CDP Portion		Ś	20.463		\$	-				
	Groundwater modeling/piezometer			,		•					
101	installation/monitoring		Ś	75.758		Ś	_				
101			Ŷ	13,130		Ŧ					
102	1		<u> </u>								

# CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

TO: Resources & Infrastructure Committee

AGENDA NO. **4.B.** 

FROM: Matthew McElhenie, General Manager Denise Fritz, Administrative Department Manager

Discussion and Consideration to Choose Dates to Schedule a Joint Finance Committee and Resources & nfrastructure Committee Special

### DISCUSSION:

The Finance Subcommittee and Resources & Infrastructure Committee would like to hold a special meeting to discuss the ranking system for the CIP list and approve the new formatting.

The suggested dates are October 10, 11, 17, and 18.

# LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY AND STORAGE ALTERNATIVES

DATE:	September 23, 2023
TO:	Cambria Community Services District Resources and Infrastructure Committee
FROM:	Jim Webb Derrik Williams
SUBJECT:	Cambria Community Services Long-Term Water Supply and Storage Options Update

## INTRODUCTION

The Long-Term Water Supply and Storage Ad-Hoc Committee is tasked with summarizing water supply and water storage alternatives. This memorandum summarizes options included in previous studies, as well as options that have been proposed but not studied by the Cambria Community Services District (CCSD). This memorandum summarizes all options, without any intent to make recommendations. This memorandum does not assess the reliability or ability of CCSD's current supplies to meet demands. Such determinations are beyond the scope of this effort and have been previously included in the CCSD's Urban Water Management Plan.

# **OPTIONS IN PREVIOUS STUDIES**

The Assessment of Long-Term Water Supply Alternatives (Kennedy/Jenks, 2004) identified eight potential water supply alternatives including:

- Seawater desalination
- Surface water from Lake Nacimiento
- Surface water from Whale Rock Reservoir
- Expanding the Santa Rosa Creek wellfield
- An Arroyo De La Cruz wellfield
- Hard rock wells
- Additional use of recycled water
- Demand management

These alternatives were further developed and refined in the *Cambria Water Supply Alternatives Engineering Technical Memorandum* (CDM/Smith, 2013). This memorandum reviewed 28

water supply options. The 28 options were screened, resulting in eight water supply alternatives. Each alternative is presented below, with an assessment of the pros and cons for each. The alternatives are grouped by type for ease of comparison.

### **IMPLEMENTED ALTERNATIVES**

# 1. San Simeon Creek Road Brackish Water Desalting (CDM Smith Alternative 5)

This alternative is a version of CCSD's existing Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). Because this alternative has effectively been implemented, it is no longer a source of new water or storage.

## **DESALINATION ALTERNATIVES**

# 2. Desalinating Seawater from Shamel Park (CDM Smith Alternative 1)

This alternative entails installing two horizontal wells: one to serve as a subsurface seawater intake and one to serve as a subsurface brine line. The two horizontal wells would originate from the Shamel Park parking lot. Seawater would be treated to drinking water standards at a reverse osmosis plant located at the existing CCSD wastewater treatment plant.

Pros: - Provides a drought proof source of water.

- No long piping is needed, compared to other alternatives.
- Cons: A previous proposal for the Shamel Park Desalination Plant project was rejected by the California Coastal Commission. It is unlikely that the Coastal Commission will reverse itself and approve this project.
   Relatively high costs.

# 3. Partner with Morro Bay's Seawater Desalination Plant (CDM Smith Alternative 3)

This alternative envisions partnering with the city of Morro Bay to convert its existing desalination plant into a plant that can supply water to CCSD as well as Morro Bay. The Morro Bay desalination plant has been idle since 2000, and its permits have lapsed. Therefore, this alternative has greater difficulties than outlined in the 2013 memorandum.

Pros: - Infrastructure for a desalination plant already exist in Morro Bay.

Cons: - The Morro Bay desalination plant permits have lapsed, and it is unclear if the plant's operation can be permitted again.

- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.

- Relatively high costs.

- Morro Bay likely has no reason to reactivate its desalination plant in partnership with CCSD because Morro Bay has invested in a Water Reclamation Facility as its supplemental water supply.

#### 4. Estero Bay Marine Terminal Desalination Plant (CDM Smith Alternative 4)

This alternative is similar to the Shamel Park desalination plant alternative, but much of the infrastructure is located near the intersection of Highway 1 and Toro Creek Road, south of Cayucos. This alternative entails installing a horizontal well in Estero Bay to serve as a subsurface seawater intake. A desalination plant would be built on Toro Creek Road, and the brine would be piped to the Morro Bay outfall through a new pipeline.

Pros: - Provides a drought-proof supply of water.
- Siting the desalination plant on Toro Creek Road, inland of the coastal zone, could potentially lessen some Coastal Commission permitting requirements.

Cons: - Permitting a desalination plant may be extremely difficult and time consuming.
- CCSD does not own the land on which the desalination plant would be built.
- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.

- Relatively high costs.

- A previous proposal for the Shamel Park Desalination Plant project was rejected by the California Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission appears to be hesitant to approve new desalination plants.

### **INCREASED STORAGE ALTERNATIVES**

### 5. San Simeon Creek Off-Stream Storage (CDM Smith Alternative 2)

This alternative entails developing off-stream reservoirs in the San Simeon Creek watershed. The CDM Smith memorandum identified three potential reservoir locations. A fourth location, known as the Warren Reservoir, was not included in the memorandum, and is discussed separately, below. Water from CCSD's existing wellfield would be pumped into the off-stream reservoirs for storage and later use. The three reservoirs were sized to cumulatively store approximately 1,200 acre feet of water, and supply approximately 250 acre-feet of water annually.

Pros: - The alternative uses existing CCSD wells as a water source.
- The proposed reservoirs are located relatively close to existing CCSD pipes and wells.

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the San Simeon wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits,

potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations. - Stored water would need to be treated as surface water, requiring a full-time surface water treatment plant.

- CCSD would be required to build, manage, monitor, and maintain new reservoirs.

- Reservoir permitting can be relatively long and difficult.
- CCSD does not own the land proposed for the new reservoirs.
- High construction costs.

- The State has expressed concerns about the impact of the San Simeon wellfield on San Simeon Creek. Although the additional wellfield pumping that supplies the reservoirs would occur during the winter when there are higher stream flows, the additional pumping may amplify the State's concerns about stream impacts.

### 6. Hard Rock Water Storage and Recovery (CDM Smith Alternative 6)

This alternative entails pumping additional water from the Santa Rosa #4 well during the winter and piping the water to an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) wellfield. The water would be injected through ASR wells in the wet season and recovered in the dry season. The ASR wells would store water in fractured bedrock.

Pros: - Uses existing wells as a water source

- Proposed piping is not in Caltrans right of way, potentially simplifying permitting.

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the Santa Rosa wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.
- Hard rock fractures generally have very little storage capacity, and the amount of water that can be stored is uncertain.

- Requires up to 42 new ASR wells.

- CCSD does not own the land where the ASR wells would be located.

#### 7. Seasonally Store Water in Whale Rock Reservoir (CDM Smith Alternative 7)

This alternative entails pumping additional water from CCSD's existing wells during the wet season, piping the water to Whale Rock Reservoir, and seasonally storing the water in the reservoir. Stored water could be piped from the reservoir to Cambria during the dry season.

Pros: - Uses an existing reservoir for storage.

- Relatively simple technology.

18

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the Santa Rosa wellfield or San Simeon wellfield to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.

- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.

- It is unclear if the City and County of SLO will permit seasonal storage in Whale Rock Reservoir.

### WASTEWATER ALTERNATIVES

8. Use San Simeon's Treated Wastewater to Offset Cambria's Potable Water Demands (CDM Smith Alternative 8)

This alternative entails treating raw wastewater from San Simeon at an upgraded CCSD wastewater treatment plant.

Pros: - Uses known technologies.

Cons: - The limited demand for non-potable water (for business and irrigation) will likely not produce adequate potable water demand savings. The amount of new potable water is likely negligible.

- Discussions with San Simeon CSD regarding regional water and wastewater management have not been fruitful.

- The future status of the San Simeon wastewater treatment facility is unclear.

# **OPTIONS DEVELOPED AFTER PREVIOUS STUDIES**

Four water supply and storage alternatives have been proposed or developed since the 2013 Cambria *Water Supply Alternatives, Engineering Technical Memorandum*.

### 9. Warren Reservoir

This alternative entails building a seasonal storage reservoir on private land near CCSD's existing WRF. This alternative is similar to the San Simeon Creek Off-Stream Storage alternative proposed in the memorandum. Water from CCSD's existing wellfield would be pumped into the Warren reservoir for storage and later use. The reservoir is sized to hold approximately 700 acre-feet of water, seasonally. It is unclear how much of the 700 acre feet would be available for annual supply.

Pros: - Uses existing CCSD wells as a water source

- The proposed reservoir is located very close to existing CCSD pipes and wells

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the San Simeon wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.
Stored water would need to be treated as surface water, requiring a full-time surface water treatment plant.

CCSD would be required to build, manage, monitor, and maintain a new reservoir.

- Reservoir permitting can be relatively long and difficult.

- CCSD does not own the land proposed for the new reservoirs. The land owner appears open to the project, but the cost and details of building the reservoir must still be developed.

- High construction costs.

- The State has expressed concerns about the impact of the San Simeon wellfield on San Simeon Creek. Although the additional wellfield pumping that supplies the reservoirs would occur during the winter when there are higher stream flows, the additional pumping may amplify the State's concerns about stream impacts.

#### **10. Regional Desalination Plant**

The County of San Luis Obispo has initiated a five-phase planning process for potentially developing and constructing a regional desalination plant. CCSD has expressed interest in being a participant in the planning process.

Pros: - Provides a reliable, drought-proof source of water.

- Costs could be shared with other regional partners, making this alternative potentially less expensive than a smaller desalination plant.

Cons: - Likely long timeline before a desalination plant is built. The County's current timeline shows the desalination plant potentially being built in 2045.
- The desalination plant's location is unknown. Piping water from the plant to CCSD may involve extensive and expensive piping.
- Cost of the plant and cost of the produced water is unknown.

#### **11. Direct Potable Reuse**

The state of California recently released its proposed Direct Potable Reuse (DPR) regulations for public review. Although not a new source of water, DPR may provide the District an option for more efficient operation of the WRF. The WRF currently employs Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR). Indirect potable reuse requires that WRF product water be injected and stored underground for an established period before the water can be pumped into the distribution system. Direct potable reuse would allow WRF product water to be directly placed into the District's distribution system.

4C

Direct potable reuse would require improvements and upgrades to the existing WRF. Additionally, it is likely the state of California will proceed cautiously with its initial DPR permits. Therefore, although DPR provides the District increased efficiency in its use of WRF product water, this option may not be available for many years.

Pros: - More efficient use of existing wastewater.

- Could leverage the existing WRF infrastructure. The WRF infrastructure provides some of the required treatment for DPR.

Cons: - Would require a change to the WRF project description.

- Likely a long timeline for the state of California to adopt DPR regulations, tests

DPR in highly monitored systems, then allow wider adoption of DPR.

- Requires some additional treatment be added to the WRF.
- May require additional monitoring and oversight of the WRF.

### **12. Reduce Water Loss**

There is a discrepancy between the amount of water pumped into the District's distribution system and the amount of water billed to customers. This is referred to as water loss and is endemic to all municipal water systems. The District's water loss ranges between 10% and 17%. Water loss can result from leaks, pipe failures, meter errors, measurement inaccuracies, or water theft. Some of the losses due to leaks or pipe failures could be reduced by identifying and repairing leaks in the existing distribution system. This would effectively provide the District additional water to provide customers.

- Pros: Relatively low cost to implement.
  - No new wells or pipelines needed.
- Cons: The water savings may be minimal if the water loss is due to meter error or measurement inaccuracy
  - Requires ongoing monitoring and maintenance to avoid future water loss.

#### 13. Add San Simeon Wastewater to the WRF Input Stream

Increasing the amount of wastewater treated by the WRF could effectively increases the amount of water percolated into the aquifer supplying the San Simeon wellfield. This

could result in additional water supplies for the San Simeon Wellfield, and possibly fewer stream impacts.

- Pros: Leverages CCSD's existing infrastructure.
  - Relatively little infrastructure needs.
  - The additional water stored in the aquifer may result in reduced stream impacts.
- Cons: Running the San Simeon wastewater through the WRF every year would require a change to the WRF project description.

- Discussions with San Simeon CSD regarding regional water and wastewater management have not been fruitful.

- The future status of the San Simeon wastewater treatment facility is unclear.

# REFERENCES

- CDM Smith, 2013. Cambria Water Supply Alternatives, Engineering Technical Memorandum, prepared for the Army Corp of Engineers and the Cambria Community Services District, 236 pp.
- Kennedy/Jenks, 2004. Assessment of Long-Term Water Supply Alternatives, prepared for Cambria Community Services District, 118 pp.