



**CITY OF MORRO BAY WATER
RECLAMATION FACILITY
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WRFCAC)
AGENDA**

The City of Morro Bay is dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the quality of life. The City shall be committed to this purpose and will provide a level of municipal service and safety consistent with and responsive to the needs of the public.

**Regular Meeting
October 6, 2015
Veterans Memorial Building - 3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.
209 Surf Street, Morro Bay, CA**

John Diodati, Chairperson

Bill Woodson,
Vice Chairperson

Dale Guerra

Barbara Spagnola

Mary (Ginny) Garelick

Paul Donnelly

Valerie Levulett

Planning Commission
Member: Richard Sadowski

Public Works Advisory Board
Member: Steven Shively

ESTABLISH QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER
MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATIONS

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Members of the audience wishing to address the Board on City business matters other than scheduled items may do so at this time. To increase the effectiveness of the Public Comment Period, the following rules shall be followed:

- When recognized by the Chair, please come forward to the podium and state your name and address for the record. Board meetings are audio and video recorded and this information is voluntary and desired for the preparation of minutes.
- Comments are to be limited to three minutes.
- All remarks shall be addressed to the Board, as a whole, and not to any individual member thereof.
- The Board respectfully requests that you refrain from making slanderous, profane or personal remarks against any elected official, commission and/or staff.
- Please refrain from public displays or outbursts such as unsolicited applause, comments or cheering.
- Any disruptive activities that substantially interfere with the ability of the Board to carry out its meeting will not be permitted and offenders will be requested to leave the meeting.
- Your participation in Board meetings is welcome and your courtesy will be appreciated.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Public Works Department at (805) 772-6262. Notification 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR

A-1 Approval of minutes from the Water Reclamation Facility Citizen Advisory Committee special meeting of September 1, 2015

Staff Recommendation: Approve minutes as submitted

A-2 Water Reclamation Facility Funding Update

Recommendation: Receive update.

A-3 WRF Status Report

Recommendation: Receive update.

A-4 Upcoming Outreach Opportunities

Recommendation: Receive update.

B. OLD BUSINESS

B-1 WRFCAC Sub-Committee Updates and Recommendations
Finance, Environmental and Engineering Sub-Committees to present their analyses and findings to the entire committee.

Recommendation: Receive and consider updates.

C. NEW BUSINESS

C-1 Discuss Status of CEQA/NEPA consultant and review scope/budget

Recommendation: Receive update and provide comment on scope/budget

D. COMMITTEE MEMBER CLOSING COMMENTS

E. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to the Water Reclamation Facility Citizen Advisory Committee regular meeting at the Veterans Memorial Building, 209 Surf Street, on November 3, 2015, at 3:00 p.m.

This agenda is subject to amendment up to 72 hours prior to the date and time set for the meeting. Please refer to the agenda posted at the Public Works Department, 955 Shasta Avenue, for any revisions or call the department at 772-6262 for further information.

Materials related to an item on this agenda are available for public inspection during normal business hours in the Public Works Department, at Mill's/ASAP, 495 Morro Bay Boulevard, or the Morro Bay Library, 695 Harbor, Morro Bay, CA 93442.

This agenda may be found on the Internet at: www.morro-bay.ca.us/wrfcac or you can subscribe to Notify Me for email notification when the Agenda is posted on the City's website. To subscribe, go to www.morro-bay.ca.us/notifyme and follow the instructions.

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Committee after publication of the agenda packet are available for inspection at the Public Works Department during normal business hours or at the scheduled meeting.

MINUTES – WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WRFCAC)
REGULAR MEETING – SEPTEMBER 1, 2015
VETERAN’S MEMORIAL BUILDING - 3:00 P.M.

- | | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| PRESENT: | John Diodati
Bill Woodson
Mary (Ginny) Garelick
Paul Donnelly | Valerie Levulett
Barbara Spagnola
Steven Shively |
| ABSENT: | Dale Guerra
Richard Sadowski | |
| STAFF: | Rob Livick
Rick Sauerwein
Bruce Keogh
Kay Merrill | Public Works Director
Capital Projects Manager
WWTP Manager
Administrative Utilities Technician |
| CONSULTANTS: | Mike Nunley
John Rickenbach | Program Manager
Deputy Program Manager |

ESTABLISH QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER
MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

The meeting was called to order at 3:02p.m., and a quorum was present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
<https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=2m43s>

PUBLIC COMMENT
<https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=3m1s>

The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed.

A. CONSENT AGENDA
<https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=3m13s>

A-1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE WRFCAC MEETING OF AUGUST 5, 2015

The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed.

MOTION:
Steve Shively moved to approve Item A-1with the following changes, on page 2 Under C-1, it should read:
Mary Garelick recommended additional language to be added to the staff report for the revised proposal to clarify the Project Management System MKN Associates has in mind and amend the attachment and memo to clarify the additional activities associated with the increased budget. When scope changes,

include those changes in reports. She would also like clarification on MKN's ideas and recommendations for technology and associated costs and on page 1, Steven Shively name was misspelled.

The motion was seconded by Barbara Spagnola and carried unanimously, 7-0.

B. OLD BUSINESS

B-1 Water Reclamation Facility Program Update <https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=5m17s>

Program Manager, Mike Nunley and Deputy Program Manager, John Rickenbach presented the Staff Report.

The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed.

B-2 WRFCAC SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS Finance, Environmental and Engineering Sub-Committees to present their analyses and findings to the entire committee. <https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=37m5s>

Barbara Spagnola announced there is an upcoming CFCC Funding Fair on September 23, 2015 in Sacramento and the Fair will be webcast.

The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed.

C. NEW BUSINESS

C-1 Discuss Objectives of Outreach Plan <https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=46m54s>

Deputy Program Manager, John Rickenbach presented the Staff Report.

There was discussion regarding having two WRFCAC Meetings in October and November and when staff has the dates then the WRFCAC members will be notified.

The public comment period was opened, seeing none, the public comment period was closed.

D. COMMITTEE MEMBER CLOSING COMMENTS <https://youtu.be/Ubt9gw9DPkQ?t=1h13m55s>

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:15p.m.



AGENDA NO: A-2

MEETING DATE: October 6, 2015

Staff Report

DATE: September 28, 2015

TO: Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Mike Nunley, PE – Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Program Manager

SUBJECT: Water Reclamation Facility Funding Update

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the WRFCAC:

- 1) Review the information regarding:
 - current status and the proposed next steps for: 1) the submitted SWRCB Clean Water State Revolving Fund Planning Grant application, and 2) upcoming SWRCB Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan application
 - list of potential future funding sources
- 2) Provide any further input to the program management team

ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

The SRF Planning Grant is intended to provide funding for a portion of the Master Reclamation Plan preparation costs. Grant and low-interest loans are considered an essential part of the funding mechanism for the WRF program.

Prepared By: ___MN___

Dept Review: ___

City Manager Review: _____

City Attorney Review: _____

DISCUSSION

SRF PLANNING GRANT

The PM team and City staff have been working with Kestrel Consulting to facilitate submittal of an application to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) to obtain a \$75,000 Planning Grant.

The planning grant is intended to assist agencies with completion of planning studies for water recycling projects using treated municipal wastewater. The grant will cover 50% of eligible costs up to \$75,000 for studies to determine the feasibility of using recycled water to offset or augment the use of fresh/potable water from state and/or local supplies.

An SRF planning grant application was submitted by Kestrel Consulting on behalf of the City of Morro Bay to the SWRCB's Recycled Water Funding Program on September 11, 2015. Review of this application is awaiting review by SWRCB funding program staff pending receipt of DWR certification of the AB 1420 compliance forms.

NEXT STEPS FOR PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION:

- Upon receipt of DWR certification, SWRCB completes initial review of grant application
- Clarifications to be provided to SWRCB, as needed, to complete review
- SWRCCB develops grant agreement and transmits to City of Morro Bay
- City of Morro Bay's authorized representative signs agreement
- Grant Study begins (grant agreement timeline requires completion within two years of agreement execution, or within three years if considering IPR or DPR)
- Draft report submittal
- Up to 50% grant disbursement following SWRCB approval of draft report
- Mandatory mid-course meeting with SWRCB, applicant, and applicant team
- Final 50% grant disbursement following SWRCB approval of finalized report

SRF LOANS

SWRCB funding program staff have indicated to Kestrel that the SRF Planning Loan application can be submitted now. Kestrel has been given direction to start work on the loan application in October. It is anticipated that preparation will require approximately two months. Targeted submittal of the loan application is end of November or beginning of December.

OTHER FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Kestrel has developed a general summary table of Grants and Loans for Water Projects FY 2015-2016 (included as an attachment to this staff report) for use in looking ahead to potential future sources of funding that may be available. The detailed project description for the WRF is still being developed. Once the Facility Master Plan is completed and CEQA project alternatives are identified, identification and pursuit of additional funding sources will continue in coordination with WRFCAC.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Kestrel Consulting Memo – Status of Grants and Loans for Water Reclamation Facility Project
2. Summary Table of Grants and Loans for Water Projects FY 2015-2016



September 23, 2015

Memo:

To: Michael K. Nunley, Rob Livick
From: Monica Reid, Principal Consultant

Subject: Status of Grants and Loans for Water Reclamation Facility Project

Dear Mike and Rob,

As requested, here is an update on the status of the recycled water planning grant application and next steps.

Recycled Water Planning Grant

On Friday, September 11, 2015 Kestrel Consulting submitted a complete application, pending SWRCB receipt of DWR compliance forms, for the City of Morro Bay to receive a \$75,000 planning grant from the State Water Board's Recycled Water Funding Program. The purpose of the planning grant is to assist agencies with completing planning studies for water recycling projects using treated municipal wastewater and/or treated groundwater from sources contaminated by human activities. The outcome of a planning study is a project report that fulfills the requirements that are specified by the Recycled Water Funding Program. For the City of Morro Bay, this will comprise a large portion of the Water Reclamation Master Plan. If approved, the grant will fund 50% of the cost of the study, and the City will contribute a \$75,000 cost-match.

The Recycled Water Planning Grant application has been assigned to a Project Manager (Mr. Jody Hack) in the State Water Board's Division of Financial Assistance. The Project Manager will review the application for completeness and may request additional information or clarification if needed. This review has not yet started, as certification of the AB 1420 Compliance Forms is still pending review by the Department of Water Resources (DWR).

Next Steps:

Kestrel suggests the following steps to complete all necessary actions for the Recycled Water Planning Grant.

- Upon receipt of the DWR certification, SWRCB completes initial review of grant application
- Clarification to be provided to SWRCB, as needed, to complete review
- SWRCB prepares grant agreement and transmits to City of Morro Bay
- City of Morro Bay's authorized representative, Rob Livick, signs the agreement
- Grant study begins. Grant agreement timeline requires completion and submittal of final project report within two years of agreement execution, or within three years if considering IPR or DPR.
- Draft report submittal (City of Morro Bay proposed to submit the draft report in December 2016.)
- Up to 50% grant disbursement following SWRCB approval of draft report



- Mandatory mid-course meeting with SWRCB and applicant team
- Final 50% grant disbursement following SWRCB approval of finalized report (City of Morro Bay proposed to submit final report by December 2017.)

In addition, Division staff may approve an extension of up to 12 months from the date specified in the grant agreement with good cause. No interim grant reporting is required, except for a mandatory mid-course meeting. The meeting should include applicant staff, principal consultants, Division staff, and other appropriate persons. The meeting should be scheduled after completion of the market assessment, the analysis of recycled water alternatives, and submittal of the draft project report to the Division.

Loans for Planning and Construction:

The Water Recycling Funding Program provides funding to eligible applicants for the planning and construction of water recycling facilities. In addition to the Planning Grant, which the City has applied for, planning *loans* are available to address costs related to environmental and legal reviews, planning, and design costs. The application for a planning loan consists of the application form, the “technical” package, and the “financial security” package. Disbursement of planning and design costs requires an executed financing agreement. Disbursement is limited to 70 percent of the financing amount until the draft deliverables are submitted. It should also be noted that a construction loan may also be used to reimburse planning and design costs retroactively.

Next Steps for Loans:

Once the planning grant agreement is initiated, Kestrel will begin preparation of the loan application. We will begin with the Financial Security Package, as this is key to understanding the maximum loan amount for which the City qualifies. We expect this work to begin in mid-late October 2015.

Other Grants:

Kestrel has prepared a summary of water-related grants offered by the state of California and others (see attached). At this time, it is too early to apply for grants to construct the new Water Reclamation Facility, since planning studies are not yet complete. If the City has eligible projects for other grants, and would like assistance with an application, or if you would like to discuss any of these grants please let us know.

My staff and I will keep you informed of any new developments with the Planning Grant application, and we will confer with you prior to initiating the Planning Loan application. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at monica@kestrel-inc.com or 541-399-6806.

City of Morro Bay								
Grants and Loans for Water Projects FY 2015-2016 as of 9/29/15								
Kestrel Consulting, Inc.								
Funding Entity	Program	Program Objective	Amount Available FY 15/16	Fund amounts to be awarded	Type	Draft Guidelines	Final Guidelines	Application Deadline
State Water Resources Control Board	Proposition 1 - Water Recycling http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_and_loans/water_recycling/	PLANNING & CONSTRUCTION - To promote the beneficial use of treated municipal wastewater in order to augment fresh water supplies in California by providing technical and financial assistance to agencies and other stakeholders in support of water recycling projects and research.	\$624,000,000	\$75,000 for Planning grants, Construction grants: 35% of total project costs up to \$15,000,000. Loan amounts almost unlimited	Grants Loans	February 2015	June 2015	Continuous
State Water Resources Control Board	Proposition 1 - Stormwater http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/swqp/prop1/	PLANNING & CONSTRUCTION - Funds will be available for multi-benefit storm water management projects, which may include: green infrastructure, rainwater, and storm water capture projects and storm water treatment facilities. Stormwater Planning Grants are also available.	\$200,000,000	To be determined	Grant	October 2015	December 2015	Continuous
State Water Resources Control Board	Proposition 1 - Groundwater Sustainability http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/proposition1/groundwater_sustainability.shtml	CONSTRUCTION - SWRCB will administer \$800 million to prevent and cleanup contamination of groundwater that serves as a source of drinking water.	\$800,000,000	No maximum or minimum amounts	Grants Loans	December 2015	Winter 2016	Continuous
State Water Resources Control Board	Proposition 1 - SB 445 Site Cleanup http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/scap/	CONSTRUCTION - New funding program allowing SWRCB to issue grants for projects that remediate the harm or threat of harm to human health, safety or the environment caused by existing or threatened surface or groundwater contamination.	\$19,500,000	No funding limit but subdivided for Site Cleanup, Storage Tanks Program, and School District account	Grants	Available	June 2015	August 2015
US Bureau of Reclamation	WaterSMART: Water and Energy Efficiency http://www.usbr.gov/WaterSMART/grants.htm	CONSTRUCTION - WaterSMART grants provide cost-shared funding for the projects that save water, improve energy efficiency, address endangered species and other environmental issues and facilitate new transfers to new uses.	\$19,000,000	Awards from \$200,000 to \$1,000,000	Grant	November 2015	January 2016	Spring 2016
Department of Water Resources	Proposition 1 – Sustainable Groundwater Planning Grant Program http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/sgwp/	PLANNING – SGWP provides funds for projects that develop and implement sustainable groundwater planning and projects consistent with groundwater planning requirements outlined in Division 6 of the California Water Code.	\$100,000,000	To Be Determined	Grant	August 2015	October 2015	November 2015
Department of Water Resources	Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Proposition 1 http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/	PLANNING & CONSTRUCTION - Integrated Regional Water Management grants may be used to fund a wide variety of water-related project types.	\$510,000,000	\$43 million to Central Coast Region over 4-5 years	Grant	In Development	TBD	TBD
Department of Water Resources	Water Desalination Grant Program http://www.water.ca.gov/desalination/2016Cycle4.cfm	CONSTRUCTION - DWR provides grants to local agencies for planning, design, and construction of water desalination facilities for brackish and ocean water. Grants may also be used for pilot, demonstration, and research projects.	\$49,550,000	Awards from \$200,000 to \$3,000,000	Grant	December 2015	Spring 2016	Spring/ Summer 2016
Department of Water Resources	Flood Corridor Grant Program http://www.water.ca.gov/floodmgmt/fpo/sqb/fpcp	CONSTRUCTION - DWR provides grants to local agencies to reduce flood risk through non-structural projects, habitat restoration/conservation and/or agricultural land preservation, and restore natural floodplain processes	\$48,000,000	Grant Cap of \$5M	Grant	Late 2015		

Natural Resources Agency	Watershed and Urban River Enhancement Program http://www.resources.ca.gov	CONSTRUCTION - Funds for multi-benefit watershed and urban rivers enhancement projects in urban watersheds that increase regional and local water self-sufficiency..	\$20,000,000		Grant	2015: Program Development		
CA Water Commission	Water Storage Investment Program http://www.cwc.ca.gov	CONSTRUCTION - Allocated to the Commission continuously for public benefits associated with water storage projects that improve the operation of the state water system, are cost effective, and provide a net improvement in ecosystem and water quality conditions, in accordance with this chapter.	\$2,700,000,000		Grants	October 2015	December 2015	Continuous
Loans								
State Water Resources Control Board	Clean Water State Revolving Fund http://waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/_programs/grants_loans/asbs/index.shtml	CONSTRUCTION - The nation's largest water quality financing source, helping communities meet CWA goals by improving water quality, protecting and restoring drinking water sources. Loan offered at half the market rate.	Dependent on state funding	No maximum or minimum amounts	Loan	May 2015	July 2015	Continuous
Ibank	Infrastructure State Revolving Fund http://www.ibank.ca.gov/infrastructure_loans.htm	CONSTRUCTION - Provides financing to public agencies and non-profits for a wide variety of infrastructure and economic development projects. Loan terms of up to 30 years.	Dependent on state funding	\$50,000 - \$25,000,000 per project	Loan	Available	Available	Continuous
State Water Resources Control Board	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/drinking_water/services/funding/SRF.shtml	CONSTRUCTION - The DWSRF program offers low interest loans and some grants for drinking water quality projects such as treatment and distribution systems, as well as desalination.	Dependent on state funding	Max of \$3,000,000 construction principal forgiveness and max \$500,000 planning principal forgiveness	Grants Loans	Available	Available	Continuous



AGENDA NO: A-3

MEETING DATE: October 6, 2015

Staff Report

DATE: October 1, 2015

TO: Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Mike Nunley, PE – Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Program Manager

SUBJECT: WRF Program Update

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends WRFCAC review the information regarding the current status and the proposed next steps regarding the development of a WRF program.

ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

Attachment 1 is a summary of the existing contracts with consultants used to assist in the WRF project.

DISCUSSION

Staff provides this report as a monthly update to the progress made to date on the new WRF project. With the denial of the permit for the WWTP project in its current location, the City has embarked on a process for a WRF. This staff report provides the following:

1. Review of what has occurred to date. See the list of major milestones or accomplishments since the last update to City Council below. See Attachment 1 for a summary of project expenses to date. Customer rates and fees are the current revenue source for the program budget.
2. Schedule for near-term activities or workshops

Accomplishments and Milestones

The City's Program Management team performed the following tasks since the September Council update:

- Negotiated a scope and budget for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) / National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) consulting services with Environmental Science

Prepared By: MN

Dept Review: RL

City Manager Review:

City Attorney Review:

Associates (See Agenda Item No. C-1)

- Evaluated five (5) Program Management software options, attended software demonstrations, and requested a detailed quote from the top-ranked vendor
- Submitted a complete application for a State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Planning Grant
- Initiated application process for a Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) Planning Loan
- Presented the draft Program Outreach Plan at the September 22 Council Meeting
- Participated in conference calls with the Facility Master Plan team and reviewed progress reports
- Coordinated base mapping and survey along Highway 41/Atascadero Road including the Rancho Colina site

Near-Term Schedule

The following table identifies major deliverables, activities, or decision points through mid-November.

Task	Approx. Date
Completion of Survey/Base Mapping for Facility Master Plan and Design Phase	10/7/15
Council Award of CEQA/NEPA Contract	10/13/15
CEQA/NEPA Notice to Proceed	10/16/15
Technical Workshop #1 - Project Delivery	10/17/15
Community Workshop #1 – Facility Master Plan Overview & Community Input	October/November (Date TBD)
Technical Workshop #2 – Liquid Treatment Technologies (Joint WRFCAC/Council Study Session)	11/17/15

ATTACHMENTS

1. Summary of Project Expenses and Estimated Costs

599-8312-6105 P0234-8312	Contract Amount (1)	Amount Paid (2)	Remaining Contract
SITE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS - SITE PREFERENCE SELECTION			
JFR Consulting – Site Selection/Project Management Assistance			
Original Contract	\$ 117,256		
Contingency	\$ 11,726		
Amendment #1	\$ 76,129		
Amendment #2	\$ 91,336		
Amendment #3	\$ 23,147		
Amendment #4	\$ 44,279		
Total Contract - Final	\$ 363,873	\$ 362,646	\$ 56
Kestrel Consulting – Assessment Funding			
Total Contract	\$ 20,530	\$ 16,205	\$ 4,325
Larry Walker and Associates – Permitting Constraints			
Original Contract	\$ 24,970		
Amendment #1	\$ 5,100		
Total Contract + Direct Costs - Final	\$ 30,070	\$ 30,151	\$ (81)
Cleath-Harris Associates – Stream Flow Augmentation			
Contract Amount	\$ 7,500		
Amendment #1	\$ 6,500		
Amendment #2	\$ 4,000		
Total Contract - Final	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,348	\$ (348)
Carollo Engineers – CMC Capacity, Siting Evaluation and Cost Estimate			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 101,945	\$ 87,361	
(Proposed to be Reimbursed by RWQCB using SEP Funds)		\$ (87,361)	
Net Amount - Final	\$ 101,945	\$ -	\$ 14,584
Outside Legal - Water Rights		\$ 8,119	
Water testing		\$ 6,900	
Appraisal - Righetti Site		\$ 5,500	
Total Site Selection - Final	\$ 534,418	\$ 447,869	\$ 18,536
FATAL FLAWS			
Kevin Merk Associates – Preliminary Bio Assessment			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 12,835	\$ 9,395	\$ 3,440
Fugro - Hydrogeological			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 38,600	\$ 22,775	\$ 15,825
Farwestern Archeological			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 12,000	\$ 3,725	
Larry Walker Associates - Pretreatment (Salt) Assessment			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 23,640	\$ 7,550	\$ 16,090
Total Fatal Flaws	\$ 87,075	\$ 43,445	\$ 35,355
FACILITIES MASTER PLAN			
Black and Veatch			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 710,123	\$ -	\$ 710,123
JoAnn Head Surveying			
Total Contract + Direct Costs	\$ 45,050	\$ -	\$ 45,050
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (CEQA/NEPA Compliance)			
Consultant to be Determined			
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT			
MKN & Associates, Inc.			
Total Contract Year One +	\$ 920,808	\$ 11,521	\$ 909,287
Estimated Amount for Eight +/- Years - Including Construction Management	\$9 - \$14 Million		
Kestrel Consulting - SRF and Prop 1 Support/Applications	\$ 65,752	\$ -	\$ 65,752
Total Consultant Contract Amount (to date)	\$ 2,318,176	\$ 502,834	\$ 1,673,301

Notes:

1. Does not include reimbursable costs, i.e. copies, travel and other direct expenses
2. Includes reimbursable costs, i.e. copies, travel and other direct expenses



AGENDA NO: A-4

MEETING DATE: October 6, 2015

Staff Report

DATE: October 1, 2015

TO: Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: John Rickenbach, AICP – Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Deputy Program Manager

SUBJECT: Upcoming Outreach Opportunities – an Update

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends WRFCAC review the proposed next steps in the public outreach process, including upcoming workshops and stakeholder interviews. WRFCAC is asked to provide feedback on specific groups or individuals who should be part of the stakeholder interview process, and what topics to address in the interviews. WRFCAC is also asked to confirm possible dates for upcoming community workshops related to the overall effort.

No other action is needed at this time.

ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed outreach program is already accounted for within the approved WRF Program Management contract led by Michael K. Nunley & Associates, Inc. (MKN). No additional fiscal impact would occur.

DISCUSSION

The approved WRF Program Management contract recognized the importance of ongoing public outreach in order to successfully implement the new WRF and related facilities. Under the direction of City staff, MKN and its subconsultants, John F. Rickenbach (JFR) Consulting and RRM Design Group, have prepared a detailed Outreach Program, which includes a multi-faceted approach to ensuring the broadest spectrum of public participation in the process as possible. Attachment 1 includes the detailed outreach program that was presented at the September 22, 2015, City Council meeting, including a schedule for both short- and long-term efforts.

Prepared By: ___ JFR ___

Dept Review: ___

City Manager Review: _____

City Attorney Review: _____

In the context of the attached schedule, the following are the next immediate outreach opportunities in October and November 2015:

1. Key Stakeholder Interviews.

- a. Purpose: Communicating with stakeholders early in the process will allow stakeholders to express any concerns, issues, and ideas in a private setting before we hold community workshops related to facility master planning. These interviews open up the communication paths for future connections throughout the process.
- b. Key Stakeholder Groups: The first step is to identify these key stakeholders, or representatives of key stakeholder interest groups. These could include, but not be limited to:
 - Residents (citywide rate payers)
 - Business Interests
 - Potential Reclaimed Water Customers (including growers or residents)
 - Resource Protection/Environmental Interest Groups
 - Neighboring property owners
- c. How Interviews Will Be Conducted: Once identified, the interview team will organize interviews into like-minded small groups. In this way, we can maximize efficiency and receive more comprehensive feedback to inform the overall process. Over a two-day period, we will conduct 30 to 60 minute interviews with key stakeholders.
- d. Feedback: We will facilitate a discussion to help the team understand issues that we will be faced with during the process. Specifically, the interviews will focus on gaining feedback on the following issues:
 - *Overall concerns to address throughout the process;*
 - *Features to include within (or design issues related to) the new Water Reclamation Facility; and*
 - *Concerns related to the Master Water Reclamation Plan process*
- e. Proposed Interview Dates: October 14-15 (subject to change)

2. Community Workshop #1.

- a. Purpose: The first community workshop will focus on different aspects of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). Specifically, we will be seeking input from the community on possible amenities that could be included in the facility or on the site, as well as the visual aspects of the design, including architectural and massing issues to ensure community compatibility. We will convey this input to the FMP team, who will use it to inform the overall master plan, in the context of achieving adopted city goals related to these issues.
- b. Proposed Workshop Date: to be determined (late October or early November)

3. Technical Workshop #1.

a. Purpose: This is an educational workshop to present the issues involved with alternative delivery methods.

b. Proposed Workshop Date: October 17

4. WRFCAC Meeting.

a. Purpose: Receive an update on the Facility Master Plan process.

b. Proposed Date: November 3

5. Technical Workshop #2.

a. Purpose: This is an educational workshop to present liquid treatment technologies.

b. Proposed Workshop Date: November 17 (joint WRFCAC and City Council study session)

ATTACHMENTS

1. Memorandum from JFR Consulting describing WRF Community Outreach Program

Memorandum

Date: September 22, 2015

To: Morro Bay City Council; Water Reclamation Facility Citizen Advisory Committee

From: WRF Program Management Outreach Team (John Rickenbach, AICP; and Debbie Rudd, AICP)

Subject: City of Morro Bay Water Reclamation Facility, Community Outreach Program

Community outreach throughout the City of Morro Bay (City) Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Program will be key to helping the process run smoothly and with success. The following memorandum describes the outreach strategy that the Project Team will undertake to engage the community early on and throughout the WRF process. This outreach program includes involving a broad cross-section of the greater Morro Bay community, in a variety of ways and settings, to get quality feedback. The primary components of the program include:

1. *Key stakeholder interviews*
2. *Community workshops*
3. *Technical presentations*
4. *Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee (WRFCAC) meetings*
5. *City Council study sessions and hearings*
6. *Formal Environmental Review process*
7. *Coordination with outside permitting agencies*
8. *WRF Program website and promotional materials*

Though this program outlines various likely outreach activities, it is important to remain flexible and allow for redirection and variations of the exercises and activities as the process evolves. This will allow the Program Management Team to learn from the community and customize the workshop and meetings to optimize their effectiveness.

A. Overall Strategic Framework

The success of the outreach program depends on reaching a variety of audiences, each with its own interests relative to implementing the new facility. **Table 1** summarizes the key stakeholder groups, their objectives in the context of the project, and how the program intends to involve them in the overall process.

Table 1. Strategic Framework for Targeting Key Stakeholders		
Stakeholder Group	Objectives for the Group	Outreach Approach(es)
General Public	• Education on City process • Understand impacts to water rates • Receive feedback to guide program	• Informal communication • Stakeholder interviews • Workshops • Website/Newsletters/E-blasts/Surveys
City Council/WRFCAC	• Affirmation of stated goals • Education on City process • Present technical information • Receive feedback and direction • Relationship of risk, cost, schedule	• Workshops • Status reports • Formal Presentation of Draft Deliverables
Potential Recycled Water Customers	• Education on City process • Determine level of interest • Identify key motivations to participate • Identify critical path items to achieve reclamation	• Informal communication • Stakeholder interviews • Technical workshops
Interested Public Agencies	• Education on City process • Identify permitting requirements • Identify needs and constraints • Identify and complete critical path items • Prevent surprises	• Informal communication • Ongoing updates • Formal consultation • Workshops
Industry	• Promote fair competition • Get best value for City • Reduce risk to City	• Technical workshops • Website with registration/ contact sharing

B. Outreach Program Components and Timing

As noted in the introduction, our team intends to use a variety of approaches and forums to reach the various general stakeholder groups described in **Table 1** above, and we intend to gain feedback through the life of the program. This is crucial in order to allow both the technical team and elected officials to adjust the program as needed to respond to evolving perspectives in the community.

Although we have a very good idea how the next several months are likely to proceed, it is not possible to accurately predict what long-term outreach strategies will need to be employed in order to most effectively realize the City's overall goals. For that reason, our plan addresses both short-term and long-term approaches, and the likely timeframe associated with the use of the various outreach methods. We intend to update this program periodically as the overall process evolves.

The intent and conceptual understanding of each outreach approach is briefly described below. **Table 2** then summarizes how each component would be used during the program, and its timing in the context of the overall program schedule. Note also that each approach is color-coded in the descriptions below (and keyed to its inclusion within **Table 2**) to more clearly show how the various outreach components relate to one another over the length of the program.

1. Key Stakeholder Interviews. Communicating with stakeholders early in the process will allow stakeholders to express any concerns, issues, and ideas in a private setting before we hold the community workshop and before we begin designing. These interviews open up the communication paths for future connections throughout the process.

The first step is to identify these key stakeholders, or representatives of key stakeholder interest groups. To a large extent, this was accomplished in the previous site selection phase of the process, but the Program Management (PM) Team will work with City staff to refine the list to include stakeholder interest that may either have been previously underrepresented, or did not previously exist.

Once identified, we intend to organize interviews into like-minded small groups, likely to include property and business owners, environmental interest groups, neighborhood representatives, possible reclaimed water customers, and others with an interest in the project. In this way, we can maximize efficiency and receive more comprehensive feedback to inform the overall process.

Over a two-day period, the PM Team will conduct 30 to 60 minute interviews with key stakeholders. We will facilitate a discussion to help the team understand issues that we will be faced with during the process. Specifically, the interviews will focus on gaining feedback on the following issues:

- *Overall concerns to address throughout the process;*
- *Features to include within (or design issues related to) the new Water Reclamation Facility; and*
- *Concerns related to the Master Water Reclamation Plan process*

Debbie Rudd of RRM design Group will lead the stakeholder interviews, supported by John Rickenbach.

2. Community workshops. The program management team will facilitate community workshops that will focus on two key aspects of the program:

- *Facilities Master Plan*
- *Master Water Reclamation Plan*

In the near term, workshops will focus on different aspects of the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). Specifically, we will be seeking input from the community on possible amenities that could be included in the facility or on the site, as well as the visual aspects of the design, including architectural and massing issues to ensure community compatibility. We will convey this input to the FMP team, who will use it to inform the overall master plan, in the context of achieving adopted city goals related to these issues. Once we have a draft plan available, a second workshop will be conducted to present the key plan components, which will provide the community an opportunity to confirm whether or not we are on the right track from their perspective. The WRFCAC and City Council can then use this feedback to fine-tune their stated goals, if needed, as the project moves forward.

Workshops related to the Master Water Reclamation Plan will follow once the FMP is near completion, and the wastewater treatment aspects of the project are well understood. In all likelihood, these workshops will occur in 2016, and follow a similar pattern to those associated with the FMP: an initial workshop to educate and receive feedback, with a second workshop to convey how the draft Master Water Reclamation Plan responded to this input, with more feedback as needed.

John Rickenbach and Debbie Rudd will lead the community workshops.

3. Technical presentations. The program will include a variety of presentations that describe various technical aspects of the FMP or the Master Water Reclamation Plan. Often, these will be based on a variety of technical memoranda that are essential to the production of these reports. These will be conducted as public workshops, with a primary focus on education, so that the general public and decisionmakers can understand provide meaningful feedback far in advance of the completion of these technical documents, which form the basis of the overall project that will be implemented.

The primary authors of the reports will conduct these presentations: Black & Veatch in the case of the FMP, and MKN in the case of the Master Water Reclamation Plan.

4. Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee (WRFCAC) meetings. The WRFCAC has both a key technical and advisory role in the overall process. The WRFCAC will be a crucial forum to present technical information, gain crucial feedback, and make recommendations to the City Council to move the WRF program forward. WRFCAC meetings are held monthly, but when additional input is needed, we expect that their meeting schedule may be accelerated. This would be the case, for example, during the preparation of the FMP.

5. City Council study sessions and hearings. Similar to the WRFCAC, the City Council has several important roles in the overall process. In addition to approving contracts and providing general direction guiding the process, the City Council's most important role is to set the goals that drive the entire program. The Council will be asked from time to time to affirm or modify these goals as needed to respond to evolving conditions associated with implementing the WRF program. The City Council will also serve as an important forum for various study sessions related both to community workshop and interview input, as well as technical input from consultants associated with the overall process. The City Council will have an ongoing role throughout the entire process.

6. Formal environmental review (CEQA and NEPA) process. The project will be subject to formal environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The CEQA process includes a formal public scoping meeting, as well as coordination of public and agency comments regarding the scope received during a 30-day period following the release of the Notice of Preparation. Once the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is released to the public, a 45-day review period begins, during which the City and its environmental consulting team will formally respond to comments, which will ultimately be considered in the Final EIR. This process has the potential to result in changes to the proposed project that would lessen potential impacts to the environment.

7. Coordination with outside permitting agencies. The WRF will require a variety of permits from state and federal resource regulatory agencies. It is crucial to initiate a dialogue with these agencies from the outset, in order to better understand their permitting requirements, and whatever critical path items there may be in order to secure needed permits.

Key resource regulatory permitting agencies for this project could include:

- *State Water Resources Control Board*
- *Regional Water Quality Control Board*
- *California Department of Fish and Wildlife*
- *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*
- *NOAA Fisheries*
- *Bureau of Reclamation*
- *San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD)*

The WRF will also require a variety of permits from state and federal land use permitting agencies, notably the California Coastal Commission among others. Annexation of the project site will also require coordination with San Luis Obispo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo). Coordination with San Luis Obispo County will also be required, because while the facility is allowed at that location under its LCP, a specific alternatives analysis will be required to support that finding. In addition, a Caltrans encroachment permit would be needed if pipelines will be located within the Caltrans right-of-way.

As with the resource regulatory agencies, early consultation will be crucial, which will help define and guide the most time-effective approach to implementing the WRF. Key land use permitting agencies could include:

- *California Coastal Commission*
- *LAFCo (annexation to the City)*
- *City of Morro Bay (consistency with GP/LCP and local land use permits)*
- *San Luis Obispo County (coordination on LCP consistency)*
- *California Department of Transportation (Caltrans Encroachment Permit)*

It is anticipated that coordination with these permitting agencies will occur throughout the process, and will consist of informal meetings, formal consultation, and the permit application process. In many cases, the permit application process will need to be coordinated with the environmental review process.

8. WRF Program website and promotional materials. The entire program depends on clear communication and easy access to the many reports and other materials associated with the effort. To this end, the program management team, led by Konig Media and MKN, will put together a website dedicated to the WRF program. This will function as a platform for the dissemination of program materials, and will also be used to inform the public about the schedule, upcoming events, and future opportunities to participate in the process.

The team, led by RRM Design Group, will provide a logo design to brand the WRF program and use on documents, website, and exhibits. As the program moves forward, the team will also prepare graphics and exhibits to put on the website, e-blasts, newsletters, and use during meetings.

Table 2 summarizes these key outreach components and how they would be coordinated within the schedule of the overall WRF program.

Table 2. Summary of Outreach Program and Schedule			
Forum	Purpose	Key Topics	Timing
Short-Term Program (through Jan 2016)			
City Council study session	Education and Feedback	• Overall Program • Near-Term Schedule • Outreach Concept • Master Reclamation Plan	August 17, 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Education and Feedback	• Facility Master Plan Update • CEQA/NEPA Consultant Selection • Concept on Outreach Program	Sept 1, 2015
Interagency coordination (various agencies and locations)	Public Agency Outreach: • Gain input on permitting needs, critical path items, and agency concerns • Gain input on funding opportunities	Informal meetings with the following agencies: • California Coastal Commission • SLO County • RWQCB • State Water Resources Control Board (including Division of Drinking Water) • LAFCo • CDFW • Army Corps of Engineers • NOAA Fisheries • Caltrans • Bureau of Reclamation	Ongoing from Sept 2015 through life of project; Formal meetings TBD as needed
City Council study session	Education and Feedback	• Outreach Program • FMP Progress Update	Sept 22, 2015
Website development and promotional materials	• Program Branding • Creating Mechanisms for Distributing Information • Industry Outreach	• Website creation • Program Logo • Newsletters/Flyers • E-Blasts • Registration for potential industry to facilitate teaming and sharing of information	• Media created Sept-Nov 2015 • Information sharing ongoing
WRFCAC meeting	Review and Feedback	• Review CEQA/NEPA scope • Preliminary lift station alternatives and recommendations • Update on grant/loan opportunities	October 6, 2015
Stakeholder Interviews	Feedback	• Get focused feedback on: ✓ Key Concerns in Process ✓ Facilities to include ✓ Reclamation Issues	early October 2015 (stakeholders identified in Sept 2015)
City Council hearing	Feedback	• Selection of CEQA/NEPA consultant	October 13, 2015
Community Workshop #1:	Process and Goals Review, Education and Feedback	• Review of City goals • Overview of FMP Process • Community input on: ✓ facilities programming ✓ visual/design issues	mid-October 2015

Table 2. Summary of Outreach Program and Schedule			
Forum	Purpose	Key Topics	Timing
Technical Presentation #1:	Education	Technical presentation on Alternative Delivery approaches	October 17, 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Technical Review	Interim report on progress of FMP	Late October 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Technical Review	- Preliminary findings from ongoing hydrogeologic study and salinity control plan - Formal update on program schedule, budget, and cashflow	Nov 3, 2015
City Council study session	Education and Update	- Program update - WRFCAC input on FMP	November 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Technical Review	- FMP Tech Memoranda 5 (Offsite Facilities) and 6 (Biosolids Treatment) - Recommendation to Council on project delivery approach for Phase I WRF	mid-Nov 2015
General Plan/LCP Workshop	Education and feedback	- Describe General Plan/LCP concepts in the context of the FMP - Discuss common issues and coordination	Nov-Dec 2015
Technical Presentation #2:	Education	Liquid treatment technologies evaluated in FMP	November 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Technical Review	FMP Tech Memoranda 7 (Liquid Treatment Processes) and 8 (Future Potable Reuse)	early Dec 2015
Community Workshop #2:	Presentation and Feedback	- Preliminary site concepts for draft FMP - Visual simulations for WRF site and influent lift station site - Community feedback	early Dec 2015
Technical Presentation #3:	Education	Organic waste disposal and energy conversion	December 2015
Release of NOP for EIR	CEQA Notice of Preparation for EIR	No meeting; begins 30-day public review period for scope	early Dec 2015
EIR Scoping meeting	Formal CEQA scoping meeting	Public feedback on EIR scope	December 2015
WRFCAC meeting	Presentation and feedback	- Draft FMP - Feedback and recommendation to Council	January 2016
City Council hearing	Presentation, feedback and FMP adoption	- Adoption of FMP as project basis - Direction to Program Management team for completing the FMP - Initial scoping meeting for Master Reclamation Plan (assuming grant is awarded by January) - Formal update of schedule, budget, and cashflow	February 2016

Table 2. Summary of Outreach Program and Schedule			
Forum	Purpose	Key Topics	Timing
Long-Term Program (2016 and beyond)			
Community Workshops #3 and #4	Process and Goals Review, Education and Feedback	- Input on Master Water Reclamation Plan; - Presentation of Plan in response to feedback	2016
Environmental Review Process	Formal environmental documentation and public review	Environmental review of FMP and Master Reclamation Plan (likely CEQA+ process)	2016; includes formal public review and workshops
WRFAC meetings	Various; TBD	- Technical memos - Reclamation Plan - CEQA/NEPA documentation - Recommendation for selection of Alternative Delivery Design team	Monthly in 2016 and beyond
City Council study sessions and hearings	Various; TBD	- Confirmation of project goals; - Modifications to WRF Program as needed - Technical memos - Review and adoption of Reclamation Plan - Review and Certification of CEQA/NEPA documentation - Request for Proposal Review and approval of contractors for design and alternative delivery - Select Alternative Delivery Design team	As needed in 2016 and beyond
Additional Community Workshops	Various; TBD	TBD	TBD, as needed
Interagency coordination (various agencies and locations)	Public Agency Outreach: - Gain input on permitting needs, critical path items, and agency concerns - Initiate permitting process as appropriate	Informal and formal consultation and permitting as needed with the following agencies: - California Coastal Commission - SLO County - RWQCB - State Water Resources Control Board (including Division of Drinking Water) - LAFCo - CDFW - Army Corps of Engineers - NOAA Fisheries - Caltrans - Bureau of Reclamation	2016 and beyond, as needed
Website development and promotional material	Update as needed	TBD	2016 and beyond, as needed



AGENDA NO: C-1

MEETING DATE: October 6, 2015

Staff Report

DATE: October 6, 2015

TO: Water Reclamation Facility Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: John Rickenbach, AICP – Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) Deputy Program Manager

SUBJECT: WRF Proposed CEQA/NEPA Scope and Contract

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends WRFCAC review the proposed scope of work prepared by Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to provide CEQA and NEPA compliance services for the WRF program, provide comment and feedback to the City Council as appropriate, and recommend approval of the proposed contract to the City Council.

ALTERNATIVES

No alternatives are recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed contract for \$346,578.40 is within the preliminary cost assumptions made as part of the overall cost to implement the WRF program. As with other aspects of the program, the City is seeking grants and loans to offset a portion of these costs, but it is anticipated that a rate-payer increase will also be needed to fully offset the cost of the program beyond the first phase.

DISCUSSION

In response to a Request For Qualifications (RFQ) for environmental compliance services sent on May 29, 2015, the City received six Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) on July 14, 2015. The City interviewed the four most qualified firms on August 24 and 26.

The City's interview panel opined that while each team had strengths, ESA stood out for the following reasons:

1. Strong project management team
2. Excellent qualifications relative to water and wastewater projects
3. Focused answers to the interview questions, showing creative and practical application of

Prepared By: JFR

Dept Review: RL

City Manager Review:

City Attorney Review:

- their experience to this effort
4. Clear understanding of the CEQA+ process and how it may be applied to this project
 5. Excellent coastal permitting experience
 6. Balanced input from all members of the interview panel
 7. Good team chemistry and interaction with the interview team
 8. Past experience and familiarity with Morro Bay's wastewater treatment issues

Based on that process, ESA was determined to be the most qualified firm, and City staff entered into contract negotiations addressing the scope and fee associated with their effort.

ESA's proposed Work Plan and associated fee are included as an attachment to this staff report.

The proposed not-to-exceed fee of \$346,578.40 includes all work necessary to provide CEQA and NEPA compliance for the WRF, including the project components associated with both the Facility Master Plan and Master Reclamation Plan. It also includes substantial time built in for various forms of outreach and coordination, whether with the WRFCAC, City Council, City staff, and the general public as appropriate. The effort includes a formal public review process required under CEQA, and outreach to key public agencies as appropriate, including the California Coastal Commission and other responsible agencies that might be involved in the permitting aspects of the project.

As part of their effort, ESA anticipates the following technical issues will be examined in detail with respect to potential project impacts:

- *Aesthetics*
- *Agricultural Resources*
- *Air Quality*
- *Biological Resources*
- *Cultural Resources*
- *Paleontological Resources*
- *Geology and Soils*
- *Hazards/Hazardous Materials*
- *Hydrology/Water Quality*
- *Land Use and Recreation*
- *Noise and Vibration*
- *Transportation/Traffic*
- *Utilities and Public Services*
- *Growth Inducement*

It should be noted that through the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, the list of key issues for study may be refined. ESA will help lead that required public process.

All technical aspects of their effort will be prepared internally, without the use of subconsultants, which will enhance the City's ability to ensure cost control.

ESA has committed to a schedule that is consistent with the overall program schedule, all of which is

based on the City Council's goal of fully implementing the first phase of the WRF within 5 years.

ATTACHMENTS

1. ESA Scope of Work and Fee (revised September 30, 2015)



626 Wilshire Blvd
Suite 1100
Los Angeles CA 90017-2934
213.599.4300 **phone**
213.599.4301 **fax**

www.esassoc.com

September 30, 2015

Mr. Rob Livick, PE/PLS
City of Morro Bay
Public Works Department
955 Shasta Avenue
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Subject: Work Plan and Fee Estimate for CEQA/NEPA Compliance Services for a New Water Reclamation Facility Serving the City of Morro Bay

Dear Rob:

We appreciate the opportunity to submit our proposed work plan and fee estimate to provide CEQA/NEPA compliance services to the City for the proposed Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). We've coordinated with John Rickenbach and Mike Nunley in preparing an updated work plan and level of effort that we hope is consistent with the City's expectations.

Let us know if you have any comments or suggestions on the attached work plan. We are excited to get started!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Barnes", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Tom Barnes
Vice President
ESA Water, Southern California Director

Enc.



CITY OF MORRO BAY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY CEQA/NEPA COMPLIANCE SERVICES

Work Plan

The two primary components to ESA's Work Plan include:

- (1) **Project Planning and Development**, which involves coordination with City staff, WRF Citizens Advisory Committee, and consultants.
- (2) **CEQA/NEPA Compliance**, which involves the steps required for successful implementation of the CEQA/NEPA process.

Our Work Program anticipates an overall schedule of approximately 18 months to 24 months, starting in October 2015. We expect to participate in Project Planning and Development for the first four to six months, coordinating with the FMP team and General Plan/LCP team and facilitating agency consultations if needed, such as with the California Coastal Commission. At the end of this time period, we expect a draft FMP to be available with sufficient information to initiate the CEQA/NEPA process. This may be the draft deliverable for the FMP and less than 20-30 percent of the Master Reclamation Plan. We expect the CEQA process to be completed within about 12 months from the point of initiation. The NEPA process may also be completed within this time period if CEQA-Plus is the required compliance standard.

Critical drivers of the CEQA/NEPA schedule for this Project include the development of the FMP and the Master Reclamation Plan as well. We assume the Master Reclamation Plan will provide the information needed to decide on the recycled water end uses. The scope of technical studies that may be required to support the environmental analysis will depend on this outcome. If additional technical studies are required to evaluate the use of recycled water for groundwater recharge, the ultimate CEQA/NEPA schedule could be extended.

Task 1: Project Planning and Development

1.1 Team Coordination and Project Development

We understand that the Program Manager has been hired to navigate the entire team toward the successful completion of the project. Under our proposed approach and scope of work, as discussed with the team, we anticipate partnering with the Program Manager in developing and maintaining an overall project outline that identifies project objectives, schedule risks, key milestones, and key team integration requirements. ESA will participate in this program management as directed. We anticipate participation in compliance strategy and design teams.

ESA will coordinate with the Facility Master Plan (FMP) team during preliminary design discussions including facility siting at the Rancho Colina site, treatment processes, pipeline alignment alternatives, discharge

alternatives including groundwater recharge, and location alternatives for other project components such as pump stations and recharge basins, and injection wells. ESA will coordinate with the Program Manager to identify environmental constraints associated with project alternatives being considered, including treatment processes, facility locations, and recycled water end uses.

We assume for purposes of this scope of work that the FMP team will identify a preferred alternative or a set of functionally equivalent alternatives. ESA will work with the team to identify environmental constraints of the project alternatives. At this time, we don't anticipate preparing a formal Constraints Analysis. The previous work conducted by the City evaluating multiple treatment plant sites included environmental constraints. Our understanding is that the design team will focus on the Rancho Colina Site as a preferred site, recognizing its benefits and constraints from the previous analysis. However, ESA will discuss with the team whether a formal constraints assessment would assist in substantiating the preferred alternative.

As a deliverable for this task, ESA will prepare a project description sufficient to initiate an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation. The project description will include project background, objectives, facility components, construction methods, and a permitting plan that outlines consultation schedules and necessary approvals. The project description will identify potential federal involvement and NEPA compliance strategies. In addition, ESA will prepare a narrative of the project background, leading to a set of project objectives. These objectives will guide the entire program and will need to be carefully considered by the entire team.

Coordination with the team will occur through a series of meetings during the development of the draft project description. Meetings will be attended by ESA's Project Manager, Jennifer Jacobus, along with technical team members if needed, based on the nature of the environmental constraints. Likely issues include coastal zone consistency, General Plan consistency and timing, land use compatibility, groundwater, biological resources, and cultural and tribal resources. We anticipate participation from Tom Barnes, Eli Davidian, and Kimiko Lizardi at these meetings, though other technical experts may also be invited.

1.2 General Plan/LCP Update Coordination

We understand the City is in the process of preparing its GP/LCP Update, which is expected to be completed in the next two to three years. It is essential for ESA to coordinate with the GP/LCP team for several reasons. The new WRF design capacity will need to be sufficient to accommodate growth as planned for in the GP/LCP Update. In addition, annexation of the property into the City will need to be reflected in the GP/LCP Update process. The GP/LCP Update will undergo separate CEQA review, but the WRF environmental documentation will be published first and will need to be consistent with the GP/LCP Update and EIR. In Addition, the project will include decommissioning of the existing WWTP. The planned use for the existing WWTP site will be determined through the GP/LCP Update. Coordination with the GP/LCP team will be necessary to describe the likely planned land use for the WWTP site, to evaluate environmental impacts to the extent feasible and evaluate land use compatibility and the consistency of future uses with the GP/LCP.

We assume that a series of meetings describing the project status will be useful throughout the EIR process timeframe. Kimiko Lizardi and Eli Davidian will lead ESA's coordination with the GP/LCP team to share relevant information to ensure internal consistency.

1.3 Citizens Advisory Committee Coordination

ESA will meet with the project team and the CAC to report on the project status periodically. As part of this task, ESA will prepare presentational materials as appropriate to convey project status effectively to the wider stakeholder community. The purpose of these meetings is to ensure a broad stakeholder involvement.

1.4 Agency Meetings

ESA will participate in agency meetings to coordinate permitting strategies. Each agency may require separate meetings or a group meeting may be more effective. The Preliminary Project Description will outline the outreach strategy and schedule. This task includes meetings with regulatory agencies that may include the County, RWQCB, CCC, or wildlife agencies.

ESA will advise on matters of Coastal Act conformity and facilitate coordination with CCC staff. We expect this coordination will begin early in the project description development and continue through the CEQA/NEPA scoping and public review processes. We anticipate that meetings with the CCC will serve to brief the CCC on the project status and minimize risks to permissibility. ESA will prepare meeting materials and meeting minutes for each of the CCC meetings. Information provided by the CCC at these meetings will be incorporated into the Project Description or EIR Land Use impact analysis as appropriate to substantiate impact conclusions and mitigation requirements.

Team Meeting Summary

	In Person Meetings	Phone/Video Meetings
Task 1.1 EIR Team/Design Team Project Coordination	2	2
Task 1.2 GP/LCP Coordination Meetings	2	2
Task 1.3 CAC Coordination Meetings	2	2
Task 1.4 Agency Meetings	4	

Task 2: CEQA/NEPA Compliance

2.1 Preparation of an Initial Study

Once a preliminary project description has been developed, ESA will prepare an Initial Study (IS) to evaluate potential environmental impacts of the project. The IS will highlight environmental issues of the proposed project, informing the content of the EIR and supporting the need for technical studies. The preparation of an IS is optional since the City anticipates preparing an EIR, but the IS may provide additional justification for the impact analysis and enhance legal defensibility of the document. ESA will prepare one draft of the IS and incorporate team edits into a final version. The IS may be referenced within the Notice of Preparation.

2.2 Notice of Preparation

ESA will prepare the NOP as required by the CEQA Guidelines including a brief description of the project, site map, and summary of potential environmental impacts of the project. ESA will conduct mailings to the State Clearinghouse, responsible and trustee agencies, affected property owners and persons requesting notice. ESA will post notices in local newspapers and with the County Clerk. ESA will prepare presentational materials and conduct one scoping meeting. ESA will prepare a scoping report summarizing comments received during the NOP review period.

2.3 Technical Studies

No technical studies are included in this scope of work. We assume that a Biological Assessment and Cultural Resources Technical Report will be provided to ESA by the City. We also assume that any detailed hydrogeology investigations necessary to evaluate impacts to groundwater quality will be conducted by the City and relevant data provided to ESA.

2.4 Data Request

ESA will prepare and submit a data request to the City for information needed to complete the CEQA process. The request will include planning estimates for construction methods and background material prepared by the City. The data received from the City will support the impact analysis within the EIR.

2.5 Prepare Administrative Draft EIR

ESA will prepare an Administrative Draft EIR (ADEIR) in accordance with CEQA guidelines that accommodates the CEQA-Plus requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) State Revolving Fund (SRF). The ADEIR will summarize environmental setting, regulatory framework, potential environmental impacts, and proposed mitigation by resource area. As required by CEQA, the setting will describe the study area “as it exists before the commencement of the project” and the effects of the project on existing conditions. The impact analysis will identify direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts based on thresholds of significance. Mitigation measures will be identified to avoid or substantially lessen potential environmental effects. The ADEIR will also provide an analysis of project alternatives. Following the SWRCB guidelines for CEQA-Plus assessments, the EIR will identify consistency with federal laws, including a robust cultural resources analysis and Native American consultation, substantial discussion on compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act, and a discussion of environmental justice. ESA will submit up to 10 hard copies of the ADEIR to the City for review.

The following issue areas will be addressed in the ADEIR.

Project Description

ESA will finalize the project description using the preliminary project description prepared under Task 1. The project description will include more detailed information and figures on facilities, locations, construction methods and schedules. ESA will coordinate with the Program Manager and FMP team to ensure accurate depiction of the proposed project.

Aesthetics

The EIR will summarize the aesthetic and visual impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The EIR will include a description of existing visual conditions in the project area and will evaluate if the proposed project will substantially degrade the existing visual character of the project area. The EIR will evaluate the potential effects to public view corridors resulting from the new facilities and will determine whether the proposed project would substantially alter the character of the site or create substantial new sources of light and glare. The evaluation will include photographs of the existing environment. Up to three visual simulations will be prepared based on preliminary design plans. Mitigation measures will be identified if necessary to reduce aesthetic impacts. We anticipate aesthetics to be an important assessment that may pose significant impacts.

Agricultural Resources

The proposed project would be located on open space land. Impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project would affect agricultural land uses on site and on adjacent parcels. The EIR will evaluate the project's potential to impact important farmland and Williamson Act parcels. The EIR will evaluate the significance of the loss of farmland in San Luis Obispo County based on the County General Plan thresholds.

Air Quality

The EIR will summarize existing air quality in the area and will identify current attainment plans for criteria pollutants. Thresholds of significance will be identified for operational and construction activities. The EIR will evaluate short-term construction related air quality impacts and long-term operational impacts. The EIR will identify sensitive receptors in the project area and address any short term or long term odor impacts that could be associated with project implementation. ESA will prepare a data request to identify the types, number, and duration of use of equipment needed for operational and construction activities. Utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2011.1.1 emissions model, ESA will estimate emissions of criteria pollutants resulting from the construction methods to be used in construction of facilities. The EIR will provide the setting and air quality impact assessment. Operational air emissions will be described qualitatively. The facility will be required to undergo a New Source Review assessment to obtain a Permit to Operate the new facility. We assume that the project will not increase regional emissions due to the elimination of the old treatment plant emissions. A Local Significant Thresholds analysis will be conducted to evaluate potential impacts to local sensitive receptors. Mitigation measures will be developed to minimize air pollutant emissions. The EIR will also evaluate the project's consistency with the regional air quality attainment plans and will address global climate change issues. The air emissions calculations will include total CO₂-equivalent emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project. The EIR will assess the project's effects on global climate change and evaluate consistency with AB 32 and the Governor's greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals.

Biological Resources

ESA staff biologists will visit the site including the pipeline alignments and confirm existing biological resources. The EIR will incorporate information from the Biological Assessment provided by the City into the biological setting description. The EIR will identify the regulatory environment including any habitat conservation plan areas. Thresholds of significance will be developed from the CEQA guidelines and regulatory environment to

evaluate potential impacts. Potential impacts to sensitive species and habitats will be documented and mitigation strategies will be identified that would minimize the impacts. The analysis will include a comprehensive list of permits required from resource agencies to implement the project.

Cultural Resources

ESA will incorporate information from the Cultural Resources Technical Report provided by the City into the EIR. ESA will assist with the City's AB52 Native American notification requirements and will request a list of interested Native American Groups from the Native American Heritage Commission. ESA will mail notices to local Native American groups to request whether the project is located in an area of cultural significance. The EIR will summarize information from the records search and site survey and identify the potential for impacts to archaeological, historical, and Native American resources. The EIR will identify potential impacts of the project and provide mitigation measures to minimize impacts.

Paleontological Resources

ESA will conduct a records search of the project area to identify the potential for significant paleontological resources to be encountered during the construction. The EIR will summarize the results of the records search and identify mitigation measures necessary to minimize impacts.

Geology and Soils

ESA will review and incorporate available geologic information of the project area. The EIR will summarize available regional and local geologic, seismologic, and geological data pertinent to the proposed project area, including information from the U.S. Geological Survey and California Geological Survey as well as data from other projects in the area. The EIR will identify potential geologic impacts of the project and will provide mitigation measures to minimize the effects where possible.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials

The EIR will summarize known contamination sites within the construction areas and will list potentially hazardous materials used and stored during construction and operation of the project. The EIR will address potential soil contamination and groundwater contamination if applicable. Chemical storage proposed by the new facility will be identified. The EIR will develop mitigation measures for management of contaminated soils and on-site chemical usage, and will outline applicable hazardous materials handling and disposal requirements.

Hydrology/Water Quality

The EIR will identify surface water resources within the project area and will evaluate potential impacts posed by the project. The EIR will describe storm water runoff control requirements and provide mitigation if necessary to meet construction and operational storm water runoff quality requirements.

ESA assumes that a detailed hydrogeological assessment will be conducted by the City to support the EIR. The assessment should include a modeled simulation of groundwater levels in the vicinity. The EIR will evaluate potential effects to groundwater and surface water resources resulting from the proposed project. Mitigation measures will be developed to ensure that the project would not result in significant impacts to surface water or groundwater resources or their beneficial uses.

If applicable, the EIR will provide a discussion on water quality and the potential effects of groundwater recharge on groundwater quality. The EIR will describe regulations to protect drinking water sources and evaluate the project's potential to impact drinking water quality. The EIR will provide a comprehensive review of recycled water regulations and the oversight responsibilities of the California Department of Public Health and SWRCB.

Land Use and Recreation

The EIR will identify land uses in the project area and will summarize the current City and County General Plans and Local Coastal Plans. The EIR will describe the proposed method to incorporate the new facility within the City jurisdiction and will evaluate potential impacts to local land uses from the action. The EIR will summarize goals and policies of the applicable planning documents and evaluate the project's consistency as the GP/LCP is updated. This section will also include an assessment of recreational resources potentially affected by the project. The EIR will develop mitigation measures if necessary to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Noise and Vibration

The EIR will evaluate potential short-term construction noise impacts and long-term noise effects associated with implementation of the proposed project. The EIR will evaluate the project's ability to comply with existing noise standards and policies. Sensitive receptors will be identified that could be affected by noise and vibration. ESA will conduct ambient noise measurements at the proposed site to confirm the baseline condition. Mitigation measures will be developed to minimize impacts to neighboring land uses by construction and operational noise. We anticipate operational noise and truck traffic noise to be an important assessment that may pose significant impacts.

Transportation/Traffic

The EIR will characterize roadway traits, traffic flow, access, and circulation conditions on affected roadways and at major intersections in the project area. The EIR will assess the potential for construction traffic and operational traffic to affect local roadways. ESA will estimate the project construction traffic generation on the basis of estimates of earthwork quantities on-site, worker crew size, and equipment needs. The EIR will describe the potential for construction in roadways to temporarily disrupt traffic resulting in lane closures. Minimum standards for travel widths that would allow maintaining either uncontrolled two-way traffic flow, or alternate one-way traffic flow, will be applied to affected roadways to ascertain the significance of the impact. The impact analysis will be reviewed by an ESA in-house Traffic Engineer. The EIR will identify components to be included in traffic control plans for different segments of the pipeline construction. Alternative installation methods such as directional drilling will be evaluated to minimize traffic impacts if necessary. The analysis will not evaluate impact to levels of service at local intersections, but rather will estimate average daily trips during operations and construction on local roadways and compare with existing trips and roadway capacities. Temporary impacts to traffic flow from construction may reduce roadway capacity significantly for short periods of time. The EIR will evaluate the need for temporary traffic control mitigation measures to reduce impacts.

Utilities and Public Services

The EIR will review the potential effects of the proposed project on utilities and public services resulting from both construction and operation of the project. The EIR will evaluate stormwater management, energy usage and efficiency, water and wastewater utilities, public services such as police and fire, telephone, and landfill

capacity and evaluate the project's consistency with federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waste. The EIR will identify beneficial impacts of the increased recycled water availability. The EIR will identify the effect to the local water supply portfolio resulting from the additional new recycled water source.

Growth Inducement

The EIR will describe the project's relationship to growth and secondary effects of growth in the region. The EIR will evaluate the proposed treatment capacity with the General Plan growth forecasts. The EIR will identify secondary effects of growth and resource management agencies with responsibility for mitigating impacts from growth.

Other CEQA-Plus Requirements

ESA will evaluate Environmental Justice issues as needed for CEQA-Plus compliance. Demographics information for component locations will be summarized. The document will also provide a summary of federal regulations that would apply to the project and will also identify irreversible impacts.

Cumulative Effects

ESA will address potential cumulative impacts of implementing the proposed project in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable public and private projects in the immediate project area. As allowed in Section 15130(b)(1)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, the cumulative analysis will be based on General Plan consistency. The EIR will evaluate the project's consistency with the existing General Plan and LCP projections and will recognize that the General Plan update process underway is being coordinated to accommodate the proposed new treatment facility and location.

Alternatives

ESA will coordinate with the Program Manager and City to develop and evaluate alternatives to the project including the No Project Alternative. The EIR will compare up to five alternatives to determine if any would substantially meet the project objectives and reduce impacts associated with the proposed project. As required by CEQA, ESA will consider any alternatives identified by agencies or others at scoping meetings or in response to the NOP and determine whether they should be included in the EIR. ESA will identify the environmentally superior alternative based on the conclusions of the analysis.

2.6 Prepare Administrative Draft EIR #2

ESA will incorporate comments on the initial Administrative Draft EIR and prepare up to 10 copies of a second Administrative Draft EIR or review by the City.

2.7 Prepare Screencheck Draft EIR

ESA will incorporate comments on the second Administrative Draft EIR and prepare up to 10 copies of a Screencheck Draft EIR for review by the City and other stakeholders as appropriate.

2.8 Prepare Draft EIR

After the City has reviewed the Screencheck Draft EIR, ESA will incorporate comments and prepare the Public Draft EIR. ESA will compile the mailing list and conduct the mailing and public noticing required by CEQA. ESA

will prepare and file the Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Clearinghouse and the County Clerk. ESA will prepare a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Public Draft EIR which will also provide notice of public meeting on the Public Draft EIR. ESA will prepare up to 45 hard copies of the Public Draft EIR. ESA will prepare materials for the public meeting and will conduct a presentation describing the project.

2.9 Prepare Final EIR

Following the close of the 45-day public review period, ESA will organize and summarize the comments received on the Draft EIR. ESA will meet with the City as necessary to discuss responses for each comment. ESA will prepare responses to each comment received on the Draft EIR. The Response to Comments in conjunction with the Draft EIR will constitute the Final EIR. After the City has reviewed the draft Final EIR, ESA will incorporate the necessary revisions into the document and will produce up to five hard copies of the Final EIR for the City.

2.10 Findings and NOD

ESA will prepare Draft Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (if necessary) for review by the City Counsel. ESA will incorporate the City comments and will prepare the final Findings. ESA will also attend one Planning Commission meeting and one EIR Certification Hearing. ESA will prepare and file the Notice of Determination (NOD) with the County Clerk and the State Clearinghouse following certification by the City.

2.11 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

In compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, ESA will prepare a Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that describes the required mitigation necessary to avoid or reduce significant impacts, the responsible parties, tasks, and schedule necessary for monitoring mitigation compliance.

Task 3 Project Management

ESA will manage the scope, schedule and budget performance and ensure consistency and accuracy in work products. Progress reports will be submitted monthly with invoices. The City will be billed monthly for project expenditures. We assume that ESA will be available for several meetings in person at the City, including an initial project kick-off meeting as summarized below. In addition, ESA would participate in regularly scheduled phone calls to discuss issues that affect all aspects of project implementation. For purposes of this scope of work, we assume that regular one-hour phone meetings would be scheduled bi-weekly for 12 months.

TABLE 3-1. PRELIMINARY PRICING PROPOSAL
ESA Labor Detail and Expense Summary
Morro Bay Water Reclamation Facility CEQA/NEPA Compliance Services

Employee Name			G. Ainsworth			M. Williams						GIS / Graphics / Admin Staff					
			M. Strauss		L. Rocha	H. Dubois		S. Spano									
			M. Burns	J. Fontaine	E. Schneiwind	C. Ehringer	S. Champion	M. South	P. Anderson								
		T. Barnes	K. Lizardi	J. Jacobus	T. Wong	E. Davidian	N. Steiner	M. Bray	M. Vader	C. Castillo							
		Senior Director II	Director II	Managing Associate III	Managing Associate II	Managing Associate I	Senior Associate II	Senior Associate I	Associate II	Associate I		Subtotal	Senior Associate II	Project Technician III			
Task #	Task Name/Description	\$240	\$205	\$185	\$170	\$155	\$140	\$130	\$110	\$95		\$140	\$110	\$90			
1	Project Planning and Development																
1.1	Team Coordination and Project Development	20	8	32		24		40			\$ 21,280	2		2	\$ 460	128	\$ 21,740
1.2	General Plan/LCP Update Coordination	4	24	4		20		2			\$ 9,980	4			\$ 560	58	\$ 10,540
1.3	Citizens Advisory Committee Coordination	16		16		12		4			\$ 9,180	4			\$ 560	52	\$ 9,740
1.4	Agency Meetings	32	8	32		32					\$ 20,200	2		2	\$ 460	108	\$ 20,660
2	CEQA/NEPA Compliance																
2.1	Preparation of an Initial Study	4		8				32			\$ 6,600	2			\$ 280	46	\$ 6,880
2.2	Notice of Preparation and scoping meeting	12		16				24		8	\$ 9,720	4	4	2	\$ 1,180	70	\$ 10,900
2.3	Technical Studies [PLACEHODER]										\$ -				\$ -	-	\$ -
2.4	Data Request			1	1	1		1		8	\$ 1,400				\$ -	12	\$ 1,400
2.5	Administrative Draft EIR										\$ -				\$ -	-	\$ -
	Project Description	8		12		4				24	\$ 7,040	12	4		\$ 2,120	64	\$ 9,160
	Aesthetics	2		4		12				40	\$ 6,880	8	40		\$ 5,520	106	\$ 12,400
	Agricultural Resources			2	4	4				40	\$ 5,470	2			\$ 280	52	\$ 5,750
	Air Quality and GHG			2	4			40			\$ 6,250				\$ -	46	\$ 6,250
	Biological Resources		2	2				24			\$ 3,900	4			\$ 560	32	\$ 4,460
	Cultural Resources		2			4	4	24			\$ 4,710				\$ -	34	\$ 4,710
	Paleontological Resources			2				16			\$ 2,450				\$ -	18	\$ 2,450
	Geology and Soils		4	2	4				32		\$ 5,390	2			\$ 280	44	\$ 5,670
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		4	2	4				32		\$ 5,390				\$ -	42	\$ 5,390
	Hydrology and Water Quality		4	2	4				32		\$ 5,390	2			\$ 280	44	\$ 5,670
	Land Use and Recreation		4	2		4	32			8	\$ 7,050	4			\$ 560	54	\$ 7,610
	Noise			2	4				16	32	\$ 5,850				\$ -	54	\$ 5,850
	Traffic		4	2	4		8			32	\$ 6,030	2			\$ 280	52	\$ 6,310
	Utilities and Public Services	2		4			8			32	\$ 5,380				\$ -	46	\$ 5,380
	Cumulative Impacts			4		4		40			\$ 6,560	2			\$ 280	50	\$ 6,840
	Growth Inducement	1	4	2		4		32			\$ 6,210				\$ -	43	\$ 6,210
	Environmental Justice	1		2					24		\$ 3,250	2			\$ 280	29	\$ 3,530
	Alternatives Analysis	4		8				40		16	\$ 9,160	8			\$ 1,120	76	\$ 10,280
2.6	Administrative Draft EIR No. 2	16	4	24	4	8		24		32	\$ 17,180	8	4		\$ 1,560	124	\$ 18,740
2.7	Screen Check Draft EIR	8		16				24		24	\$ 10,280	8	4		\$ 1,560	84	\$ 11,840
2.8	Publish Public Draft EIR and public meeting	24		16				32		32	\$ 15,920	16	8	16	\$ 4,560	144	\$ 20,480
2.9	Final EIR - Response to Comments	32	24	40		24		60		24	\$ 33,800	4	4	8	\$ 1,720	220	\$ 35,520
2.10	Findings of Fact, SOC, and NOD	2		16						40	\$ 7,240				\$ -	58	\$ 7,240
2.11	Prepare Mitigation Monitoring & Report Plan			4						16	\$ 2,260		4		\$ 440	24	\$ 2,700
3	Project Management	36		68				52			\$ 27,980	24	32		\$ 6,880	212	\$ 34,860
Total Hours		152	56	265	33	69	52	465	136	408		114	104	26	\$ 244	1,880	
Subtotals - Labor Costs		\$ 36,480	\$ 11,480	\$ 49,025	\$ 5,610	\$ 10,695	\$ 7,280	\$ 60,450	\$ 14,960	\$ 38,760	\$ 295,380	\$ 15,960	\$ 11,440	\$ 2,340	\$ 29,740		\$ 325,120
Percent of Effort - Labor Hours Only		8.1%	3.0%	14.1%	1.8%	3.7%	2.8%	24.7%	7.2%	21.7%		6.1%	5.5%	1.4%		100.0%	
Percent of Effort - Total Project Cost		10.5%	3.3%	14.1%	1.6%	3.1%	2.1%	17.4%	4.3%	11.2%		4.6%	3.3%	0.7%			93.8%

ESA Labor Costs\$ 325,120

Communication Fee on Labor Cost (2%)\$ 6,502

ESA Non-Labor Expenses

Reimbursable Expenses (Printing, Postage, Mileage, Cultural Records Search)\$ 14,306

ESA Equipment usage (GIS)\$ 650

Subtotal ESA Non-Labor Expenses\$ 14,956

Subconsultant Costs (None)\$ -

TOTAL PROJECT PRICE\$ 346,578.40

Attachment A
Pricing Proposal Template
ESA Non-Labor Expenses

Reimbursable Costs		
Project Supplies	\$	-
Printing/Reproduction	\$	5,000
Document and Map Reproductions (CD + Digital photography)	\$	1,500
Postage and Deliveries	\$	2,500
Mileage	\$	1,440
Vehicle Rental	\$	-
Lodging	\$	2,000
Airfare	\$	-
Other Travel Related	\$	-
Subtotal Reimbursable Costs	\$	12,440
15% Fee on Reimbursable Expenses	\$	1,866
Total Reimbursable Costs	\$	14,306

ESA Equipment Usage		
General Equipments:		
Company Vehicle Usage	\$	-
HP Plotter	\$	-
Computer Time (GIS)	\$	-
Trimble GPS	\$	500
Tablet GPS	\$	-
Laser level	\$	-
Garmin GPS or equivalent	\$	-
Laptop Computers	\$	-
LCD Projector	\$	-
Noise Meter	\$	150
Electrofisher	\$	-
Sample Pump	\$	-
Surveying Kit	\$	-
Total Station Set	\$	-
Field Traps	\$	-
Digital Planimeter	\$	-
Cameras/Video/Cell Phone	\$	-
Miscellaneous Small Equipment	\$	-
Stilling Well/Coring Pipe (3 inch aluminum)	\$	-
Hydrologic Data Collection, Water Current, Level and Wave Measurement Equipments:		
Culvert Flow Meter	\$	-
Logging Rain Gage	\$	-
Marsh-McBirney Hand-Held Current Meter	\$	-
Logging Water Level Logging-Stainless Steel Pressure Transducer	\$	-
Logging Water Level -Titanium Pressure Transducer	\$	-
Logging Barometric Pressure Logger	\$	-
Well Probe	\$	-
Bottom-Mounted Tripod / Mooring	\$	-
Water Quality Equipments:		
Logging Turbidimeter/Water Level Recorder	\$	-
Logging Temperature Probe	\$	-
Hach Hand-Held Turbidimeter Recording Conductivity Meter w/Datalogger	\$	-
Refractometer	\$	-
YSI Hand-Held Salinity Meter	\$	-
Hand-Held Conductivity/Dissolved Oxygen Probe	\$	-
Sedimentation / Geotechnical Equipments:		
Peat Corer	\$	-
60lb Helly-Smith Bedload Sampler with Bridge Crane	\$	-
Suspended Sediment Sampler with Bridge Crane	\$	-
Vibra-core	\$	-
Shear Strength Vane	\$	-
Auger (brass core @ \$ 5/each	\$	-
Boats:		
14 foot Aluminum Boas with 15 HP Outboard Motor	\$	-
Single or Double Person Canoe	\$	-
17' Boston Whaler w/ 90 HP Outboard	\$	-
Total Equipment Usage Costs	\$	650