PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/COMMENTS
At this time members of the public will be given an opportunity to address the Board concerning items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. Members of the public may also address the Board about a particular Agenda item at the time it is considered by the Board and before action is taken.

The Board requests, but does not require, that members of the public who want to address the Board complete a voluntary “Request to be Heard” form available from the Board Secretary prior to the meeting.

ITEMS RECEIVED TOO LATE TO BE AGENDIZED
Determine need and take action to agendize item(s), which arose subsequent to the posting of the Agenda. (ROLL CALL VOTE: Adoption of this recommendation requires a two-thirds vote of the Board members present or, if less than two-thirds of the Board members are present, a unanimous vote.)

ITEMS DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD LESS THAN 72 HOURS PRIOR TO MEETING
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.5, non-exempt public records that relate to open session agenda items and are distributed to a majority of the Board less than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection in the lobby of the District’s business office located at 18700 Ward Street, Fountain Valley, California 92708, during regular business hours. When practical, these public records will also be made available on the District’s Internet Web site, accessible at http://www.mwdoc.com.

(NEXT RESOLUTION NO. 2088)

ACTION ITEM

1. AUTHORIZE ATTENDANCE AT THE URBAN WATER INSTITUTE CONFERENCE AUGUST 14-16, 2019 IN SAN DIEGO

   Recommendation: Consider authorizing attendance by an additional Director(s) at the Urban Water Institute Conference to be held August 14-16, 2019 in San Diego.

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS

2. INPUT OR QUESTIONS ON MET ISSUES FROM THE MEMBER AGENCIES/MET DIRECTOR REPORTS REGARDING MET COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION

   Recommendation: Receive input and discuss the information.
3. PRESENTATION BY METROPOLITAN STAFF REGARDING REGIONAL RECYCLING WATER PROGRAM

Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.

4. DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT ACTIVITIES UPDATE

Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.

5. MET ITEMS CRITICAL TO ORANGE COUNTY (The following items are for informational purposes only – a write up on each item is included in the packet. Discussion is not necessary unless requested by a Director)
   a. MET’s Water Supply Conditions
   b. MET’s Finance and Rate Issues
   c. Colorado River Issues
   d. Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues
   e. MET’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation in the Doheny and Huntington Beach Ocean (Poseidon) Desalination Projects
   f. South County Projects

Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.

6. METROPOLITAN (MET) BOARD AND COMMITTEE AGENDA DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Summary regarding July Board Meeting
   b. Review items of significance for MET Board and Committee Agendas

Recommendation: Review and discuss the information presented.

ADJOURNMENT
Note: Accommodations for the Disabled. Any person may make a request for a disability-related modification or accommodation needed for that person to be able to participate in the public meeting by telephoning Maribeth Goldsby, District Secretary, at (714) 963-3058, or writing to Municipal Water District of Orange County at P.O. Box 20895, Fountain Valley, CA 92728. Requests must specify the nature of the disability and the type of accommodation requested. A telephone number or other contact information should be included so that District staff may discuss appropriate arrangements. Persons requesting a disability-related accommodations should make the request with adequate time before the meeting for the District to provide the requested accommodations.
ACTION ITEM  
August 7, 2019

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert J. Hunter, General Manager

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE ATTENDANCE AT THE URBAN WATER INSTITUTE CONFERENCE, AUGUST 14-16, 2019 IN SAN DIEGO

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board of Directors: Consider authorizing attendance by an additional Director(s) at the Urban Water Institute Conference to be held August 14-16, 2019 in San Diego.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

This item was not presented to a Committee.

SUMMARY

The Urban Water Institute (UWI) will hold its Annual Water Conference in San Diego on August 14-16, 2019.

The FY 2019-20 budget authorized attendance by three Directors and four staff members. As four Directors have expressed interest in attending (Directors Tamaribuchi, Thomas, McVicker, and Yoo Schneider), staff is requesting the Board authorize attendance for additional Director(s); it should be noted that three staff members plan on attending.

Approximate costs include registration of $425 each and hotel (2 nights), which is estimated at $500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N): Y</th>
<th>Budgeted amount: $4050/Directors; $5400/staff for a total of $9450</th>
<th>Core X__</th>
<th>Choice __</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action item amount: 0</td>
<td>Line item:</td>
<td>Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted): Funds have been budgeted between staff and Directors; the amount budgeted for staff should adequately cover a fourth Directors attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Looking Into The Future – Western Water In 2070”
Urban Water Institute’s 26th Annual Water Conference | | August 14-16, 2019
Version July 23, 2019

Wednesday, August 14, 2019: Politics & Policies

12:00 p.m. – Registration, Networking & Exhibits

1:00 p.m. – Opening Remarks & Introduction
Greg Quist, Chairman, Urban Water Institute

1:15 p.m. – Welcome to San Diego
Congressman Scott Peters, City of San Diego *(invited)*

1:30 p.m. Looking inside the Congressional Crystal Ball – to help water decision makers in California
Learning about climate change impacts in California has forced water decision makers to become nascent meteorologists. We will hear from elected and appointed Congressional representatives about what they see emerging in the federal policy arena. Will it help, hurt or even exacerbate the water supply and management challenges we are today and will face even more over the next 50 year.

Moderator, Greg Quist, Director, Rincon del Diablo Water
Anaís Borja, Legislative Staff, Congressman Peter’s Office *(invited)*
Hanna Ceja, Legislative Staff, Congressman Juan Vargas’ Office *(invited)*

2:30 p.m. – Getting Stuck with the Teflon Contaminant – How PFAs will Affect Water Agencies
Per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are a large group of human-made substances used in a wide variety of products since the 1940s including non-stick products, stain and water-repellent products and fire-fighting foams. They are widespread in the environment, and according to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), PFAS were found in the blood of nearly every person tested in several national surveys. While PFAS as a class and individually are currently unregulated contaminants, increased regulatory scrutiny is already here. This panel will provide: general background on PFAS; an update on regulatory initiatives, including ongoing State Board investigations and development of drinking water standards; toxicology of PFAS; and, the anticipated impact of PFAS on water and recycled water systems.

Moderator, Greg Newmark, Meyers Nave, Attorney
Annalisa Kihara, Water Board Regulator, PE
Jason Dadakis, Executive Director of Water Quality & Technical Resources, OCWD
Margaret Whitaker, Tox Services, Washington DC

3:15 p.m. – Networking Break – Sponsored by HDR, Inc.
3:30 p.m. – Water Managers Dilemma - Caught in the political vortex of climate change

We know about the prisoner’s dilemma where two people who appear to be rational may not cooperate even if it is in their best interests to do so. Are we creating a water managers version as we learn more about the impacts of climate change over the next 50 years.

Moderator, Ane Deister, Urban Water Institute, Executive Director
Alex Tardy, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Scientist
Dan Denham, San Diego County Water Authority, Assistant General Manager
Erik Ekdahl, SWRCB, Deputy Director Division of Water Rights

4:45 p.m. – Adjourn

5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. – Welcome Reception – Sponsored by Water Replenishment District of Southern California

Thursday, August 15, 2019: Regulations & Resources

8:15 a.m. – Registration, Networking, Exhibits & Continental Breakfast – Sponsored by Irvine Ranch Water District

8:45 a.m. – Opening Remarks/Get to Know Your Exhibitors
Ane Deister, Urban Water Institute, Executive Director

9:00 a.m. – “Let’s Make a Deal! – where’s Monte Hall when you need him?”

As climate change threatens the state’s water infrastructure and reliability, come find out what the hubbub is all about on these “Green New Deals”. It’s much more than the almighty green $. There is an emerging “green” trend at the state and local level towards the resiliency of water supplies, air quality and the overall environment. Come learn about LA Mayor Garcetti’s Green New pLAN and then find out how water recycling could be integral to the Newsome Administration’s new Water Resilience Portfolio Plan by hearing for the first time in a public setting, and “hot of the press”, the July 2019 CA WaterReuse Action Plan.

Moderator, Rich Nagel, Vice President, Jacobs
City of LA Mayor’s new plan, David Pettijohn, Director of Water Resources LADWP and Rafael Villegas, Manager of Water Rights and Resources, LADWP
WateReuse Plan to Governor Newsom, Dave Pedersen, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, General Manager
10:00 a.m. – Groundwater Banking: Who’s saving on a rainy day?

Water supply reliability is becoming increasingly difficult to predict as climate change progresses and infrastructure ages. Groundwater banking case studies illustrate how this vital strategy is increasingly being used to maximize water resources, mitigate the impacts of long-term drought, and forge a sustainable future.

Moderator, Shelley Sorsabal, AVEK Board President
Shivaji Deshmukh, Inland Empire Utilities Agency, General Manager
Paul Weghorst, Irvine Ranch Water District, Executive Director of Water Resources
Dwayne Chisam, Antelope Valley – East Kern Water Agency, General Manager
Matt Payne, WestWater Research, Principal

11:00 a.m. – Networking Break – Sponsored by Geoscience Support Services, Inc.

11:15 a.m. – Dan Lafferty, Water Resources Deputy Director, Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works: Update on the innovative stormwater funding in Los Angeles County.

12:00 p.m. – Conference Luncheon – Sponsored by Meyers Nave

1:15 p.m. – The Colorado River – Will Coming Allocation Pressures Reach “Class 6" Difficulty?
A Class 6 rapid is said to be unpassable, with any attempt to do so resulting in serious injury or death. Policymakers and stakeholders across the basin states face ever more daunting challenges as they deal with current and forecasted structural shortages of water on the Colorado River. How will they run this new policy gauntlet?

Moderator, Dick Ackerman, Ackerman Consulting, President
Anne Castle, University of Colorado, Senior Fellow
Chris Frahm, Shareholder, Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck
Tina Shields, Imperial Irrigation District, Water Department Manager
Bill Hasencamp, Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA, Manager of Colorado River Resources

2:15 p.m. – Annual Membership Meeting

2:45 p.m. – Networking Break – Sponsored by Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

3:00 p.m. – Three Hundred Twenty Four Boundary and Water Minutes – How Do You Measure the Length of a Treaty?
The 1944 treaty between Mexico and the United States entered its 75th year in 2019. Over the years a series of agreements (or minutes) have advanced the degree of cooperation in relation to the water of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers, and of the Rio Grande. Recent challenges and opportunities addressed through a series of Treaty Minutes include the 2010 Mexicali Earthquake, Colorado River binational water scarcity contingency plans, and trial environmental flows for the Colorado River delta. Our panel includes key members of the International Boundary and Water Commission, with MWD’s GM, a key to CA water user collaboration. Collectively they will share their insights.

Moderator Kevin Hunt, General Manager, Central Basin MWD
Brenda Burman, United States Bureau of Reclamation, Commissioner
Jeff Kightlinger, Metropolitan Water District, General Manager
Roberto Salmón, International Boundary and Water Commission, Mexican Commissioner
4:00 p.m. – How Technology Can Affect Water Regulatory Operations in 2070
Advances in real time data driven regulatory decisions are being implemented. This is a trend that is likely to increase over the next several years. This case study features the Army Corps of Engineers and how they are adopting this approach - surely to be followed by other regulators.

Moderator, Ane Deister, Urban Water Institute, Executive Director
Jay Jasperse, Sonoma Water, Chief Engineer & Director of Groundwater Management
Dr. F. Martin Ralph, Director, Center for Western Weather and Water Extremes at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego

Adjourn 5:00 p.m.

5:30 – 7:00 p.m. – Chairman’s Reception – Sponsored by West Basin Municipal Water District

Friday, August 16, 2019: Money and Markets

8:00 a.m. – Registration, Networking, Exhibits & Buffet Breakfast- Sponsored by Western Municipal Water District

8:15 a.m. – Opening Remarks
Short conference report card, lessons learned and introduction to the final day of conference.
Ane Deister, Urban Water Institute, Executive Director

8:30 a.m. – Show me the Money! Who’s investing in Water and Why
Private investors are staking out the water industry as a new gold mine for economic returns. Learn from the experts why they see this as a thriving new investment market, who’s in the game, and how they decide to invest or not invest.

Moderator, Greg Quist, Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District board of directors
David Henderson, Executive Director, XPV Water Partners
Cristina Ahmandpour, President, ISLE Utilities
Mark Lambert, Former President IDE Technologies America

9:30 a.m. – Nasdaq Veles Calif: Water as A Commodity
California has a robust water transfer market that helps agencies accommodate changing demands, and address supply variability. However, unlike nearly every other segment of the United States economy, the water market has been largely ignored by the financial sector - until now. How can the introduction of a new exchange-traded financial product deliver value for water managers?

Moderator, Shelley Sorsabal, AVEK Board President
Matt Payne, WestWater Research, Principal
Patrick Wolf, Nasdaq Global Indexes, Senior Product Development Specialist
10:15 a.m. – Policy, Pivots, Planning and Plumbing – An Update on The Bay Delta
A new chapter has opened in the Bay Delta saga with the recent Newsom administration’s shift to a single tunnel concept for a Delta Conveyance Project. Our moderator and panelists will provide an update from the policy perspective as well as some pragmatic next steps for the necessary planning, permitting, preliminary design, and environmental review for a Delta Conveyance Project.

Moderator: Mary Aileen Matheis, Irvine Ranch Water District, Board Member
Alf Brandt, California State Assembly, Senior Counsel to the Speaker
Kathryn Mallon, Delta Design and Construction Authority, Executive Director

11:15 a.m. – Tell it Like it is
The venerable Pat Mulroy will share her thoughts and insights in her own way – as she has been doing for more than 3 decades.

Introduction - Ane Deister, Urban Water Institute, Executive Director
Pat Mulroy, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Former General Manager

12:00 p.m. – Chairman’s Raffle
Conference Adjourns
TO:  Board of Directors
FROM:  Robert Hunter,
       General Manager

Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre
   Melissa Baum-Haley

SUBJECT:  PRESENTATION BY METROPOLITAN STAFF REGARDING REGIONAL RECYCLING WATER PROGRAM

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors review and discuss the information presented.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Committee recommends (To be determined at Committee Meeting)

REPORT

The Regional Recycled Water Program (RRWP), a partnership with the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, will purify wastewater to produce high quality water. Following the completion of the Conceptual Planning Studies Report in February 2019, Metropolitan staff is seeking further Metropolitan Board input and direction on the RRWP before starting the environmental review and preliminary engineering work on the program.

Two Metropolitan Board workshops will provide opportunity for discussion of the program, policy considerations, and issues that may need further exploration. The first workshop was held on July 23, 2019. A second workshop will be scheduled in the fall. The discussion and board direction given during the workshops will help Metropolitan staff develop potential future actions related to the environmental process, preliminary engineering, and regulatory approvals for later Metropolitan Board consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted (Y/N): N/A</th>
<th>Budgeted amount: None</th>
<th>Core <em>X</em></th>
<th>Choice ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action item amount: N/A</td>
<td>Line item:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact (explain if unbudgeted):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached is the first white paper, which broadly addresses the early steps for implementation and delivery of the program. It describes the environmental review process and presents opportunities to accelerate program implementation. It also discusses the extent to which Metropolitan could support the development and approval of raw water augmentation regulations at the state and regional levels, which would be necessary for the full build-out of the program. This paper provided the framework for presentations and discussions at the first board workshop.

The second workshop and whitepaper will address a number of topics that include how current and projected demands affect the need and potential phasing of the program, the forms of agreement needed to accomplish the program, and considerations regarding the financing and cost recovery methods that could be employed.

MWDOC staff has invited John Bednarski, Chief Engineer and Group Manager of Engineering Services for Metropolitan, to provide an overview presentation of the first RRWP whitepaper focused on program implementation and delivery.

More information on the RRWP can be found at: http://www.mwdh2o.com/DocSvcsPubs/rrwp/index.html#home

**Attachment: Regional Recycled Water Program White Paper Program on Program Implementation and Delivery**
Regional Recycled Water Program

White Paper

Program Implementation and Delivery

July 16, 2019
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The conclusions of the Conceptual Planning Studies Report (Report 1618, February 21, 2019) include a recommendation that Metropolitan should "proceed with the environmental review process" for the RRWP (program). It is anticipated that a future Metropolitan Board action will be proposed to undertake that effort. The proposed action is expected to include a scope of work and budget to accomplish the environmental review at a programmatic level, with the supporting engineering and planning services needed to complete it. This paper presents a summary description of the scope of work and a preliminary estimate of costs for those activities. The paper also presents two additional options for work that could be accomplished in parallel with the environmental review to advance planning and preparation for implementation of the RRWP, if approved.

The additional scope falls into two broad categories. The first addresses RRWP implementation options for accelerating (1) the commencement of construction for the conveyance facilities, and (2) the initial deliveries of purified water to users in close proximity to the proposed advanced water treatment (AWT) plant in Carson. The second focuses on the proposed level of effort to be undertaken by Metropolitan in development of DPR opportunities through raw water augmentation at a water treatment plant. These topics are intended to support Board discussions around two broad questions:

1. What additional activities (if any) should Metropolitan undertake during the environmental review process in order to accelerate program implementation?
2. How would Metropolitan proceed in developing raw water augmentation opportunities, considering DPR regulations are not currently in place?

SUMMARY

This paper addresses two topics that will be the focus of the first Metropolitan Board Workshop on the implementation of the Regional Recycled Water Program (RRWP). It begins with a brief overview of the program and environmental review process and describes additional activities that could be undertaken during the environmental review. One topic relates to actions that could accelerate program implementation, and the other relates to Metropolitan’s potential role in the development of direct potable reuse (DPR) through raw water augmentation.

The implementation topic describes two options for accelerating (1) the start of construction on conveyance, and (2) the first deliveries of purified water for replenishment and industrial uses. Descriptions of the scope, estimated budgets (ranging from $20 to $60 million), and preliminary timelines for each option are provided. Benefits and risks of acceleration measures are discussed.

The DPR discussion acknowledges the primary purpose of the RRWP is to meet demands on Metropolitan for regional groundwater replenishment and describes opportunities to supplement the program’s replenishment goals with DPR, when regulations allow. The paper offers steps Metropolitan could take in preparing for those regulatory changes.

In both cases, the paper is intended for discussion purposes only. Based on the Board’s direction and input received, future recommendations will follow.
2.0 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

As described in the Conceptual Planning Studies Report, a primary objective of the full-scale program is to deliver purified water from an AWT plant at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson to injection and spreading facilities for groundwater replenishment. Four groundwater basins in Southern California were considered as potential recipients of this purified water: Central Basin, Main San Gabriel Basin, Orange County Basin, and West Coast Basin. This system will also have the flexibility to accommodate industrial users whose needs are consistent with the quality of water produced by the AWT plant. Finally, future use of this system for DPR applications appears feasible once applicable regulations are established. The conveyance system for the program will feature a backbone system from Carson to the Santa Fe Spreading Grounds sized to accommodate existing and future uses. Figure 1 shows the full program as described in the Conceptual Planning Studies Report.

Figure 1: Full Regional Recycled Water Program Elements

The Conceptual Planning Studies Report recommended the program be implemented in two major phases: a 100 million gallon per day (mgd) first phase, followed by a 50 mgd second phase. The first phase includes construction of a backbone conveyance system (indicated in Figure 1 in blue) delivering water approximately 38 miles, from the AWT plant in Carson to the Central and Main San Gabriel Basins.

The backbone pipeline would be capable of conveying 150 mgd or more to the Santa Fe Spreading Grounds. Preliminarly sized at 84-inches internal diameter, the backbone system provides for initial program demands and future operational flexibility, including the potential adaptation for DPR applications.
applications, the addition of expanded treatment capacity at the JWPCP beyond the initial 150 mgd, and potential interconnections to other purified water reuse programs.

For example, the City of Los Angeles is currently embarking on a comprehensive program to maximize and reuse 100% of available secondary effluent from the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant by 2035. The feasibility of a connection between the City of Los Angeles purified water program and Metropolitan’s backbone system is being examined and future studies are planned. Integration of the two programs may produce additional operational flexibility and benefits for both Metropolitan and the City of Los Angeles. The information developed in future studies can be included in the RRWP environmental review.

The second phase of the program would fully build out the treatment and conveyance components of the system by adding an additional 50 mgd or more of treatment at the JWPCP, and by building additional conveyance pipelines (indicated on Figure 1 in green). This second phase would expand the program by adding additional basin replenishment options and/or potential DPR connections. Further discussion of DPR opportunities for the program are presented in Section 9 of this paper. As described in Section 3 below, a programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR) would cover the AWT plant in Carson, a conveyance system for the full-scale program, including the potential for DPR connections, additional treatment, and potential future interconnections to the City of Los Angeles and other purified water reuse programs.

As this program is being developed, it is recognized that additional water recycling projects are currently being pursued at many different locations within Metropolitan’s service area. These other programs vary in size and levels of water quality depending on the intended use of the specific project. Going forward, Metropolitan will continue to work collaboratively with other parties to prevent redundant investments of public funds, avoid stranded capacity, and ensure these programs are appropriately captured in the regional planning for its service area. As described above, an example includes the current collaborative efforts between Metropolitan and the City of Los Angeles to study potential integration of two significant programs that are within relatively close geographical proximity to one another. Metropolitan has executed a Letter of Intent (LOI) to collaborate on the development of a future memorandum of understanding related to advanced treated water delivery systems between The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and City of Los Angeles, through the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. A copy of the LOI is provided as Attachment 1.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

#### 3.1 Programmatic Environmental Impact Report

For large multi-year, multi-phase infrastructure programs like the RRWP, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows the environmental analysis to proceed in a tiered approach when the development of the large program will occur over time in discrete stages. The environmental process will begin with an overall PEIR, including near- and long-term program components. From CEQA (Title 14, California Code of Regulations §15168), the PEIR may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large program and are related either: geographically; as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; and in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program. The PEIR typically analyzes certain discernable effects of the entire program. Where data is not initially available to allow certain impact areas to be fully analyzed
in the PEIR, analyses of these areas are deferred. At a later date, when additional design and site information is available, a subsequent project-specific environmental analysis will be conducted.

Use of a PEIR allows Metropolitan to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early stage of a program’s development. Ultimately, this approach provides for greater flexibility down the road to deal with basic issues or cumulative impacts and reduces the potential need to repeat analyses. A PEIR undergoes the same steps as a project-level environmental impact report, with additional subsequent environmental review conducted as stages of the project become sufficiently stable and defined to allow the completion of project-level analyses.

As recently as 2017, Metropolitan utilized the PEIR approach to develop the programmatic environmental clearance for the $2 billion prestressed concrete cylinder pipe (PCCP) program. The PCCP PEIR has since been supplemented with project-specific documentation. For example, in May 2019, the Board certified an addendum to the PEIR for one of the Second Lower Feeder construction projects. A similar approach is recommended for the RRWP.

3.2 Integration of Federal and State Environmental Reviews

It is anticipated that certain aspects of the RRWP will have impacts to resources within federal jurisdictions. In these cases, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that federal agencies assess the environmental effects of proposed agency action and any reasonable alternatives before deciding on whether and/or how to proceed. Where a proposed project will require decisions from both state and federal agencies, joint CEQA and NEPA reviews are required. In 2014, the United States Council on Environmental Quality and the California Office of Planning and Research published a handbook that details how to integrate CEQA and NEPA planning to streamline project approvals. Presently, it is not anticipated that NEPA reviews will be required to complete PEIR development and certification. If future investigations and studies identify the need for NEPA reviews, those reviews will be addressed in subsequent tiered environmental documents.

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

This section provides an overview of implementation strategies that would be part of a traditional programmatic environmental review process, as well as strategies that could be undertaken in parallel to accelerate program implementation. The first option proposes to conduct the environmental planning and subsequent design and construction activities in a traditional ‘step-wise’ approach where subsequent activities are started once the predecessor activity is completed. The second option accelerates the timeline for initial construction of the conveyance system only by conducting preliminary design activities on a reach of pipeline simultaneously with the development of the PEIR. The third option accelerates potential for early water deliveries by conducting preliminary design on both conveyance and treatment systems while the PEIR is being developed. For each option, scopes of work, estimated budgets, and estimated schedules for an initial 24-month period, which coincides with the anticipated duration of the PEIR development, have been assembled. Table 1 summarizes the options, followed by a brief description of each. Further discussion of the accelerated options is included in the two subsequent sections.
Table 1: Summary of Program Implementation Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>24-Month Scope</th>
<th>Milestone Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Option:</td>
<td>Complete PEIR before starting preliminary engineering.</td>
<td>PEIR scope with engineering and technical support as needed.</td>
<td>PEIR certification and Board approval of program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIR only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Construction:</td>
<td>Complete PEIR and project-level CEQA documents in parallel with preliminary</td>
<td>PEIR and tiered CEQA document; engineering support, permitting, studies &amp; investigations; and preliminary engineering for approximately 3.5 miles of conveyance towards Long Beach.</td>
<td>Award of initial construction contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIR plus Tiered Project-Level CEQA</td>
<td>engineering needed to award initial construction contract as soon as possible after CEQA document certification and Board approval of program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document for conveyance from the AWT plant towards Long Beach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Water Delivery:</td>
<td>Complete PEIR and project-level CEQA documents in parallel with preliminary</td>
<td>PEIR and tiered CEQA document(s); engineering support, permitting, studies and investigations; preliminary engineering for conveyance and injection wells; and preliminary engineering for AWT plant.</td>
<td>Award of initial construction contract and commencement of deliveries to West Coast Basin for replenishment and to Harbor Area for industrial users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIR plus Tiered Project-Level CEQA</td>
<td>engineering needed for initial deliveries of purified water as soon as possible following CEQA document certification and Board approval of program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document for 3.5 miles of conveyance, initial AWT plant (approximately 20 mgd), and additional conveyance from the AWT plant towards the West Coast Basin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Accelerated Construction Option

The objective of the second option is to start construction of the conveyance system only as soon as possible following completion of the appropriate CEQA document(s) and Board approval. This option includes completion of the overall PEIR, combined with additional environmental analysis and review to complete a project-level tiered document for the initial 3.5-mile portion of the backbone system (Segment 1; see Figure 2). This tiered approach to the PEIR will enable final design of this pipeline to commence immediately following the completion of the PEIR.

The approximately 3.5-mile pipeline reach to be considered under this option has been preliminarily identified as running between the AWT plant at the JWPCP and the Alameda Corridor. While the exact alignment of this pipeline reach has not been finalized, it is expected that this section is entirely within the street right-of-way. Consequently, complex permitting or easement issues that will need to be addressed during preliminary and final design are not anticipated. Hence, design and commencement of construction can be accelerated. The preliminary design activities and project-level environmental review for this first
conveyance reach will run concurrently with the PEIR activities. Under this option, it is anticipated that construction would commence approximately 24 to 36 months following PEIR certification.

4.2 Accelerated Water Delivery Option

In comparison to the two prior options, the third option presents the most aggressive approach to scheduling and implementation. The objective is to develop a project plan that puts a premium on making initial deliveries of purified water as soon as possible following completion of the appropriate CEQA document(s) and Board approval. The scope for this option includes everything described in the accelerated construction option plus additional project-level tiered environmental document(s) for conveyance facilities and approximately 20 mgd of purified water production from an AWT plant at the JWPCP. At the current time, it is anticipated that uses for this purified water would be industrial users in the Harbor Area, as well as potential West Coast Basin replenishment demands. The environmental review and permitting that would take place under this option would include a more extensive investment in early engineering and other technical efforts to allow for these early deliveries of purified water. The conveyance facilities in this option include both 3.5 miles of Segment 1 and the Segment 5 pipeline, and the injection wells needed for basin replenishment (see Figure 2). The AWT facilities required under this option include a partial retrofit of existing secondary basins at the JWPCP with new membrane bioreactor (MBR) process equipment, as well as the reverse osmosis (RO) and ultraviolet (UV)/advanced oxidation process (AOP) equipment, along with other plant process and support facilities required to produce up to 20 mgd of purified water.

**Figure 2: Facilities included in Preliminary Design Scope by Option During PEIR Process**

Under this option, preliminary and final design of both the conveyance pipelines and the initial increment of treatment capacity at the JWPCP would begin once the environmental review document(s) is completed and the Board has approved the program. The result of the PEIR, tiered project-specific documents, and the preliminary design efforts would ultimately lead to the accelerated delivery of water from the program when compared to either the traditional option or the accelerated construction option.

4.2.1 Testing, Technical Studies, and Preliminary Design Investigations

In order to proceed with the accelerated water delivery option, a series of questions must be investigated on an expedited timeline. Some of these technical issues include testing of a secondary MBR application at Metropolitan’s demonstration facility, developing criteria for overall AWT product water quality requirements, determining firm demands for the initial system capacity, and development of an overall
purified water process treatment train capable of producing the required water quality within an accelerated timeframe.

**Additional Demonstration Facility Testing**

The current phase of testing at the demonstration facility (Phase 1) located at the JWPCP is focused on obtaining regulatory acceptance for the tertiary MBR system identified in the November 2016 Feasibility Study. This process is referred to as tertiary MBR because the water source to the MBR process is secondary effluent from the JWPCP secondary clarifiers. The key to gaining this regulatory approval for the tertiary MBR process will be the demonstration of pathogen removal in the secondary effluent that will be processed by the MBR system. In addition to pathogen removal studies, the demonstration facility will be used to determine the effectiveness of the planned process to remove nitrogen (in the form of ammonia) from the secondary effluent that enters the demonstration facility. Removal of nitrogen is important so that the downstream treatment process will not be fouled by biological growth, which is otherwise stimulated by the presence of ammonia in the secondary effluent.

For the accelerated water delivery option discussed, the secondary MBR process will be investigated during the PEIR preparation. This process is referred to as secondary MBR because the water source to the MBR process is primary effluent from the JWPCP. It is envisioned that a secondary MBR process, utilizing a retrofitted existing clarifier basin at the JWPCP, could reduce the construction schedule for initial AWT plant water deliveries. However, in order to accomplish this retrofit, secondary MBR testing must be completed. A secondary MBR testing and monitoring plan is currently being developed for coordination with the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation Districts), State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) Division of Drinking Water, and the RRWP Independent Scientific Advisory Panel. Secondary MBR testing would follow completion of the initial 15-month tertiary MBR testing and would provide the necessary design criteria to support a potential retrofit of a portion of the JWPCP for the initial MBR treatment, as further discussed below.

**Retrofit of JWPCP Existing Basins for Initial MBR Treatment**

The current demand in the Harbor Area and West Coast Basin for water from this program is estimated to be approximately 20 mgd. As described above, to accelerate deliveries of purified water for these demands, Metropolitan and the Sanitation Districts have discussed the potential of converting one JWPCP high purity oxygen activated sludge (HPOAS) secondary treatment train to accommodate the MBR system.

In order to achieve this result, extensive investigations and studies of the retrofit would be undertaken during the PEIR process. At the same time, demonstration facility testing on primary effluent from the JWPCP would be conducted, as described above, to verify the efficacy of the secondary MBR process. Other fast-tracked technical studies would be undertaken to support this effort to investigate the secondary MBR process and the desire to convert existing JWPCP basins to MBR process trains. The goal of these efforts would be to complete studies and investigations on all aspects of the secondary MBR process coincident with the completion of the PEIR. This option would facilitate the start of preliminary and final design for the initial AWT treatment phase immediately following completion of the PEIR.
5.0 MILESTONE SCHEDULES FOR OPTIONS

5.1 Traditional Option

Figure 3 presents a schedule for the traditional option to implementing programmatic environmental review. The dark shaded area on the schedule covers the 2-year period in which it is expected PEIR activities will take place, with all work on the PEIR to be completed in late 2021. Figure 3 also presents the potential schedule for near-term activities that would take place in close proximity to the completion of the PEIR—activities that would be closely linked to the award of the program’s first construction contract. This schedule assumes that the Metropolitan Board authorizes commencement of the work in late 2019 or early 2020. Preliminary design activities for the AWT plant and conveyance facilities are expected to start in early 2022, with the first project specifications being advertised for construction bids in mid-2024. It is anticipated that the first construction bids will be for portions of the conveyance system.

Figure 3: Traditional Tasks and Durations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA/NEPA</td>
<td>54 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic EIR/EIS</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific tiered documents</td>
<td>30 mo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (First Contract Only)</td>
<td>12 mo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Water Treatment (AWT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>82 mo</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDW/RWQCB Permits</td>
<td>82 mo</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (100 mgd)</td>
<td>30 mo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Pipeline Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the traditional option, after the PEIR is certified by the Board, staff will commence work on tiered project-level CEQA and NEPA reviews (as well as permitting). Tiered or project-level documents are generally started after certification of the PEIR and will take from 9 to 16 months depending on the facility to be constructed. Work on these tiered project-level activities will proceed in coordination with design activities and will be rolled out as each segment of the program is implemented. Based on the information developed to date on the program, some of the most challenging permitting and environmental clearances are expected to be those associated with the segment(s) of pipeline currently proposed to be built within the San Gabriel River. In these locations, it is expected that segments may require more detailed environmental reviews, as well as numerous regulatory permits and potential mitigation.
5.2 Accelerated Construction Option

Should the Board elect to implement the program in a manner that prioritizes accelerating the start of construction, the above-described tiered environmental activities and costs associated with those activities would occur on an expedited schedule. Under the accelerated construction option, work on tiered documents would occur simultaneously with the development of the program-level documents, allowing Metropolitan to obtain permits sooner and expedite the start of construction. The minimum time to obtain permits is estimated to be 1 year after tiered documents are certified and all necessary engineering design is complete. This assumes that take of federal and state threatened, endangered, or protected species can be avoided. Figure 4 presents the accelerated construction schedule. Tasks shown in blue bars have earlier start dates than those presented in Figure 3. The durations of the tasks remain unchanged from the traditional option. Under the accelerated construction option, initial pipeline construction can be expected to start approximately 18 months earlier than under the traditional option, as shown in Figure 4.

**Figure 4: Accelerated Construction Tasks and Durations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA/NEPA</td>
<td>36 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic EIR/EIS</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific tiered documents</td>
<td>36 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance (Segment 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (First Contract Only)</td>
<td>16 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Water Treatment (AWT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>82 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDW/RWQCB Permitting</td>
<td>82 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>24 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (100 mgd)</td>
<td>30 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the environmental review process will require engineering design to be significantly advanced and additional technical studies completed. Field investigations will be needed to determine the nature and extent of potential soil and water contamination along the pipeline alignment, and how to dispose of construction water and any contaminated soils encountered during construction. Advanced levels of design will also be required in order to apply for key permits needed for some sections of the pipeline alignment. Consequently, in order to achieve an accelerated start to construction, some of the permitting and environmental issues will be targeted as potential areas for early work. Due to these constraints on some of the more complex portions of the pipeline alignments, an approximately 3.5-mile portion of pipeline, originating at the JWPCP, is the planned initial pipeline construction contract.
5.3 Accelerated Water Delivery Option

Figure 5 presents a preliminary estimate of the time to complete the work described in the accelerated construction option (above), as well as the AWT and conveyance facilities needed for accelerated deliveries of purified water to industrial users in the Harbor Area and for replenishment in the West Coast Basin. Preliminary design of the AWT plant is scheduled to begin in close coordination with the regulatory approval process. Preliminary design of the pipeline conveyance facilities would begin during the PEIR process. In the case of the accelerated water delivery option, the initial capacity of the AWT plant will be approximately 20 mgd. This production capacity closely matches the anticipated demands near the JWPCP. Water deliveries from this initial project could reasonably be expected to commence from 48 to 60 months following PEIR certification.

Figure 5: Accelerated Water Delivery Tasks and Durations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA/NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic EIR/EIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific tiered documents Board Approval(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance (Segments 1 and 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (First Contract Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Water Treatment (AWT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDW/RWQCB Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (20 mgd only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 SCOPE OF WORK ESTIMATED BUDGETS

This section presents estimated budget ranges associated with each of the delivery options presented above. As indicated in Figures 3, 4, and 5, the differences between the options reflect alternative sequencing of tasks. The budgetary ranges presented in this section reflect the anticipated costs to complete the identified work for each option during the 24-month period from the beginning of 2020 through the end of 2021. A key assumption is that accelerated options, above and beyond the traditional option, bring work activities and costs forward into the 24-month window (shaded area in the figures).

The budget ranges presented in Table 2 reflect early estimates for the 24-month work efforts for each of the implementation options. The ranges reflect the probable costs for work efforts related to environmental planning for the CEQA process; technical studies; preliminary engineering; real property, external affairs and outreach; operations and water resources planning support; project management.
support; and a 20 percent contingency for each option. Once an implementation option is selected by the Board, the range of costs for the selected option will be replaced by a definitive cost estimate for the 24-month work effort. That cost estimate will serve as the basis for a funding request to the Board when appropriate.

Table 2: Preliminary Budget Ranges by Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Budget Range (24 Month Duration)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Construction</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$41,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Water Delivery</td>
<td>$47,000,000</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Traditional Option

For the traditional option, emphasis is placed on completion of the PEIR within a 24-month period. Engineering efforts and other technical support during that time are limited to activities needed to support the development and certification of the PEIR, including studies examining the integration of a future City of Los Angeles purified water system with Metropolitan’s backbone conveyance system. Table 2 shows the initial budget range of $20 to $33 million to complete the scope of work for this option. This range represents the baseline cost to support the full-scale program through the initial environmental review process. Under this option, preliminary engineering design efforts would not commence until the PEIR is certified by the Board; and preliminary design costs are not included in this cost range.

6.2 Accelerated Construction Option

The accelerated construction option includes the same level of technical and engineering support for the PEIR process described in the traditional option above. In addition, the option includes engineering and technical investigations needed to complete preliminary design of the first 3.5-mile segment of the 84-inch diameter backbone pipeline system from the JWPCP towards Long Beach. This preliminary engineering design will be completed in parallel with preparation of the PEIR and will also be used to support a project-level tiered CEQA review for construction of this first segment of pipeline. The option includes pipeline engineering efforts, geotechnical investigations, substructure investigations, detailed property title research, hydraulic analyses, and development of traffic plans to support construction efforts. As shown in Table 2, the estimated budget range is $30 to $41 million to complete the scope of work.

6.3 Accelerated Water Delivery Option

The accelerated water delivery option includes and adds to the level of technical and engineering activities described in the accelerated construction option above. The additional effort comprises engineering and technical investigations to complete the preliminary design of a pipeline conveying water to the West Coast Basin, as well as preliminary design of an initial 20-mgd AWT module at the JWPCP. The project-level CEQA review will be expanded to cover three initial projects; (1) the 3.5-mile segment of the 84-inch diameter backbone pipeline, (2) the pipeline from the JWPCP to the West Coast Basin, and (3) the 20-mgd treatment module at the JWPCP. All of this work will be conducted in parallel with the preparation of the PEIR.
Engineering and technical support in this option is the most extensive when compared to either the traditional option or the accelerated construction option. Under this approach, preliminary engineering will simultaneously commence on two independent pipeline projects, as well as an advanced water treatment facility. Typical work activities will include pipeline preliminary design; treatment plant process development and preliminary design; geotechnical investigations for both the pipelines and the treatment facility; preliminary design for electrical power supplies/interconnections for the treatment and pumping facilities; substructure investigations; detailed property title research; hydraulic analyses for pipelines/pump station(s)/treatment plant; and development of traffic plans to support construction efforts. As shown in Table 2, the estimated budget range is $47 to $60 million to complete the scope of work outlined for this option.

6.4 Additional Demonstration Testing and Operations

Phase 1 demonstration facility operations at the JWPCP are anticipated to begin in August 2019. These activities are funded through June 2020. After that date, additional funding will be required to complete Phase 1 testing and to conduct Phase 2 testing. As outlined in Section 4, this testing is needed to determine the optimal treatment process that will be used in the full-scale AWT plant. Secondary MBR demonstration facility testing is anticipated to be complete by the end of 2021, with further testing planned for process optimization and design criteria development. It is estimated that approximately $6 million will be needed to conduct the required testing for the secondary MBR process at the demonstration facility, regardless of which implementation option is pursued. This budgetary amount for additional demonstration facility testing and operations is not included in the budget ranges shown in Table 2. This demonstration facility budget does not include any modifications necessary to conduct research into the DPR options that are discussed in Section 9 of this paper. Additional testing options, including potential modifications to the demonstration facility to conduct studies related to DPR, are discussed in Section 9.

7.0 BENEFITS OF SCHEDULE ACCELERATION

Metropolitan could realize potential benefits as a result of implementing program options to accelerate the overall schedule by (1) starting early construction of the conveyance system, and (2) making early deliveries of purified water to users in close proximity to the AWT plant.

Table 3 summarizes these potential benefits, which fall into three broad categories:

- Reduced exposure to schedule delays and cost increases associated with many large-scale, linear construction projects
- Increased operational understanding and experience in the treatment and delivery of purified water
- Early availability of new water supply and cost recovery
Table 3: Summary of Benefits of Accelerated Implementation Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accelerated Construction | ▪ Minimizes cost increases resulting from inflation  
                        ▪ Reduces impacts of unexpected delays on final completion date  
                        ▪ Launches preliminary design and risk management as early as possible  
                        ▪ Accelerates project team learning curve |
| Accelerated Water Delivery | ▪ All of the accelerated construction benefits listed above  
                          ▪ Enables early acquisition of operational experience and knowledge  
                          ▪ Accelerates regional benefits of additional water supply  
                          ▪ Provides early water sales and cost recovery  
                          ▪ Utilizes existing facilities made available by the Sanitation Districts for the program |

7.1 Reduced Exposure to Construction Cost Increases

Metropolitan has more experience in delivering large-capacity conveyance systems than most of the world’s water utilities. That said, every project is unique, and linear infrastructure by its nature is susceptible to localized “bottle-necks” that delay completion of a fully-functional system and drive up costs. This reality has been documented not only by Metropolitan’s own experience, but also by extensive literature in the construction industry regarding the risks associated with large-scale, linear projects.

Commencement of engineering design and other technical studies and investigations, as well as subsequent construction as early as possible, reduces the potential for unexpected delays and uncertainties to occur. Additionally, accelerated start of preliminary engineering and the associated risk mitigation processes will aid in identifying problematic portions of the program at an early date. Once identified, early actions can be taken to mitigate these risks, which left unaddressed could jeopardize the budget and overall schedule of the program. Finally, increased costs associated with inflation-sensitive components of the program can be reduced by acceleration options that are implemented.

7.2 Early Start on Long Lead Time Activities

The early start of long lead time activities related to conveyance and the AWT plant can help to quickly identify potential issues. Identification and scoping the impact of these issues on long lead time activities is often challenging. By gaining an early understanding of the issues, reasonable mitigation methods can be employed to keep the overall program on schedule. The permit process for river crossings is anticipated to be a complex activity that will dictate the schedule for design and construction of these portions of the pipeline alignment. Early design and investigation activities in this specific area, as well as early engagement with the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, will streamline subsequent final design and construction scheduling.
7.3 Increased Operational Understanding and Experience

Early delivery of purified water from the program will help Metropolitan’s staff gain the experience and knowledge needed to develop the full-capacity AWT plant. There is no substitute for actual operational experience when implementing new and innovative treatment processes, even if that initial increment of production capacity is a relatively small fraction of the full program capacity. Consequently, there are potentially significant benefits to be accrued by not only Metropolitan, but also other program stakeholders by pursuing the option which emphasizes early deliveries of water. The initial AWT capacity of approximately 20 mgd is a desirable size for gaining important knowledge that can be incorporated into subsequent expansions of the initial system. Metropolitan has proven the value of early operational learning experiences in the implementation of its oxidation retrofit program which added ozone disinfection to all five Metropolitan water treatment plants.

7.4 New Water Supply and Cost Recovery

The acceleration of purified water deliveries in close proximity to the AWT plant offers the following additional benefits:

- Early establishment of new water supply and cost recovery
- Actual real-case experiences related to producing and delivering purified water to member agencies for both replenishment and industrial uses

These benefits provide valuable institutional and technical knowledge toward finalizing the full-scale program development.

8.0 RISKS OF SCHEDULE ACCELERATION

There are inherent risks associated with the early start of preliminary design and other technical studies and investigations while the PEIR is being developed. The majority of the risks have to do with the potential for programmatic changes after the PEIR is certified, which may diminish some or all of the preliminary engineering and other technical work completed during the PEIR preparation. Some of these risks can be mitigated by focusing preliminary design and technical studies on smaller discrete aspects of the program. These aspects of the program should be relatively straightforward components that hold little risk of changing even if other more significant components of the program are subsequently revised. Stated simply, the inherent risk to acceleration is there is a chance that preliminary design would have to be redone if final environmental and technology permitting requires significant changes. Changes are likely to result from:

- Measures needed to eliminate or mitigate environmental impacts identified during the environmental review processes. Such mitigation measures could impact pipeline alignments or construction methods associated with pipeline installations.
- Changes to the AWT treatment process resulting from the regulatory technology acceptance process and/or finalization of the nitrogen management strategy. Such changes could cause a redesign of key process components whose design was expedited in advance of full regulatory approval or CEQA clearance.

Table 4 summarizes some of the risks of accelerating the start of the program.
Table 4: Summary of Risks Resulting from Accelerating Design Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accelerated Construction | ▪ Additional mitigation measures required  
▪ Complex pipeline alignments must be revised | ▪ Some additional costs to revise preliminary engineering documents are expected  
▪ Significant rework could be required if complex pipeline alignments change through the PEIR process |
| Accelerated Water Delivery | ▪ MBR treatment process approval delayed  
▪ Decision on the nitrogen management strategy delayed  
▪ Timing of WRD need for replenishment water in the West Coast Basin remains uncertain | ▪ Expected early water deliveries are delayed (i.e., the goal of acceleration is not fully achieved)  
▪ Some rework required  
▪ Demands for purified water are delayed |

8.1 Redesign Resulting from Environmental Process Outcomes

Under both the accelerated options, preliminary design will occur simultaneously with the environmental review processes under CEQA and NEPA. While additional engineering data may be useful to support these environmental reviews, potential impacts may be identified that may require design changes to reduce or avoid environmental effects. These modifications to the design could require engineering rework, adding costs. Further, if portions of the program require alternative alignments be incorporated to avoid impacts, the additional engineering costs could be significant.

For these reasons, it is recommended that if accelerated construction or delivery options are pursued, preliminary design and technical studies should focus on areas that hold small risks of change resulting from either the environmental review process or the regulatory technology acceptance process.

8.2 Uncertainty Regarding Final AWT Process Train

One of the challenges of accelerating the first deliveries of purified water are uncertainties associated with finalization of the AWT process train. These uncertainties affect the ability to achieve the goal of early deliveries; though they do not necessarily put the investment in preliminary engineering at risk. The following milestones are important to reaching the process train finalization decision:

- Completion of MBR technology acceptance process for regulatory approval
- Completion of evaluation for the treatment process trains identified by the Nitrogen Management Committee
- Evaluation of tertiary and secondary MBR performance at the demonstration facility
- Evaluation of costs, performance, and risk of retrofitting JWPCP basins for future MBR systems

A comprehensive regulatory permitting process, including completion of a Title 22 Engineering Report and receipt of a water recycling permit, will take place prior to any delivery of purified water. For the
accelerated water delivery option, Metropolitan would work with the regulators on an accelerated permitting schedule for the 20 mgd AWT plant and associated water deliveries. The proposed approach to accelerating water deliveries focuses on retrofitting existing HPOAS basins at the JWPCP. This initial retrofit can provide important information regarding secondary MBR options within the JWPCP, while producing purified water for early delivery to users.

8.3 Timing of West Coast Basin Demands

As indicated in the Conceptual Planning Studies Report (Section 3.3), expected replenishment demands in the West Coast Basin rely on additional future pumping in the basin. At present, the timing of those future demands is uncertain. Current planning studies are being undertaken by the Water Replenishment District (WRD) and basin pumpers. Should those demands be delayed, the extent of accelerated delivery potential would be reduced.

9.0 DIRECT POTABLE REUSE CONSIDERATIONS

The current focus of the RRWP is on indirect potable reuse (IPR) through groundwater replenishment, as groundwater basin replenishment constitutes a significant portion of demands on Metropolitan. The Conceptual Planning Studies Report described an additional concept for blending advanced treated water at one or more of Metropolitan’s existing water treatment plants, employing DPR through raw water augmentation. Based on the status of DPR regulations, this option may become feasible in the near future for application at the Weymouth or Diemer plants.

DPR would allow significant operational flexibility if used in conjunction with IPR deliveries and could considerably expand the benefits of the program. However, additional work would be needed to fully evaluate this option. Metropolitan Board input and funding would be required to examine opportunities for DPR through raw water augmentation with demonstration facility testing.

If approved by the Board, it is recommended that DPR testing at the demonstration facility begin prior to the State Board’s final adoption of raw water augmentation regulations. This timing should enable consideration of industry research outcomes, tertiary and secondary MBR testing results, and draft regulatory criteria during test plan development and design of the DPR treatment process train.

It is also recommended that Metropolitan engage in industry research, collaborating with regulators, other agencies, and stakeholders to help guide development of final raw water augmentation regulations. Collaborative efforts in support of regulatory approval of raw water augmentation could also be beneficial, particularly as Metropolitan and the City of Los Angeles examine the additional flexibility and benefits that could result from integrating their respective purified water reuse programs.

This section provides an overview of the DPR opportunities of the RRWP through raw water augmentation, an overview of the testing approach at the demonstration facility for potential implementation of raw water augmentation, and a brief discussion of DPR through treated drinking water augmentation.
9.1 Background

Both the groundwater recharge and surface water augmentation regulations adopted in 2014 and 2018, respectively, require an environmental buffer, which is a waterbody such as an aquifer or a surface water reservoir, lake, or river, into which purified water is introduced before being withdrawn for potable reuse. Environmental buffers provide a number of benefits, including contaminant removal, dilution and blending, and time to detect and respond in the event the purified water does not meet specifications before final treatment and distribution.

In April 2018, the State Board released its Proposed Framework for Regulating Direct Potable Reuse in California, which focused on the regulatory development of raw water augmentation. Raw water augmentation is the placement of advanced treated water into a raw water conveyance system upstream of a drinking water treatment plant. The State Board is required to adopt uniform water recycling criteria for raw water augmentation by the end of 2023; however, that timeline may extend to the end of 2025 based on the state of available scientific and technical research at that time. No timeline has been established for the State Board to develop regulations for DPR through treated drinking water augmentation.

9.2 DPR through Raw Water Augmentation

The Conceptual Planning Studies Report considered the future potential for adapting the program to meet the requirements of forthcoming DPR regulations, including the potential future use of AWT product water for DPR through raw water augmentation at Metropolitan’s water treatment plants. Under this scenario, product water from the AWT plant would be conveyed to the Weymouth and/or Diemer plant, blended with raw water from the State Water Project and/or the Colorado River Aqueduct, and undergo additional treatment before entry into Metropolitan’s treated drinking water distribution system. As the Weymouth and Diemer plants are two of the three treatment plants that supply treated water to the Central Pool, introduction of the advanced treated water to these two treatment plants would augment a significant portion of Metropolitan’s treated water distribution system, further enhancing water supply reliability and system flexibility for Metropolitan’s service area.

Implementing raw water augmentation as part of the RRWP would require additional conveyance infrastructure. A system connection from near the Santa Fe Spreading Grounds to the Weymouth plant would require approximately 13 miles of additional pipeline, as well as additional pump stations. From the Weymouth plant, one option would allow purified water to be conveyed from the Weymouth plant to the Diemer plant via Metropolitan’s existing Yorba Linda Feeder. This offers a unique opportunity for purified water deliveries to two of Metropolitan’s water treatment plants. A second conveyance option, if a pipeline towards the Orange County Spreading Grounds were constructed, would be to repurpose the existing East Orange County Feeder No. 1 to deliver water to the Diemer plant. A schematic of these two potential raw water augmentation options is shown in Figure 6. Additional analyses on pipeline diameters, alignments, and hydraulics, as well as use of existing Metropolitan infrastructure to deliver purified water, would need to be conducted if these DPR options are pursued further.

Several considerations discussed below for DPR through raw water augmentation include enhancements that are anticipated to be required by future regulations to compensate for the loss of the environmental buffer, treatment facility options, blending assumptions, and forecasted available capacities at the treatment plants to accept purified water.
9.2.1 Treatment Process Enhancements

In pursuing DPR options for the RRWP, focus areas include enhanced source control, wastewater treatment optimization, additional advanced water treatment processes, and improved monitoring and response systems.

Source control programs under a DPR application are expected to be more prescriptive than those required for an IPR project. Public outreach would likely be further strengthened, and further optimization of wastewater treatment processes may also be needed. The Sanitation Districts continue to assess opportunities to enhance existing source control programs and wastewater treatment operations as part of the RRWP. These efforts would be of even greater significance for DPR.

Higher levels of advanced treatment and treatment redundancy through multiple independent barriers are expected to be required by future raw water augmentation regulations. The State Board, through its DPR framework, indicated the downstream drinking water treatment plant would be considered redundant treatment in a raw water augmentation application; therefore, it may require all pathogen log removal values (LRVs) to be obtained at the AWT plant. An AWT train that has been evaluated by the State Board is ozone and biological activated carbon filtration, upstream of membrane filtration, RO, and UV/AOP.

With the loss of the environmental buffer, responding to treatment failures becomes even more critical in a DPR treatment scheme. More rigorous monitoring and enhanced tools will be required to respond to “off-spec” events. Locations for diverting off-spec water would have to be identified. Engineered storage may be considered to provide additional response time. In addition, as Metropolitan is considering the option to allow purified water input into the RRWP conveyance system by other entities, introduction into the AWT system may be more feasible utilizing a storage tank with hydraulic buffer capacity, rather than a direct flange-to-flange connection.
9.2.2 Treatment Facility Options

The additional treatment processes needed for raw water augmentation could be included as part of the potential AWT plant at the JWPCP site, or at a potential satellite location downstream. The increased treatment costs for DPR application warrant consideration of satellite treatment only for the portion of flow to be used for DPR; however, further investigation on the feasibility of this concept and its potential to meet anticipated regulatory requirements is needed.

Placement of additional treatment processes at the full-scale AWT plant would require up to a potential 150 mgd to be treated to the higher degree required for DPR, even if most of the treated water would be used for IPR. This could significantly increase the cost per unit of water treated at the AWT plant. It is currently envisioned that only the portion of flow to be used for DPR would be treated to the more stringent requirements, and these additional treatment processes would be placed at a location close to where the advanced treated water would be introduced into the raw water conveyance system.

Further discussion with the State Board is needed to determine whether pathogen reductions from treatment processes at a satellite facility could still be additive to those achieved much further upstream at the full-scale AWT plant, given (1) the potential for water quality changes within the conveyance pipeline, and (2) the sequence of the additional treatment processes being completely downstream of those at the AWT plant.

9.2.3 Blending Assumptions and Forecasted DPR Capacity Scenarios

The State Board has indicated that blending requirements would be incorporated into future raw water augmentation regulations to the degree that it provides a “meaningful public health benefit” (State Board, 2018), and is expected to take a relatively conservative approach until greater DPR project experience is gained. Even without a regulatory-driven blending requirement, Metropolitan may take a conservative approach for introducing advanced treated water to the Weymouth or Diemer plant to ensure operational impacts are minimized, treatment performance is closely monitored, and regulatory compliance is not jeopardized. The median daily average flow at the Diemer and Weymouth plants over a 10-year period (2009 through 2018) ranged from 120 to 293 mgd. Based on these historic flows, if a 10, 25, or 50 percent DPR blend was used, the portion of AWT flows for each treatment plant would range between approximately 15 and 30, 30 and 70, or 60 and 140 mgd, respectively.

Figure 7: Potential AWT Flows to the Diemer Plant under Alternative Blending Scenarios
An example of the historic plant flow and projected AWT flows based on alternative blending scenarios for the Diemer plant is shown Figure 7 (above). A similar trend would be observed for the Weymouth plant.

Figure 8 illustrates the total AWT flow that could be delivered simultaneously to both plants at various blends. The Conceptual Planning Studies Report indicated that of the 150 mgd total IPR demand for the RRWP, 84 mgd was existing demand whereas the remaining 66 mgd was either planned or projected.

**Figure 8: Potential Total AWT Flows to the Diemer and Weymouth Plants under Alternative Blending Scenarios**

(based on historical flows from 2009-2018 at the Diemer and Weymouth plants)

If the targeted raw water augmentation deliveries to the Weymouth and/or Diemer plants were intended to substitute for these planned/projected deliveries of 66 mgd, this could be achieved in a 25 percent DPR blend scenario at both plants and in a 50 percent DPR blend scenario at either plant. Alternatively, if the full-scale AWT plant were to be base loaded at a set capacity, flows in excess of demands up to the total AWT plant capacity of 150 mgd could potentially be sent to the Weymouth and Diemer plants in a 50 percent DPR blend scenario, demonstrating the flexibility that a DPR option could provide to the RRWP.

### 9.3 Demonstration Facility Testing Roadmap for DPR

As described in Section 4, the first phase of tertiary MBR testing at the demonstration facility focuses on obtaining regulatory acceptance for the MBR process. In the second phase, a secondary MBR will be tested to obtain analogous pathogen removal data. With respect to DPR testing, the equipment needs and costs, research objectives, potential to accelerate testing, and schedule options are discussed in this section.

#### 9.3.1 Equipment Needs and Costs

The State Board’s DPR framework highlights the need for multiple barriers that would provide a diverse set of mechanisms to ensure consistent pathogen removal. The treatment mechanisms currently employed at the demonstration facility through the MBR-RO-UV/AOP processes are primarily biological/physical removal, UV light degradation/inactivation, and oxidation. Processes that could be used to provide additional treatment barriers for raw water augmentation include the following:
- Ozone for oxidation/chemical inactivation,
- Biological activated carbon filtration for biological/adsorption/physical removal, and
- Microfiltration for physical removal

These additional processes are currently used for San Diego’s Pure Water Program to meet surface water augmentation regulations, and these processes would likely be used if the additional treatment to meet future raw water augmentation regulations were implemented on site at JWPCP. If satellite treatment were to be used, further discussion with the State Board would be needed to identify the additional treatment processes needed.

Modifications could be made at Metropolitan’s demonstration facility to test the additional treatment processes for raw water augmentation. It is anticipated that design and construction costs would range from approximately $4 to $13 million depending on the size of facilities. Operational costs are anticipated to be approximately $5.5 to $6.5 million per year for staffing, operations and maintenance, treatment chemicals, and analytical costs. For the satellite treatment option, discussions with the State Board would be required to identify the appropriate treatment train for testing at Metropolitan’s demonstration facility.

9.3.2 Research Objectives

The State Board’s expert panel identified various areas of research that should be conducted to ensure the protectiveness of DPR. The objectives of Metropolitan’s DPR testing at the demonstration facility would build upon those outcomes and seek to achieve the following:

- Demonstrate the efficacy of additional treatment processes for pathogen and contaminant removal
- Demonstrate the appropriate treatment train that can satisfy basin plan and anticipated regulatory requirements for DPR through raw water augmentation
- Develop water quality acceptance criteria and blending strategies for advanced treated water upstream of drinking water treatment plants
- Develop, evaluate, and optimize analytical methods for detecting microbial and chemical contaminants
- Evaluate impact of blending on distribution system water quality stability

9.3.3 Raw Water Augmentation Testing Schedule

Should the Board direct Metropolitan staff to proceed with developing opportunities for DPR through raw water augmentation, it is recommended that Metropolitan begin test plan development and treatment process design in 2021. It should be noted that this testing schedule would commence prior to State Board adoption of raw water augmentation regulations; however, it allows Metropolitan to work with other stakeholders to help guide regulatory development. The State Board typically leverages actual project experience during the regulatory development process; therefore, it is likely that they would readily engage a potential project sponsor, such as Metropolitan, to help in the development of criteria associated with future raw water augmentation regulations. Similar to the approach taken for the demonstration project, Metropolitan would engage an independent scientific advisory panel on development of raw water augmentation.
Design, construction, and test plan development for DPR development is shown in Figure 9, with test plan development and design beginning in January 2021. Outcomes from research projects currently underway to address topics identified by the State Board to further the science needed to support DPR regulatory development are anticipated near the end of 2020. This timeline would enable consideration of these findings into the design for testing DPR treatment processes. In addition, results from testing tertiary and secondary MBR at the demonstration facility are anticipated to be concluded by early 2022, allowing findings from these first two phases of testing to be incorporated into the DPR test plan. Draft regulatory criteria are likely to be available during test plan development and design of the DPR treatment process train.

9.4 DPR through Treated Water Augmentation

DPR through treated drinking water augmentation is the planned placement of recycled water directly into the water distribution system of a public water system, or commonly referred to as “flange-to-flange” where no buffer is provided between an advanced treated water supply and a treated drinking water distribution system. As noted, while Assembly Bill 574 requires the State Board to develop regulations for DPR through raw water augmentation and mandates the development of raw water augmentation regulations by December 31, 2023, no timeline has been established for the State Board to develop regulations for DPR through treated drinking water augmentation. In addition, the State Board has indicated it will not pursue this regulatory development until raw water augmentation regulations are established.

There have been questions by the Board on the future possibility of DPR at Palos Verdes Reservoir. Palos Verdes Reservoir is a terminal reservoir in the Central Pool low pressure zone, supplied by the Second Lower Feeder and the Palos Verdes Feeder, and located approximately 5 miles from the JWPCP.
total water demand at the reservoir is approximately 10 to 50 cubic feet per second (cfs) (6.5 to 32 mgd) based on annual average demand. Ninety percent of the time historical demands are less than 14 cfs (9 mgd).

If DPR through treated drinking water augmentation were to be implemented at Palos Verdes Reservoir, the relatively smaller demand at this location would be impractical for utilizing the reservoir as a central distribution source for advanced treated water. A more suitable option to deliver advanced treated water to the Central Pool distribution system would be slightly upstream of Palos Verdes Reservoir, into the Second Lower Feeder, thereby supplying the high-pressure zone of the Central Pool where annual average demand is approximately 400 cfs (258 mgd). Since the regulatory timeline for DPR through treated drinking water augmentation has yet to be determined and requirements would be highly speculative, the delivery of advanced treated water to Palos Verdes Reservoir will not be further evaluated at this time.

9.5 Conclusions

The current focus of the RRWP is IPR through groundwater replenishment, as groundwater basin replenishment constitutes a significant portion of demands on Metropolitan. Raw water augmentation may be a viable additional opportunity for the RRWP; however, further work is needed to fully evaluate this option to deliver advanced treated water to the Weymouth or Diemer plant. DPR would offer significant operational flexibility if used in conjunction with IPR deliveries and could significantly expand the benefits of the program. Metropolitan Board input and funding is required to develop options for raw water augmentation through demonstration facility testing. If approved, testing for DPR requirements at the demonstration facility would likely commence prior to State Board adoption of the regulations. This offers an opportunity for Metropolitan to help develop components that need to be detailed in future raw water augmentation regulations.
LETTER OF INTENT TO COLLABORATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FUTURE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING RELATED TO ADVANCED TREATED WATER DELIVERY SYSTEMS BETWEEN THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND CITY OF LOS ANGELES, THROUGH THE LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER

This LETTER OF INTENT (LOI) is made by and between THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (Metropolitan) and CITY OF LOS ANGELES (City), by and through THE LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER (LADWP), who may be referred to individually as “Party” or collectively as “Parties.”

BACKGROUND

A. Metropolitan and County Sanitation No. 2 of Los Angeles County (Sanitation District) are working together to develop a Regional Recycled Water Program (Program). The objective of the Program is to produce up to 150 million gallons per day (MGD) of advanced treated water from a new advanced water treatment (AWT) facility located at the Sanitation District’s Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in Carson, California (Metropolitan AWT Facility). The Program’s development may be phased, starting at lower levels of production with the potential to build up to 150 MGD of production as demands and conditions warrant.

B. If the Program is finalized and approved by Metropolitan’s Board of Directors, it will also include plans for the development of a conveyance system consisting of approximately 60 miles of pipeline and a series of pump stations (AWT Conveyance System). The AWT Conveyance System could potentially deliver up to 150 MGD of treated water to the Central, West Coast, Orange County and Main San Gabriel Groundwater Basins. Delivery locations along the alignment will consist of either existing groundwater spreading basins, new or existing injection wells, or industrial customers of Member Agencies in the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor areas. Metropolitan has divided the pipeline alignment into five segments for consideration of a phased construction approach.

C. LADWP and the City’s Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN) are currently developing a comprehensive program (City Program) to purify and reuse 100% of available secondary effluent from the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (HWRP) by 2035. Under the City Program, LASAN will be pilot-testing treatment processes that will ultimately lead to the retrofit of the HWRP to produce advanced treated water. LADWP is also currently developing a masterplan with the Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD) that will evaluate the most optimal locations to convey this water into the underlying aquifers within the West Coast and Central Groundwater Basins. At a future date, there may be opportunities for LADWP to convey some of its advanced treated water into Metropolitan’s planned AWT Conveyance System as a potential supplemental supply source to the water source produced by the Metropolitan AWT Facility. There may also be opportunities for Metropolitan’s advanced treated water to flow into the LADWP system. Both options could create flexibility for both plants.
D. Due to the size, complexity and anticipated capital investment required of both Metropolitan’s and the City’s programs, it will be beneficial for both organizations to coordinate and collaborate, as appropriate, during the developmental stages of both programs. Such coordination and collaboration will ensure that both systems are planned, designed, constructed and operated in a manner consistent with the best interests of the customers of each organization and its constituents.

TERMS

1. INTENT AND COMPONENTS:

a. It is the intent of the Parties to collaborate in the development and utilization of AWT supplies produced from their respective facilities, while minimizing areas of potential conflict or duplication of activities.

b. Metropolitan and LADWP intend to develop a plan to coordinate the potential integration of Metropolitan’s Program and the City’s Program. This collaboration will examine the operational and institutional integration of the water and facilities of the respective program. To that end, the Parties intend for the plan through a future MOU to:

i. Ensure continuity, compatibility, and flexibility of both Metropolitan and LADWP’s recycled water infrastructure to meet future supply conditions;

ii. Identify and examine potential water quality issues and specifications related to integrating the two programs;

iii. Provide for related research, testing, and other technical collaborations;

iv. Provide for collaboration on regulatory developments related to both programs; and

v. Develop additional areas for collaboration and support, as identified by the Parties.

c. The Parties intend to develop an MOU that will include conducting and preparing any additional studies necessary to evaluate the integration of these two programs. These studies may include the economic and technical feasibility, financing needs, right-of-way and permitting requirements, environmental and regulatory compliance obligations, brine discharge requirements, and engineering, construction, operational, and water quality specifications.

2. The provisions of this LOI represent a statement of the Parties’ general intent only, and shall not be binding on either Party. Neither Party shall have any obligation to enter into the MOU, and no course of conduct of the Parties shall evidence any binding obligations. Each Party fully understands that the terms and conditions of the proposed MOU are subject to approval by the
General Manager of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Board of Commissioners of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Los Angeles City Council, the General Manager of Metropolitan, and the Metropolitan Board of Directors, and that no Party shall have any legal obligations to the other unless and until all of the terms and conditions of the proposed MOU have been negotiated and agreed to by all Parties and set forth in the proposed MOU, which have been approved by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners and the Los Angeles City Council, and signed and delivered by all Parties.

3. NOTICES

Any notice under this LOI must be in writing and addressed as follows:

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Post Office Box 54153
Los Angeles, CA 90054-0153
Attn: John Bednarski, Group Manager, Engineering Services
With a courtesy copy by email to: jbednarski@mwdh2o.com

Los Angeles Department of Water
111 North Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Room 1460
Attn: David Pettijohn, Director of Water Resources
With a courtesy copy by email to: David.Pettijohn@ladwp.com

A properly addressed notice will be effective on the day of delivery, if delivered directly by a Party or by a nationally recognized delivery service, or on the third day after mailing, if sent postage prepaid by U.S. Mail. The Parties shall transmit a courtesy copy of any notice to the other Party by email on the day the notice is sent.

Either Party may change the address listed in this section by providing five days’ notice to the other Party.

The Parties are signing this LOI in duplicate originals.
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

By: ________________________________
    General Manager

Date: ______________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: ________________________________
    General Counsel

LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER

By: ________________________________
    General Manager

Date: ______________________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM & LEGALITY:

Michael F. Feuer
LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY

By: ________________________________
    Deputy City Attorney
    Melanie A. Ting
    7/15/19
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert Hunter,
General Manager

Staff Contact: Harvey De La Torre
Melissa Baum-Haley

SUBJECT: DELTA CONVEYANCE PROJECT ACTIVITIES UPDATE

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors review and discuss the information presented.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Committee recommends (To be determined at Committee Meeting)

REPORT

Regulatory Activities

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) and Department of Water Resources (DWR) have been working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the reinitiation of consultation for the Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP). In January 2019, USBR released a biological assessment to support consultation under the Endangered Species Act. In June 2019, the USFWS and NMFS completed the effects analyses and submitted them for peer review. The final biological opinions are expected to be released in July.
**Joint Powers Authorities**

The Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) met on June 20. At the meeting, the DCA approved amending the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement for Planning and Environmental Services in support of the environmental analysis for a potential Delta Conveyance project, approved a revised scope of services for Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., to align with new planning and environmental support services, approved the FY 2019/20 budget, authorized the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a lease for office space, and authorized amendment of the bylaws regarding meeting times and staffing flexibility. The Delta Conveyance Finance Authority did not meet in June.

**Additional Information**

Additional information on the Bay-Delta Issues can be found in *Issue Brief D - Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues* of the Discussion Item regarding Metropolitan Water District items critical to Orange County.
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Robert Hunter, General Manager

Staff Contact: Karl Seckel
Harvey De La Torre
Melissa Baum-Haley

SUBJECT: METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT (MET) ITEMS CRITICAL TO ORANGE COUNTY

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Board of Directors to review and discuss this information.

DETAILED REPORT

This report provides a brief update on the current status of the following key MET issues that may affect Orange County:

a) MET’s Water Supply Conditions
b) MET’s Finance and Rate Issues
c) Colorado River Issues
d) Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues
e) MET’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation in the Doheny and Huntington Beach Ocean (Poseidon) Desalination Projects
f) South Orange County Projects
SUBJECT: MET’s Water Supply Conditions

RECENT ACTIVITY

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) in June increased the State Water Project (SWP) “Table A” allocation to 75%. This allocation provides Metropolitan with approximately **1.41 MAF in SWP deliveries this water year**. DWR’s approval considered several factors including existing storage in SWP conservation reservoirs, SWP operational regulatory constraints, and the 2019 contractor demands.

With estimated total demands and losses of 1.50 million acre-feet (MAF), along with 947 thousand acre-feet (TAF) of Colorado River water and a 75% SWP Table A Allocation plus an additional 65 TAF of Article 21 supplies, Metropolitan is projecting that supply will exceed demand levels in CY 2019. Based on this, estimated total dry-year storage for Metropolitan at the end of **CY 2019 is projected to go up to 3.3 MAF**.
SUBJECT: MET’s Finance and Rate Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

For the period ending June 30, 2019, June M. Skillman, Interim Assistant General Manager/Chief Financial Officer, reported on Metropolitan’s SWAP Quarterly Report. Metropolitan has $493.6 million in outstanding interest rate swaps. These transactions and their associated bonds have resulted in $119.5 million in savings through the date of the report, including $3.8 million, net present debt service savings, on the three swap termination transactions. The mark-to-market value plus the accrued interest of the swap portfolio is a negative $59.7 million, reflecting interest rates, as of June 30, 2019, which were significantly lower than when these swaps were executed. Net exposure to all counterparties is within board-approved guidelines. As of June 30, 2019, Metropolitan had no collateral posted with any counterparties.
SUBJECT: Colorado River Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

**Metropolitan Submits Updated 2019 Intentionally Created Surplus (ICS) Plan**

After the Drought Contingency Plan (DCP) agreements became effective in May, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) requested that all Colorado River contractors with ICS accounts submit updated ICS Plans to reflect any changes resulting from implementation of the DCP. On June 17, Metropolitan submitted its updated 2019 ICS Plan. This update reflects Metropolitan’s new and amended Extraordinary Conservation ICS (ECICS) exhibits, which added Metropolitan’s conservation and local resource programs. This expansion in Metropolitan’s conservation programs that qualify to create ECICS give Metropolitan greater flexibility in creating California’s 400,000 acre-foot maximum annual ICS creation volume, which Metropolitan is targeting leaving in Lake Mead this year.

**Salinity Control Forum Meeting**

The Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum (Forum) celebrated its 100th meeting in Denver, Colorado on June 5 and 6, and Metropolitan was elected to serve as Chair of the Forum. The Forum addressed the recent earthquake at the Paradox Valley Unit (PVU). PVU is a well in Colorado’s Paradox Valley that Reclamation uses to inject naturally-occurring brine into a deep aquifer system at high pressures. The brine is extracted from shallow groundwater that would otherwise flow to the nearby Dolores River, which is tributary to the Colorado River, effectively reducing the Colorado River salt load by 95,000 tons per year—the largest single salt reduction project in the Basin. On March 4, 2019, a magnitude 4.5 earthquake near PVU prompted Reclamation to shut down the facility. Since that time, a total of 1,760 aftershocks have been measured. The U.S. Geological Survey suspects the high-pressure brine injection is responsible for this significant increase in seismic activity. It is not clear when, or if, injection at PVU will recommence. Reclamation is currently evaluating three brine disposal alternatives as part of an ongoing EIS process. The Forum also discussed the 2020 Triennial Review, a review mandated to occur every three years, which evaluates the water quality standards for salinity in the Colorado River. Metropolitan staff will provide input on Reclamation’s modeling of salinity in the Colorado River and will contribute to the development of the Triennial Review report.

**Reclamation Begins 2020 Annual Operating Plan Consultation**

On June 4, Reclamation held the first of three annual consultation meetings regarding its Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River Reservoirs (AOP) for 2020. Each year Reclamation prepares an AOP that reports on operations of Colorado River Reservoirs during the past year, and projects operations and releases for the current year based on current and projected reservoir elevations and hydrologic conditions throughout the basin. The 2020 AOP will be the first to implement the recently finalized DCP agreements. Each
year’s AOP provides Metropolitan with significant operational information regarding projected releases from Lake Powell to Mead and whether the Lower Division States (California, Arizona and Nevada) will face normal, surplus or shortage conditions. Metropolitan uses information in the AOP to plan diversions, ICS creation and/or delivery, as well as interstate banking determinations. Based on current projections, there will be no surpluses or shortages in 2020.
SUBJECT: Bay Delta/State Water Project Issues

RECENT ACTIVITY

For information specifically relating to the Delta Conveyance Project (f.k.a. the California WaterFix) please, refer to the associated Board Item – Delta Conveyance Project Activities.

Science Activities

Metropolitan staff participated in the Sutter Bypass workgroup meetings this month to discuss preliminary results of ongoing fish, zooplankton, and hydrology studies that are taking place to better identify how juvenile salmon use this habitat and what restoration actions are needed to improve salmon use and survival. Preliminary results suggest that fish in the Sutter Bypass have higher growth rates than fish in the Sacramento and Feather Rivers, with the exception of the Sacramento River near the Tisdale Weir, where fish have similar growth to fish in the Sutter Bypass. Study results also suggest that the Sutter Bypass has longer residence time of water, lower dissolved oxygen, and higher zooplankton density than the Sacramento and Feather Rivers. Seining efforts in the Sutter Bypass captured all four runs of Chinook salmon as identified by length-at-date, which will be confirmed by genetic analysis. Analysis will continue through the summer.

Metropolitan staff met with the Centerville Schoolhouse Workgroup to tour different facilities of the hydroelectric project on Butte Creek and discuss potential project improvements that could be made to ensure delivery of cold water from the West Branch of the Feather River to Butte Creek to support spawning spring-run Chinook salmon. The Workgroup is a diverse group of stakeholders that are committed to ensuring the future of Butte Creek’s population of spring-run Chinook salmon.

Metropolitan staff continued participating in the Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program (CSAMP), including participation on the Collaborative Adaptive Management Team (CAMT). In June, CAMT discussed the status of the Delta Smelt Science Plan implementation effort. This CAMT effort is pilot testing the framework laid out in the Delta Smelt Science Plan to assess the effects of ambient environmental conditions and flow-related management actions for Delta smelt. CAMT discussed the need for the pilot implementation to include all planned management actions, pilot studies and monitoring activities related to the food web and flow management actions proposed to benefit Delta smelt. CAMT also provided input to the development of process guidelines for Phase 1 of the CSAMP Structured Decision Making (SDM) Project for Delta Smelt. The overall objective of this SDM process is to identify actions to benefit Delta smelt and evaluate and rank the actions in a scientifically structured process to support consideration of prioritized management actions. The SDM process guidelines will address the SDM process, membership, development of goals, objectives and evaluation criteria, identification of management actions, and methods for estimating consequences. Metropolitan staff also participated in a CAMT workshop to review a proposed spreadsheet tool that could be used to estimate salmon survival for different actions, and discuss uses and limitations of the tool.
The Delta Independent Science Board (DISB) is charged with reviewing the adequacy of the science in support of adaptive management for the Delta, and they have done this by conducting reviews of science for specific topics. On June 17, the DISB released their draft review of the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) for public comment. The review looks at the organizational and programmatic business of IEP to produce science to inform Delta management. Metropolitan staff is reviewing the document and will coordinate with the State Water Contractors to provide comments by the July 26 deadline.
ISSUE BRIEF # E

SUBJECT:  MET’s Ocean Desalination Policy and Potential Participation in the Doheny and Huntington Beach Ocean (Poseidon) Desalination Projects

RECENT ACTIVITY

Doheny Desal

The details of this have been moved to briefing Issue F as it pertains only to South Orange County.

Poseidon Huntington Beach

The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) continues to work with Poseidon on renewal of the NPDES Permit for the HB Desalination Project. At the June 14, 2019 SARWQCB meeting, the Regional Board staff provided an information item update on the “Identified Need” for the Poseidon project. In evaluating whether the proposed location is the “best site feasible”, the Ocean Plan directs the Regional Board to evaluate, in part, if the identified need for desalinated water is consistent with applicable water planning documents. In the case of the proposed Poseidon project, the applicable water planning documents are Municipal Water District of Orange County’s (MWDOC) 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the OC Water Reliability Study, OCWD’s Long Term Facilities Plan and other OCWD planning documents. There were a considerable range of views expressed at the meeting. One of the reactions from the SARWQCB was that they did not believe they could permit a project if it was not highly probable that the project would move forward. The alternative position was noted that it is hard to agree ahead of time to move forward with the project if the full extent of terms and conditions are unknown.

The Regional Board schedule for the permit is:

- Draft Permit Will be discussed in a Fall Workshop
- Final Permit Anticipated issuance by the end of the year

Assuming success, Poseidon would then seek its final permits from the California Coastal Commission. The August 2, 2019 meeting of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board has been cancelled. The next Regional Board meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2019.
SUBJECT: South Orange County Projects

RECENT ACTIVITY

Doheny Desal Project

On June 27, 2019 the South Coast Water District (SCWD) Board certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Phase I Local Doheny Ocean Desalination Project, which would produce up to 5 million gallons per day (MGD) of new, drinking water supplies for the area. SCWD subsequently filed its Notice of Determination and is beginning the permitting process with various permitting agencies.

In March 2018, SCWD was awarded a $10 million grant from the State Department of Water Resources for the Doheny Ocean Desalination Project.

In April 2019, U.S. Representative Mike Levin announced that SCWD is set to receive more than $8.3 million in US Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) WaterSMART Desalination Construction Program grant funding for the Project. The grant is subject to pending federal appropriations and needs to be included in the E&W Appropriations list of projects for which the Secretary of Interior intends to award grants. Congressman Levin is acting as the lead office on this request in the House.

On July 11, 2019 SCWD’s Board adopted a resolution pursuing a second year (round) of the USBR WaterSMART Desalination Construction Program grant funding. SCWD is eligible to receive a cumulative total of $20 million for the Project from USBR. Approximately two to six awards are expected to be made by USBR with up to $12 million available in this round. The recipient must provide at least 75% of the total project costs.

Next Steps:

1. Alternative Power Supply Management Study – SCWD staff is currently reviewing a proposal from engineering consultant Burns & McDonnell for a 6 month detailed study of alternative power alternatives. The study would include a District-wide assessment and Conceptual Management Plan including studying a community choice aggregation option.

2. Legislative – SCWD is working on AB 1752 to allow the District to proceed with a DBO Contract while maintaining access to State funding for the Project (both DWR grant money and SRF loans). A vote in anticipated in mid-October.

3. Project Delivery – Beginning work on the development of several documents including; Request for State of Qualifications (SOQ) for potential bidders, contract documents, and a RFP package.

4. Peer Review Cost Estimate – California American Water (CalAm), who developed the 6.4 MGD Monterey Ocean Desal Project using slant well technology, is completing a peer review cost estimate. A Board workshop, tentatively scheduled for August 22, 2019, will present the assumptions, costs, and lessons learned.
5. Slant Well Risk Evaluation – A second workshop will be scheduled to get CalAm’s perspective on the risks of slant well technology.

6. SCWD Local Potable Water System Integration – Updated hydraulic modeling and surge analysis of the SCWD system.

7. Project Partners – continuing to discuss partnering opportunities with interested agencies

8. High Level Schedule
   a. Environmental permitting Summer 2020
   b. DBOM Contract Develop/Award Fall 2020
   c. Funding Fall 2020
   d. Final Design Dec. 2020
   e. Construction Late 2022

**SMWD Trampas Canyon Recycled Water Reservoir**

Trampas Canyon Reservoir and Dam (Trampas Reservoir) is a seasonal recycled water storage reservoir, with a total capacity of 5,000 AF, of which 2,500 AF is available to meet Santa Margarita Water District’s projected base recycled water demands, and 2,500 AF to meet future water supply needs. When completed, the Trampas Reservoir will allow SMWD to store recycled water in the winter and draw on that water during the peak summer months.

The construction of the Trampas Canyon Recycled Water Seasonal Storage Reservoir consists of three main components:

1. Trampas Canyon Dam (Dam)
2. Conveyance facilities to transport recycled water into and out of the Reservoir (Pipelines)
3. Trampas Canyon Pump Station (Pump Station)

The construction of the facilities is being completed in three phases:

1. Preconstruction/Site Preparation for the Dam and Pump Station Construction
2. Dam and Pipelines
3. Pump Station
**PROJECT STATUS**

**Preconstruction/Site Preparation**

Complete

**Dam and Pipelines**

The Construction Contract was awarded in December 2017 and is approximately 49% complete.

**Pump Station**

The 90% design of the facility has been submitted by AECOM and reviewed by SMWD. The design process is scheduled to conclude in July 2019, and the project will likely be available to start the construction bidding process in August 2019. Overall completion of the Pump Station construction is expected to be in June 2020, about 2 months ahead of the Reservoir and Dam completion. Interim partial completion of Pump Station components is being considered by SMWD to enable the start of “early filling” of recycled water to the Reservoir in Spring 2020.

**San Juan Watershed Project**

NO NEW INFORMATION

**South Orange County Emergency Service Program**

NO NEW INFORMATION

**Strand Ranch Project**

NO NEW INFORMATION

**Other Information on South County Projects:**

If any agencies would like to have updates included herein on any projects within your service area, please email the updates to Karl Seckel at kseckel@mwdoc.com.
COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

None. (Agenda Item 5E)

FINANCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE

Adopted resolution authorizing the reimbursement of capital expenditures from bond proceeds for fiscal years 2018/19 and 2019/20 and other capital expenditures relating to Metropolitan’s water delivery systems as contained in the Board letter. (Agenda Item 8-1)

FACILITIES NAMING COMMITTEE

Approved naming The Lake Mathews Multiple Species Reserve in honor of former Metropolitan Board Chairwoman Lois B. Krieger. (Agenda Item 8-2)

ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Awarded $14,784,000 contract to Helix Electric, Inc. for the Stage 2 electrical upgrades at the Jensen plant. (Agenda Item 8-3)

Authorized amendments to the Administrative Code regarding deliveries of member agency water supplies in Metropolitan's system in an emergency. (Agenda Item 8-4)

WATER PLANNING AND STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

By a two-thirds vote, authorized the General Manager to make payment of up to $3.43 million to the State Water Contractors. (Agenda Item 8-5)

COMMUNICATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Authorized the General Manager to express support for AB 296 (Cooley, D-Rancho Cordova): Climate change: Climate Innovation Grant Program: voluntary tax contributions; and AB 409 (Limón, D-Santa Barbara): Climate change: agriculture: Agricultural Climate Adaptation Tools Program: grants. (Agenda Item 8-6)

ORGANIZATION, PERSONNEL AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Authorized a professional services agreement with PlanNet, LLC not-to-exceed $1,900,000 to relocate Metropolitan enterprise data center systems to qualified colocation data center service providers. (Agenda Item 8-7)
CONSENT CALENDAR

In other actions, the Board:

Awarded $475,000 contract to Mehta Mechanical Company, Inc. for installation of a weather enclosure at the Yorba Linda Power Plant.  *(Agenda Item 7-1)*

Authorized the granting of a ten-year license to E-Z Storage for storage containers and parking purposes.  *(Agenda Item 7-2)*

Authorized granting of a ten-year license to CTF for temporary storage of finished products.  *(Agenda Item 7-3)*

OTHER MATTERS

Approved Commendatory Resolution for Director Zareh Sinanyan representing the City of Glendale.  *(Agenda Item 5C)*

Adopted motion to adjourn the August Board Meeting to August 20, 2019, to establish tax rate.  (Committees to meet on August 19 and 20, 2019)  *(Agenda Item 5D)*

Approved an employment contract with Mr. Abel Salinas as Ethics Officer, containing the terms and conditions set forth in the Board letter.  *(Agenda Item 10-1)*

Discussed Department head Evaluation Process Guidelines and Department Head Evaluation Presentations.  *(Agenda Item 10-2)  *(Heard in closed session)*

Security Awareness Board Training.  *(Agenda Item 13-1)  *(Heard in closed session)*

THIS INFORMATION SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED THE OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING.

Board letters related to the items in this summary are generally posted in the Board Letter Archive approximately one week after the board meeting. In order to view them and their attachments, please copy and paste the following into your browser:

http://edmsidm.mwdh2o.com/idmweb/home.asp

All current month materials, before they are moved to the Board Letter Archive, are available on the public website here: http://mwdh2o.com/WhoWeAre/archived-board-meetings
Adjourned Board Meeting
August 20, 2019
12:00 p.m. – Boardroom

**Meeting Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Rm. 2-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>C&amp;LR</td>
<td>Rm. 2-456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Boardroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MWD Headquarters Building **

700 N. Alameda Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

1. **Call to Order**
   (a) Invocation: TBD
   (b) Pledge of Allegiance: Director De Jesus

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Determination of a Quorum**

4. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on matters within the Board’s jurisdiction. (As required by Government Code Section 54954.3(a))

5. **OTHER MATTERS**
   A. Report on list of certified assessed valuations for fiscal year 2019/20 and tabulation of assessed valuations, percentage participation, and vote entitlement of member agencies as of August 19, 2019. (F&I)
   B. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting for July 9, 2019
      (A copy has been mailed to each Director)
      Any additions, corrections, or omissions
   C. Report on Directors' events attended at Metropolitan expense for month of July 2019
D. Approve committee assignments

E. Chairwoman's Monthly Activity Report

6. DEPARTMENT HEADS' REPORTS

A. General Manager’s summary of activities for the month of July 2019

B. General Counsel's summary of activities for the month of July 2019

C. General Auditor's summary of activities for the month of July 2019

D. Ethics Officer’s summary of activities for the month of July 2019

7. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS — ACTION

7-1 Adopt resolution designating Metropolitan’s maximum contribution for medical benefits in order to comply with the current authorized Memoranda of Understanding; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (OP&T)

7-2 Review and consider the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District’s approved Mitigated Negative Declaration and authorize the General Manager to enter into a Local Resources Program agreement with Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District and La Puente Valley County Water District for the La Puente Recycled Water Project. (WP&S)

7-3 Adopt resolution for Rancho Corrido Annexation to San Diego County Water Authority and Metropolitan; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (F&I)

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR
8. OTHER BOARD ITEMS — ACTION

8-1 Adopt resolution establishing the tax rate for fiscal year 2019/20; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (F&I)

8-2 Award $10,439,354 contract to McMillen Jacobs Associates to replace radial gates along the Colorado River Aqueduct; amend an existing agreement with Lee & Ro, Inc.; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (E&O)

8-3 Award $32,946,000 contract to J.F. Shea Construction, Inc. for installation of discharge line isolation coupling assemblies at each Colorado River Aqueduct pumping plant; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (E&O)

8-4 Adopt CEQA determination that the proposed action was previously addressed in the certified 2005 Environmental Impact Report; and award $2,944,000 contract to Mehta Mechanical Company, Inc. for construction of water quality instrumentation improvements at the F. E. Weymouth Water Treatment Plant. (E&O)

8-5 Authorize the General Manager to enter into an agreement with the State of California Department of Water Resources for the sale of output from three hydroelectric power plants; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (E&O)

8-6 Report on Cyclic Credit Offset Program and affirm General Manager’s decision to activate the Cyclic Credit Offset Program; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (WP&S)
8-7 Report on San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, et al., San Francisco County Superior Court Case Nos. CPF-10-510830, CPF-12-512466, CPF-14-514004, CPF-16-515282, CPF-16-515391, CGC-17-563350, and CPF-18-516389; the appeal of the 2010 and 2012 actions, Court of Appeal for the First Appellate District Case Nos. A146901 and A148266 and California Supreme Court Case No. S243500; the petition for extraordinary writ in the 2010 and 2012 actions, Court of Appeal for the First Appellate District Case No. A155310; and the petition for extraordinary writ in the second 2016 action, Court of Appeal for the First Appellate District Case No. A154325 and California Supreme Court Case No. S251025; and authorize increase in maximum amount payable under contract for legal services with Horvitz & Levy, LLP in the amount of $150,000 for a total amount not to exceed $600,000; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA. (L&C)

[Conference with legal counsel – existing litigation; to be heard in closed session pursuant to Gov. Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)]

9. BOARD INFORMATION ITEMS

9-1 Update on Conservation Program

9-2 Information on Stormwater for Direct Use Pilot Program. (WP&S)

9-3 Report on Allocation of Demand Management Costs. (F&I)

10. OTHER MATTERS

10-1 Department Head Performance Evaluations

[Public Employees’ performance evaluations; General Manager, General Counsel, and General Auditor; to be heard in closed session pursuant to Gov. Code 54957.]

10-2 Report on Department Head 2019 Salary Survey

10-3 Discuss and Approve Compensation Recommendations for General Manager, General Counsel, and General Auditor
11. FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

13. ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: Each agenda item with a committee designation will be considered and a recommendation may be made by one or more committees prior to consideration and final action by the full Board of Directors. The committee designation appears in parentheses at the end of the description of the agenda item e.g., (E&O, F&I). Committee agendas may be obtained from the Board Executive Secretary.

Writings relating to open session agenda items distributed to Directors less than 72 hours prior to a regular meeting are available for public inspection at Metropolitan's Headquarters Building and on Metropolitan's Web site http://www.mwdh2o.com.

Requests for a disability related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to attend or participate in a meeting should be made to the Board Executive Secretary in advance of the meeting to ensure availability of the requested service or accommodation.
## Updates to August 19 & 20 2019 Draft Agendas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BL No.</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Reason for Change</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>WP&amp;S</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Update on Delta Conveyance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>WP&amp;S</td>
<td>Updated subject</td>
<td>Report on Cyclic Credit Cost Offset Program and affirm General Manager’s decision to activate the Cyclic Credit Cost Offset Program; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Updated subject</td>
<td>Board Training on Social Media, Public Officials and the First Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>F&amp;I</td>
<td>Item withdrawn</td>
<td>Adopt resolution for Rancho Corrido Annexation to San Diego County Water Authority and Metropolitan; the General Manager has determined that the proposed action is exempt or otherwise not subject to CEQA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7/23/19