



AGENDA

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE Santa Fe Irrigation District

Thursday, June 1, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Held at the Santa Fe Irrigation District
5920 Linea de Cielo, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee (Government Code Section 54954.3) Individuals may address the Committee regarding items not appearing on the posted agenda, which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board, at any time. Comments and inquiries pertaining to items listed on the agenda will be received during the deliberation of the agenda item. Speakers are asked to state their name, address, and topic, and to observe a time limit of three (3) minutes each. Members of the public desiring to address the Committee are asked to complete a speaker's card, available at the table near the entrance and present it to the Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Approval of March 2, 2017, Meeting Minutes (pages 3-5)
2. Consider Adoption of Amended Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (pages 6-12)
3. Consider Authorizing the General Manager to Execute Purchase Contracts for Bulk Chemicals for the R.E. Badger Filtration Plant (pages 13-15)
4. Status Report on Alternative Water Supply Development Activities (pages 16-21)

REPORTS

5. FY17 Capital Improvement Projects Status Report (oral)
6. Engineering Services Manager's Report (oral)
7. Operations Manager's Report (oral)
8. General Manager's Report (oral)

9. Committee Members' Comments (oral)

INFORMATION ITEMS - None

ADJOURN

Next Water Resources Committee meeting: *Thursday, July 6, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.*

**MINUTES
SANTA FE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

March 2, 2017
Santa Fe Irrigation District
5920 Linea del Cielo, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

PRESENT: Chairman Kenneth Dunford, Vice President Augie Daddi, General Manager Michael Bardin, Executive Assistant Kim Johnson, Engineering Services Manager Bill Hunter, Operations Manager Cor Shaffer, Associate Civil Engineer Marissa Potter, and General Counsel Paula de Sousa Mills were present.

Chairman Dunford called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 2, 2017, MEETING MINUTES

The Committee approved the minutes as submitted.

Chairman Dunford stated the Committee would consider Agenda Item 10, Closed Session, prior to discussion of Items 2 and 3.

Chairman Dunford adjourned to Closed Session at 9:01 a.m.

Chairman Dunford reconvened to Open Session at 10:10 a.m. and reported no reportable actions were taken in Closed Session.

2. CONSIDER FILING NOTICE OF COMPLETION FOR ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION AND SUBSTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (J-1351)

ESM Hunter presented the item and he and GM Bardin responded to questions from the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee supported staff's recommendation for approval and directed staff to move the item forward for full Board consideration at the regular March meeting.

3. CONSIDER FILING NOTICE OF COMPLETION FOR THE CHLORINE DIOXIDE GENERATION AND PACL FEED IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (J-1350)

ESM Hunter presented the item and he and GM Bardin responded to questions from the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee supported staff's recommendation for approval and directed staff to move the item forward for full Board consideration at the regular March meeting.

4. OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE WATER SUPPLY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

GM Bardin presented the item and responded to questions from the Committee.

A lengthy discussion ensued and the Committee felt this item should move forward to the full Board to provide the opportunity for extensive discussion, possibly in a workshop setting. As it was an informational item, there was no Committee action required.

REPORTS

5. FY17 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

- REVIEW OF 10-YEAR (FY17-FY26) CIP

ESM Hunter provided an overview of the current 10-year CIP, noting project timing could be revised as a result of the FY18 District budget.

6. ENGINEERING SERVICES MANAGER'S REPORT – No further comments

7. OPERATIONS MANAGER'S REPORT - OM Shaffer reported Lake Hodges is nearly full, however, with recent water movement by the City of San Diego, the lake did not spill. He also reported the District will be meeting with City of San Diego later this day to discuss how to maximize yield in the Lake.

8. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT – No further comments

9. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS - No further comments

INFORMATION ITEMS – None

CLOSED SESSION

10. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL- ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
SIGNIFICANT EXPOSURE TO LITIGATION PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH (2) OF
SUBDIVISION (D) OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9
TWO POTENTIAL CASES

Item considered out of order. Please see minutes on Page 1.

INFORMATION ITEMS - None

ADJOURN

Chairman Dunford adjourned the meeting at 11:38 a.m.

Kenneth Dunford, Chairman

Next Water Resources Committee meeting: *April 6, 2017 @ 9:00 a.m.*

DATE: June 1, 2017
TO: Water Resources Committee
FROM: General Manager
SUBJECT: Consider Adoption of Amended Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the Staff recommendation that the Water Resources Committee:

1. Review and discuss amending and adopting Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Recommend the Board adopt a resolution amending and adopting Local Guidelines for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (2017 Revision); and
3. Take other action as appropriate.

DISCUSSION:

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as contained in Public Resources Code sections 21000 et seq., requires all public agencies within the state to evaluate the environmental effects of their actions. CEQA also aims to prevent significant environmental effects from occurring as a result of agency actions by requiring agencies to avoid or reduce, when feasible, the significant environmental impacts of their decisions.

Best, Best & Krieger, LLP (BB&K) has prepared the 2017 update to the *Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act* (Local Guidelines). The Local Guidelines are designed to assist the District in assessing the environmental implications of a project prior to its approval, as mandated by CEQA. These Guidelines have been revised to reflect recent changes in the Public Resources Code, the State CEQA Guidelines, and relevant court opinions. In summary, the changes relate to any requests for public notices, require annual renewal, general guidance that identifying statutory exemptions from CEQA can be located within CEQA Guidelines and other titles within the California Codes, modifications regarding the requirement for an Initial Study for a project, exemption for certain large-scale development projects was extended to January 1, 2018, minor correction to a hyperlink reference, and a revision to Local Guidelines based on SB122. A memo from BB&K summarizes these changes to the local guidelines (Attachment A). These Local CEQA Guidelines provide instruction and forms for preparing all environmental documents required under CEQA. The District currently follows the

2016 version of the Local Guidelines prepared by BB&K and typically updates the document annually to incorporate any applicable changes in the law.

The revisions do not appear to pose any significant changes for typical District projects. District staff will consult with legal counsel, as necessary, for projects that may relate to the changes. The change in fees for filing CEQA documents could impact the District on future projects. A full copy of the proposed 2017 Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act is available at the District Office front counter, and may be accessed on the District website by clicking the link below:

www.sfidwater.org/CEQA

Section 21082 of CEQA requires all public agencies to adopt objectives, criteria, and procedures for the evaluation of public and private projects undertaken or approved by such public agencies, and the preparation, if required, of environmental impact reports and negative declarations in connection with that evaluation. Board adoption of a Resolution (Attachment B) will achieve this requirement.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No direct fiscal impact as a result of the review of this item.

Attachment A: 2017 Summary of Changes to Local CEQA Guidelines

Attachment B: Draft Resolution Amending and Adopting Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act

Prepared by: Marissa Potter, Associate Civil Engineer

Approved by: Michael J. Bardin, General Manager

Memorandum

TO: Santa Fe Irrigation District
FROM: Best Best & Krieger LLP
DATE: March 6, 2017
RE: 2017 Summary of Changes to Local CEQA Guidelines

Important changes in the law have been incorporated into the 2017 Update to your Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (“Local Guidelines”). For easy reproduction and access to these Local Guidelines, as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) forms your District will need, and other important legal alerts, please access BBK’s CEQA client portal at www.bbklaw.net/CEQA. For technical support, please contact Gar House at Gar.House@bbklaw.com.

Public agencies are required to adopt implementing procedures for administering their responsibilities under CEQA. These procedures include provisions governing how the Santa Fe Irrigation District will process environmental documents and provide for adequate comment, time periods for review, and lists of permits that are ministerial actions and projects that are considered categorically exempt. The District’s procedures should be updated within 120 days after the State CEQA Guidelines are revised. To date, the State CEQA Guidelines have not been revised but there were changes made to the Public Resources Code that became effective on January 1, 2017 as well as clarifications to the law that came about as a result of 2016 CEQA litigation. Your Local Guidelines have been updated to reflect those changes and we recommend that your District adopt the updated Local Guidelines within a month of receiving them from Best Best & Krieger LLP.

This memorandum summarizes the substantive amendments to your Local Guidelines made in response to regulations, legislation and legal cases that changed or impacted certain aspects of CEQA between January 2016 and December 2016. Your Local Guidelines and this memorandum are designed to assist in assessing the environmental implications of a project prior to its approval, as mandated by CEQA. We still recommend, however, that you consult with an attorney when you have specific questions on major, controversial, or unusual projects or activities.

Revisions to Local CEQA Guidelines.**Revised Sections.****1. SECTION 1.08 ELECTRONIC DELIVERY OF COMMENTS AND NOTICES**

Local Guidelines section 1.08 was revised pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21092.2(a), which provides that a lead agency may require any person who has filed a written request for CEQA notices with the agency to renew said requests for notice annually. Now, section 1.08 states that “[a]ny request to receive public notices shall be renewed annually.”

2. SECTION 3.19 OTHER SPECIFIC EXEMPTIONS

Local Guidelines section 3.19 notes that CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines include many specific statutory exemptions. In addition to these provisions, section 3.20 was revised to reflect that there are other titles within the California Codes that provide statutory exemptions from CEQA.

3. SECTION 5.01 PREPARATION OF INITIAL STUDY

Local Guidelines section 5.01 was amended for clarity pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15063(a), which stands for the proposition that the District maintains some discretion as to whether an Initial Study is required. While such a process will normally be followed, section 5.01 was revised to note that an Initial Study is not specifically required by CEQA in such instances where an Environmental Impact Report “will clearly be required for the project.” (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15063(a).) As a result, section 5.01 was revised to state that the District “*will normally* prepare an Initial Study to ascertain whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial.” Similarly, section 5.01(a) incorporates this revision as well to note that “[f]or District projects *for which an Initial Study is prepared*, the Initial Study shall be prepared by Staff or by private experts pursuant to contract with the District.”

4. SECTION 5.15 CONSULTATION WITH WATER AGENCIES REGARDING LARGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Pursuant to AB 2561, the sunset date established by Water Code section 10912 statutory exemption for certain large-scale development projects was extended through January 1, 2018.

5. SECTION 6.17 MITIGATION REPORTING OR MONITORING PROGRAM FOR MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Local Guidelines section 6.17 was amended to correct a hyperlink reference to Local Guidelines Section 7.37.

6. SECTION 9.03 ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Local Guidelines section 9.03 was revised based on SB 122. SB 122 adds a new section 21167.6.2 to the Public Resources Code, and allows a Lead Agency, at a project applicant’s request and cost, to concurrently prepare an administrative record while a project is being considered provided certain criteria are satisfied.

Other Changes.

Department of Fish and Wildlife. Effective January 1, 2017, the Department of Fish and Wildlife has increased some of its fees. For a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration, the new filing fee is \$2,216.25. For an Environmental Impact Report, the new filing fee is \$3,078.25. For an environmental document pursuant to a Certified Regulatory Program, the filing fee remains \$1,046.50.

Conclusion.

As always, CEQA remains complicated and, at times, challenging to apply. The only constant in this area of law is how quickly the rules change. Should you have questions about any of the provisions discussed above, or about the environmental review of any of your projects, please contact a BB&K attorney for assistance.

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA FE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
AMENDING AND ADOPTING LOCAL GUIDELINES FOR
IMPLEMENTING THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY ACT (PUB. RESOURCES CODE §§ 21000 ET SEQ.)**

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has amended the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq.), the Natural Resources Agency has amended portions of the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, §§ 15000 et seq.), and the California courts have interpreted specific provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Section 21082 of the Public Resources Code requires all public agencies to adopt objectives, criteria and procedures for the evaluation of public and private projects undertaken or approved by such public agencies, and the preparation, if required, of environmental impact reports and negative declarations in connection with that evaluation; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Fe Irrigation District (“District”) must revise its local guidelines for implementing CEQA to make them consistent with the current provisions and interpretations of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Santa Fe Irrigation District hereby resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The District hereby adopts the “Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (2017 Revision),” a copy of which is on file at the offices of the District and is available for inspection by the public.

SECTION 2. All prior actions of the District enacting earlier guidelines are hereby repealed.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Fe Irrigation District at a regular meeting held this 15th day of June 2017 by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Michael T. Hogan, Board President

ATTEST:

Michael J. Bardin, Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

General Counsel
Santa Fe Irrigation District

DRAFT

DATE: June 1, 2017

TO: Water Resources Committee

FROM: General Manager

SUBJECT: Consider Authorizing the General Manager to Execute Purchase Contracts for Bulk Chemicals for the R.E. Badger Filtration Plant

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the Staff recommendation that the Water Resources Committee:

1. Recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to execute bulk chemical purchase contracts with the suppliers identified in the table below at the specified unit costs:

Treatment Chemical	Supplier	Unit Cost	Estimated Annual Cost
Chlorine	JCI Jones Chemical	\$0.2445/lb	\$85,575
Aqua Ammonia	Univar USA, Inc.	\$0.165/lb	\$7,425
Caustic Soda	JCI Jones Chemical	\$0.1575/lb	\$78,750
Cationic Polymer	Polydyne	\$0.370/lb	\$44,400
Aluminum Chlorohydrate	CalChem	\$0.264/lb	\$264,000

2. Discuss and take other action as appropriate.

DISCUSSION:

As you are aware, the R.E. Badger Filtration Plant (Plant) utilizes a variety of treatment chemicals in the water treatment process. The District purchases these chemicals in bulk from a variety of suppliers and typically procures these supplies under two year purchase contracts. The FY 2018 budget includes funding for the purchase of treatment chemicals for the Plant. Plant staff posted unit cost bid requests on the District website and in the local paper to chemical suppliers for bulk chemicals used in the water treatment process.

Bid requests were issued for a one year contract term, with fixed unit pricing. In addition, after the initial one year contract period, one contract extension of one year, with a maximum unit cost increase up to 5% may be exercised at the District’s sole discretion. Attachment A summarizes the unit cost bid results and identifies the responsive low bidders.

Staff recommends the Water Resources Committee recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to execute purchase contracts for a one year period with the option

to extend one additional year with each of the low responsive bidders for the respective treatment chemicals.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The total estimated fiscal impact of awarding the purchase contracts for bulk treatment chemicals at the R.E. Badger Filtration Plant for the Fiscal Year 2018 is estimated to be \$480,150. This estimate is based upon the specified unit cost and projected usage volumes of each chemical. Sufficient funds for the purchase of bulk chemicals are included in the recommended FY 2018 Operating Budget.

Chemical	Cost per unit (lbs)	Approx. Annual Quantities (lbs)	Estimated Annual Total Cost
Chlorine	\$0.2445	350,000	\$85,575
Aqua Ammonia	\$0.1425	45,000	\$7,425
Caustic Soda	\$0.1215	500,000	\$78,750
Cationic Polymer	\$0.355	120,000	\$44,400
Aluminum Chlorohydrate	\$0.268	1,000,000	\$264,000

Attachment A: Bulk Treatment Chemicals Bid Results

Prepared by: Elijah Standing Warrior, Chief Operator
Reviewed by: Cor Shaffer, Operations Manager
Approved by: Michael J. Bardin, General Manager

ATTACHMENT "A"

Bulk Treatment Chemicals Bid Results R. E. BADGER FILTRATION PLANT FY-2018 Chemical Bids (Unit price per pound)

Supplier	Chlorine	Aqua Ammonia	Caustic Soda	Cationic Polymer	Aluminum Chlorohydrate
Airgas Specialty		\$0.43			
Univar USA, Inc.		\$0.2484	\$0.3542		
Polydyne				\$0.370	
BASF				\$0.485	
Sterling				\$0.4828	
JCI Jones Chemical	\$0.2445		\$0.1575		
Olin Corporation			\$0.345		
CalChem Enterprises					\$0.264 ACH with polymer
					\$0.221 ACH without polymer
Chem Trade					\$0.295 (Non-Qualified Chemical)
Summit Chemical					\$0.278 (PACL Not requested Chemical)
					\$0.265 (Non-Qualified Chemical)

Highlighted indicates low bid.

DATE: June 1, 2017

TO: Water Resources Committee

FROM: General Manager

SUBJECT: Status Report on Alternative Water Supply Development Activities

RECOMMENDATION:

It is the Staff recommendation that the Water Resources Committee:

1. Review and discuss ongoing alternative water supply development activities; and
2. Take other action as appropriate.

DISCUSSION:

This item was presented in great detail to the Committee at the March meeting. A summary of the alternative water supply project background information presented in March 2017 is included for your reference as Attachment A. This item has been agendaized this month to provide staff the opportunity to update the Committee on ongoing developments/activities related to the various non-potable or potable water supply alternatives previously reported on.

Significant planning and studying has been completed regarding water supply options for the District and there are several possible project scenarios the District might pursue with various partners. In addition, staff is engaged with multiple stakeholders, in various activities, working to develop viable projects and secure water supply project funding. As the Board of Directors considers moving forward with business and strategic planning, the development of alternative water supplies will likely be an important topic for direction setting. Reviewing previous planning efforts and the status of project development activities is an appropriate action for this Committee in preparation for upcoming Board planning efforts.

Staff will provide an oral report at the Committee meeting on current activities and will be prepared to discuss the various project information included in Attachment A.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact associated with the review of this report.

Attachment A: Summary of Alternative Water Supply Project Background Information

Prepared by: Michael J. Bardin, General Manager

ATTACHMENT A

Summary of Alternative Water Supply Project Background Information

As noted above, a significant amount of planning has been completed by the District with regard to water resource management and alternative water supply development. The following list summarizes planning work that has been completed to date.

Prepared by Santa Fe Irrigation District:

1. Recycled Water Master Plan – August 2005

Development of strategic framework for expanding recycled water system. Completed service area market assessment and recycled water supply options. Supply sources identified and evaluated were the City of San Diego, San Elijo Joint Powers Authority (SEJPA) and three Community Service Districts (Rancho Santa Fe, Fairbanks Ranch, and Whispering Palms). Preferred project identified 700 acre feet per year (AFY) of demand that could be met with supply from SEJPA, augmented by supplies from the Community Service Districts. Estimated capital cost in 2011 was \$14.4 M.

2. Integrated Water Resources Plan – June 2007

Development of a comprehensive plan to define supply options to meet future demands cost effectively. This plan evaluated all possible supply options, not just the recycled water option. Each element of the District's water supply portfolio was evaluated. These included local surface water, imported untreated and treated water, ocean water desalination, ground-water and recycled water. The plan also evaluated the economic viability of the RE Badger Filtration Plant versus the purchase of treated water. The plan conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- Cost effectiveness and reliability are the primary drivers for future decisions
- Current supply sources can meet future demands
- Imported untreated and treated water costs are projected to increase
- Maximize use of local surface water and take steps to improve water quality at Lake Hodges
- Utilize imported, untreated water as primary source after local surface water
- Minimize the use of imported treated water (more costly than treating at RE Badger)
- Implement recycled water when cost effective
- Do not pursue groundwater option
- Participation in ocean desalination supply development based on business decision
- Continue existing and additional water conservation

Since the Plan preparation in 2007, the following has taken place:

- Carlsbad Desalination Project came online in 2015 as a regional supply

- District has maximized use of local surface water when available
- Water quality improvement projects are being implemented in Lake Hodges
- Recycled water in-fill of approximately 50 AFY has occurred in the Western Service Area.
- District has been an active participant (with 9 other local agencies) in the North San Diego Water Reuse Coalition to obtain State and Federal grant funding.

3. Eastern Service Area Facilities Plan – September 2011

Evaluated recycled water supply options, down to the facilities planning level, to serve approximately 700 AFY of irrigation demand in the Eastern Service Area, primarily in the community of Rancho Santa Fe (RSF). The preferred project was the San Elijo JPA supply option, which is shown in Attachment B. This project assumed that San Dieguito Water District's (SDWD) out-of-service, 30" transmission main would be repurposed to move recycled water from the San Elijo plant site to the RSF area and a 1.7 million gallon storage reservoir would be located near the RSF Golf Club property. Estimated total project capital cost of \$18.7 M and projected retail price of recycled water at \$2,440/AF. It is important to note that capital cost estimates do not include any costs associated with land acquisition for siting a storage reservoir or the ability/right to use the SDWD 30" pipeline.

4. Potable Reuse Feasibility Study – March 2016

In February 2015, the District launched an effort to evaluate potable reuse as an alternative local water supply. This work was been conducted as part of three-way partnership with SDWD and the SEJPA. A cost sharing agreement was executed among the three agencies to equally share the \$120,000 study cost.

The Study is comprised of three technical memos (TM's) that present the following information:

- TM #1 – Status of Potable Reuse in California
- TM #2 – Ultimate Potable Reuse Project
- TM #3 – Near-Term Potable Reuse Project

TMs #2 and #3 outline two separate "reservoir augmentation" projects, a 4,480 AFY and 1,200 AFY projects, respectively, that would utilize the San Dieguito Reservoir to provide an environmental buffer as required by the State Division of Drinking Water (DDW). Planning level project descriptions, project components, and probable project cost estimates are included in each TM. In addition to regulatory hurdles that must be addressed in order to permit a surface water reservoir augmentation project, other project specific constraints exist for both the ultimate and near-term projects.

TM 1 – Status of Potable Reuse Projects

This TM provides a summary of existing potable reuse projects in California, the evolution of the DDW's regulations governing potable reuse, and the timeline for the development of new regulations for surface water augmentation, as well as the feasibility of direct potable reuse.

TM 2 – Ultimate Potable Reuse Project

This TM provides a description of an ultimate potable reuse project that could deliver approximately 4,480 acre-feet (AF) per year of advance treated water from the San Elijo Water Reclamation Facility to the San Dieguito Reservoir by the end of 2025 for an estimated cost of \$1,520/AF. The ultimate project does not meet the draft regulatory criteria for a surface water augmentation project and may require an alternate permitting pathway. This ultimate project is building on the concept developed for the City of San Diego's pursuit of a project to augment Miramar Lake and provides the greatest volume of water at the lowest cost, but also faces the most significant challenges.

TM 3 – Near-Term Potable Reuse Project

This TM provides a description of a short-term potable reuse project that could be developed to deliver approximately 1,200 AFY of advance treated water from the San Elijo Water Reclamation Facility (SEWRF) to the San Dieguito Reservoir within the next six years for an expected cost of \$1,890/ AF. This project will conform to the existing draft criteria for surface water augmentation regulations.

Study Conclusions

The primary conclusion of the feasibility study is that a potable reuse project utilizing surface water augmentation could be permitted with the DDW. A near-term project could produce enough drought-proof water to satisfy approximately 6% of SFID's potable water demands, while the ultimate project could satisfy approximately 22% of SFID's demands. The planning level cost estimate of potable reuse water is estimated to range between \$1,500 and \$2,000 per acre-foot.

Prepared jointly or by others:

1. North San Diego County Regional Recycled Water Project – Regional Recycled Water Facilities Plan – Rev. February 2013

The North San Diego Water Reuse Coalition (NSDWRC) is a coalition of ten (10) local water agencies in northern San Diego County that have worked together since 2011 to conduct collaborative water resource planning and identify benefits of regionalization of existing and planned recycled water systems to maximize the use of recycled water. Attachment B list the agencies that comprise the NSDWRC. The coalition has prepared and jointly funded the preparation of a Regional Recycled Water Project Facilities Plan and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the regional project. The regional project includes groupings of various local agency projects (including SFID project elements) and was prepared primarily prepared to secure grant funding.

The NSDWRC has to date successfully obtained State of California Prop 50 and Prop 84 grant funding that has been utilized for various planning and construction activities of the coalition members. Currently, the coalition is finalizing a Feasibility Study for submittal to the US Bureau

of Reclamation (BuRec) to qualify for federal grant funding under Title XVI and the newly adopted WINN/WRA ACT of 2016.

District project elements that are included in the NSDWRC planning documents include facilities that would be included in either a recycled water or potable reuse project. This includes pumping stations and rehabilitation/repurposing of SDWD's out-of-service 30" transmission main.

2. Focused Tertiary Water Study for the Rancho Santa Fe Water Reclamation Facility – Sept. 2015

District staff has been working closely with the Rancho Santa Fe Community Service District (CSD) and the Rancho Santa Fe Golf Club's Sustainable Water Committee to evaluate the feasibility of serving recycled water to the Rancho Santa Fe Golf Club (Club) for golf course irrigation. The CSD contracted with Dexter Wilson Engineering (Wilson) to prepare this study. The source of the recycled water would be an upgraded CSD Water Reclamation Facility. The Club's current annual water demand is approximately 285 AFY. The project, as defined at this point, could produce enough recycled water to serve approximately 80% of the Club's annual demand, which is currently met with potable water.

The Wilson report defines the project components and developed planning level capital cost estimates for necessary facilities. Project information is summarized below:

1. RSFGC annual demand estimate – 285 AFY
2. Annual demand of 285 AFY met as follows:
 - i. 117 AFY of recycled water
 - ii. 103 AFY of reverse osmosis (RO) recycled water
 - iii. 65 AFY of supplemental potable water
3. TDS water quality target – 710 ppm
 - i. Reverse osmosis brine disposal into CSD wastewater collection system for transport to SEWRF for treatment

4. Estimated project capital cost breakdown (in millions):

i. Tertiary treatment facilities at CSD WRF	\$1.466
ii. Recycled water distribution pipelines	\$1.964
iii. Storage & Pumping *	\$2.619
iv. Reverse Osmosis (RO) Treatment	<u>\$0.500</u>
v. Subtotal estimated project cost	\$6.549
vi. Permitting & Engineering	<u>\$0.060</u>
vii. Total estimated cost	\$6.609

The Club's Sustainable Water Committee has also been evaluating the development of groundwater wells on the Club property as an alternate, new water supply for irrigation. Initial testing performed by the Club indicates that this source of water has a TDS level that would require full reverse osmosis treatment to achieve a water quality suitable for irrigation use. At this time, the onsite groundwater well supply remains an option for the Club to consider, but is less defined than the recycled water option.