

**SELMA-KINGSBURG-FOWLER
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

December 17, 2008

The meeting of the Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District Technical Advisory Committee was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Chairman Alan Weaver.

MEMBERS ROLL CALL

Darren Hays, Kingsburg (present)
Alan Weaver, County of Fresno (present)
Archie Moosakhanian, City of Selma (present)
David Weisser, City of Fowler (present)

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS PRESENT

David Michel, General Manager
Ben Muñoz, Assistant General Manager
Veronica Cazares, Supervising Engineer
Scott Aguiar, Plant Operations Supervisor
David Bacon, Information Systems Analyst
Michael Fong, Chief Accountant
Dennis Lujan, Selma Mayor
Steve Samuelian, California Consulting

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2008, were approved on a motion duly made, seconded and approved by unanimous vote of all members present.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Board Meeting Report

General Manager Michel gave a verbal report on the actions taken at the Board meeting of December 11, 2008.

Reconsideration of California Consulting Agreement

At the November 19th meeting, DTAC recommend that the contract with California Consulting be terminated at the end of 2008, with review in upcoming years. The consensus was that the recommendation of the Committee was not a reflection on Steve Samuelian's performance, but rather an attempt to eliminate a redundant effort. If the District can't spend \$75,000 on a Recycled Water Planning grant, then it shouldn't pay for grant research & lobbying services already provided by professional associations such as the California Association of Sanitation Agencies and California Water Environment Association.

The Board had requested that DTAC listen to a presentation by Steve Samuelian and re-visit this item.

Steve Samuelian of California Consulting gave a presentation with a seven-page handout. He emphasized the lobbying services as well as the grant research services provided by his company on behalf of SKF. He reviewed the following potential loans and grants for SKF for which his firm can provide assistance: lobbying for the possible Water Bond; US EPA State Revolving Fund Loan; State Water Resources Control Board State Revolving Fund Loan; California Infrastructure Bank Revolving Fund Loan; PG&E Energy Audit; California Energy Commission (CEC) Technical Assistance Program; CEC Renewable Fuel Program; CEC Energy Efficiency Loan; Air Resource Board Vehicle and Equipment Projects; San Joaquin Valley Air District Vehicle and Equipment Projects; Water Recycling; Buffer Trees and Trails. He also added that yesterday David Elias had mentioned a possible grant source which Mr. Samuelian had not thought about, namely the Obama administration infrastructure plan. He said that his firm would be looking into that program and tracking it.

Selma Mayor Dennis Lujan said that he endorses Steve Samuelian and the work that his firm does. Fresno County Council of Governments uses him as well as the City of Selma and Steve more than pays for himself. He needs one more year to prove himself at SKF.

General Manager Michel reported that Steve Samuelian has worked hard for the District and has communicated well. As shown by his lists, there are virtually no grants for wastewater, only loans. He does good work, but it is most applicable to his 40+ City clients, not a special wastewater District like SKF. His work is redundant, because lobbying efforts and grant availability reports are already provided by the California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) and California Water Environment Association. CASA has lobbyists in Sacramento and Washington. CASA is ahead of California Consulting in that CASA already has been working with Congress and the incoming Obama administration on the Infrastructure Economic Stimulus Package. Three weeks ago, CASA solicited lists of "shovel-ready" construction projects and "ready-to-go" refurbishment projects from its agency members, including SKF. SKF staff already has submitted a list of \$9 million worth of projects. This is a good example of how California Consulting's services are a duplicate of services provided by CASA and can be implemented by SKF staff.

Committee Member Darren Hays stated that the American Water Works Association (AWWA) also has been soliciting project lists from its member agencies. General Manager Michel said that SKF is a member of AWWA.

Assistant General Manager Muñoz reported that there is some redundancy in Mr. Samuelian's work and that he has done good work for the Cities. However, SKF is a special District whose mission to

treat wastewater. He said that staff has experience in the types of loans listed by Mr. Samuelian, but plant expansion loans will not be needed for 5-10 years. Regarding energy efficiency, he reported that the PG&E audit is complete, and staff is now working with PG&E and Quest, Inc. on a variety of activities identified in the audit. Staff is well aware of several energy rebate programs and is already engaged in them, without assistance from California Consulting. Regarding renewable fuels, staff has looked extensively into solar energy and the Board determined it is not feasible. Regarding cogeneration, SKF does not produce methane and so is ineligible for those programs. Staff keeps informed about regulations and programs from both the State Air Board and the local Air Quality District. The water recycling and buffer tree grants have already been reviewed and declined by the SKF Board. Staff needs to look at it from the perspective of performing the nuts-and-bolts activities to treat wastewater, as directed by the Board.

Archie Moosakhanian asked which loans or grants can SKF use? General Manager Michel responded as follows: revolving fund loans for expansion beyond 6.3 MGD are probably 5-10-years out; PG&E rebate activities are well underway by staff initiative (brush aerators, Quest, Inc.); CEC Technical Assistance \$20,000 grant is not needed because one energy audit is done and the other is underway at no cost to SKF; CEC renewable fuel is not applicable because SKF does not have anaerobic digesters which produce methane; CEC Energy Efficiency Program is known to staff; Air Board programs are known to staff and will be implemented by staff; water recycling has been determined to be not needed at this time; buffer trees and trails have been determined to be not needed at this time.

DTAC Chairman Weaver said that DTAC is a technical committee and looks at things from a dollars and cents, cost-effective point of view. It considers whether something is needed in the current economic environment. While Mr. Samuelian's services are good, they are not likely to be needed this year. Maybe in the future. If the Board feels they need a bridge to Sacramento, the Board may wish to continue the contract.

After considerable discussion between DTAC members, staff and Mr. Samuelian, Chairman Weaver made a motion to endorse Mr. Samuelian's abilities, experience and contacts as valuable and beneficial, but to recognize that California Consulting's services are not needed now because they are not critical to the operation with limited resources. Archie Moosakhanian seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously by all four members present.

NEW BUSINESS

Improvement Projects Summary

General Manager Michel reported that staff has updated the Improvement Projects Summary which includes CIP's. The summary proposes a plan to keep Refurbishment & Replacement (R&R) funding steady for two years (no increase) and puts off borrowing for at least two years. The process in developing the lists was changed to engage staff up first, General Manager second and Consulting District Engineer last before presenting to DTAC.

Last year, DTAC reviewed a comprehensive R&R plan for District facilities and City-owned sewer systems. With the slowdown in growth, this updated summary postpones some treatment plant projects. Other projects are consolidated. The engineering planning line items have been removed because of the following: cash is limited; the mid-range planning can be done in-house; the long range planning is too far off; and both would need to be funded as O&M engineering services. Note that the R&R plan calls for borrowing \$4 million in 2011/12 with more borrowing to follow.

In the collection system, the identification and removal of stormwater in Selma has eliminated the necessity for major projects and borrowing. The attached updated summary (version 12-10-08) incorporates the latest thinking of staff and management.

The following three items need to be considered by DTAC by January, 2009.

1. Do not make the budgeted \$800,000 transfer from the O&M fund to the District R&R fund for FY 2008-09. Use the money for plant repair & maintenance projects which will be expensed out of the O&M fund.
2. For FY 2009-10, use \$800,000 for budgeting purposes for District R&R projects (same as FY 2008-09).
3. For FY 2009-10, use \$22 per ESFR as the rate for Cities' Collection Systems R&R for each city (same as FY 2008-09).

The Committee partially reviewed the lists. Chairman Weaver asked if the schedule being pushed back to postpone borrowing will still meet the needs of the District. General Manager Michel and Assistant General Manager Muñoz explained that the slowdown in growth, in conjunction with several operational changes have allowed staff to recommend pushing back some projects and still meet the needs of the District. Refurbishing the secondary clarifiers was especially scrutinized by staff and they agreed that they can get a few more years of service out of them. General Manager Michel reported that he and Supervising Engineer Cazares have revised the growth projections lower and believe that the schedule meets the needs of the District.

Chairman Weaver suggested asking the Cities to comment on the growth projections. He also noted that Table 1, 2011/12, item 2 needs to have a total and the report needs to have an Expansion fund cash flow sheet.

General Manager Michel reported that Consulting Engineer Whitley spent several hours reviewing Tables 1 and 11 and discussed them with General Manager Michel, who told Engineer Whitley that he supported the tables. Engineer Whitley said that he could not support the revised lists because there are too many unanswered questions and he questions whether staff's proposed goal of eliminating borrowing for the next two years properly provides for refurbishing and expanding the treatment and disposal facilities.

Mr. Michel said that he has confidence that staff is on the right track with its approach to revising the Improvement Projects Summary. It calls for “no borrowing” at least for two years. Furthermore, staff intends to develop a budget with no increase in rates.

Engineer Whitley’s questions and comments are listed below in italics.

1. *Regarding the bottleneck projects, there needs to be a timeline based on flow projections to show that this schedule will meet the growth needs of the District.* District response: Engineer Whitley had not seen Table 2. All but one bottleneck is shown as relieved by 2011/12. The operational change from diking disposal ponds to deep ripping will be evaluated over the next couple of years with regard to Bottleneck #4 – Effluent Transport to look again at it’s 2013/14 completion schedule.
2. *The project lists deleted the Deepening DP’s-4&5 project. It would be best to leave it on as a place holder, even 8 years out, and decide later.*
3. *The 2009 R&M project to Replace RAS pumps should not be identified as BN#1 without justification.* District response: the BN#1 label, which can easily be removed.
4. *How will staff consistently and accurately distribute mixed liquor to clarifiers in service without the distribution box insert recommended by him?* District response: by taking and marking some surveying shots, staff can use them as level controls.
5. *Does 2009/10 Project 1 in Table 1 (AB-2 Energy Efficiency) include dividing walls? Energy efficiency is a worthwhile goal but performance effectiveness must also be considered.*
6. *Table 1, 2011/12 Project 3 (Replace DAFT) should not be stated so conclusively. The type of equipment eventually chosen should be based on pilot tests. Sludge thickening is highly dependent on the type of sludge, and what works on primary sludge or anaerobically digested sludge may not work on aerobically digested sludge.* District response: tests will be done in 2009/10 and 2010/11 and the two alternatives are listed to explain the \$ estimate. Either alternative would give the District the needed two units instead of one.
7. *Table 1, 2012/13 Project 8 (21” to 42” Clarkson Sewer) needs to have an evaluation of whether the headworks can handle the increased flow.* District response: certainly these types of reviews will be done before any expenditure, but including it on a 10-year list, four years out, seems reasonable at this time.
8. *Table 1, 2013/14, Project 6 (Effluent Transport – Pump Station and Lining Bottleneck #4). This is designed for a range of flows, usually with less horsepower than it takes to lift the water over the show pond fountain. The design is more efficient electrically and hydraulically than lifting the effluent. The Table 11 projects to install VFD’s at the effluent pump station for five years until this project is scheduled provides energy savings for only a few years. Lifting the effluent is a waste of energy no matter how efficient the pumps and motors are.* District response: the need to lift depends on the levels in the disposal ponds. The operational change

from disking disposal ponds to deep ripping will be evaluated over the next couple of years. It may allow staff to operate with a minimal need to lift effluent or pump it by force main.

9. *Table 1, 2015/16, Project 3, (Line Ward Drain Pipe). Is it needed? It's far enough out in the schedule and is not a big issue.*
10. *Table 11, refurbishing of the deteriorated secondary clarifiers was pushed out in time. The District has the luxury at this time to take one clarifier out of service per year and refurbish it. the luxury may not continue. Refurbishing later may cost more. Do one per year and start sooner.* District response: the structural modifications to the draft tubes in Clarifiers 1 and 2 made by staff appear to be working well, relieving most of the solids handling restriction.. With the relocation of the MLSS line and the installation of new RAS pumps, staff believes that these projects can be pushed out in time in order to refrain from borrowing over the next two years.
11. *Table 11. Incinerator demolition should be at the end of the schedule, it being not high priority.*
12. *As reported by staff, various flow meters need to be replaced and/or calibrated and it should be listed on Table 11.* District response: staff has been doing this for a couple of months and is continuing.

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, Chairman Weaver declared the meeting adjourned on a motion duly made, seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved,

David Michel, General Manager/
Secretary of the Committee

Alan Weaver, Chairman
SKF Technical Advisory Committee