

# CRESCENTA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 19, 2010  
TO: Engineering Committee Meeting File  
FROM: David S. Gould  
SUBJECT: CVWD Engineering Committee Meeting No. 255

Following is a summary of Engineering Committee Meeting No. 255, held at 8:30 am on January 12, 2010, at the CVWD main office, and was attended by the following:

---

Director Kathy Ross - Committee Chairperson	CVWD
Director James Bodnar - Committee Member	CVWD
Dennis Erdman – General Manager	CVWD
Julian Lee – CIP Manager	CVWD
David S. Gould - District Engineer	CVWD

---

### **1. Well Levels and Nitrate Levels for 2009**

Mr. Gould presented charts that showed the well levels from 2000 – 2009 and indicated that well levels have been steadily decreasing since 2007 due to less than average rainfall over that period. Mr. Gould indicated that Well 10 will be the next well planned for rehabilitation which will commence once Well 9 is back into service. After Well 10 is completed, the staff plans to perform well rehabilitation on Well 11 as it appears that the well pump is showing signs of wear and decreased capacity.

Mr. Gould next presented charts that showed the nitrate levels from 1998 – 2009 and indicated that the nitrate levels are generally decreasing as more groundwater is being pumped and treated. In addition, it was discussed that there are some indications that nitrate levels increase relative to increased rainfall.

### **2. Discussion on FMWD's Engineers' Report**

Mr. Gould discussed that he has started reviewing FMWD's Engineers' Report for the proposed parcel charge as requested by Director Bodnar. Mr. Gould pointed out that a number of issues need to be further clarified by FMWD including the types of projects being proposed and the preliminary cost estimates. The overlap area within Glendale that CVWD provides water service and how will these parcels be assessed were also discussed. Director Bodnar asked staff to review the demand for recycled water and potential customers. In addition, Director Bodnar asked staff to review the cost sharing and benefits for each agency as they relate to project costs and the agencies' overall dependency on FMWD. Staff will be preparing a memorandum that will discuss the proposed projects by FMWD (CIP and Water Supply), the request for a \$21M bond as it relates to the \$65M 10-year FMWD CIP, FMWD staffing and project schedule, and FMWD's cost scenarios to CVWD if the parcel tax passes or fails.

### 3. Discussion on Well 5 – GAC Treatment Plant Engineering Services

Mr. Gould discussed staff’s request to obtain only one proposal for design services for the new GAC water treatment system from AECOM. Mr. Gould indicated that for a typical design project, staff would send out at least three (3) requests for proposals from engineering firms for design services to promote competition among the engineering firms.

However, staff needs to accelerate the GAC Treatment project from design to construction, so that Well 5 can be brought back into service as soon as possible. If staff went through the typical process to hire an engineering firm for design services, this process would take about 2 months to complete.

Staff has been working with AECOM since June 2009 on the preliminary design report that was submitted along with the application to CDPH for grant funding and CEQA documentation for the addendum to the negative declaration.

In addition, AECOM has previous knowledge of the GAC treatment process and appropriate appurtenance. Hence, staff requested a proposal from AECOM to provide professional engineering design services for this project.

The Engineering Committee agreed with the discussion and recommended to sole-source the project to AECOM.

### 4. Discussion on preliminary cost and risk analysis for Edmund #2 Reservoir site

Mr. Gould presented a memorandum and summary table for a preliminary cost and risk analysis for Edmund #2 Reservoir site. The attached memo discussed the five (5) areas that need to be repaired or restored that will address the potential risks to the site and to providing water service to its customers.

After much discussion, the Engineering Committee recommended a list of priorities for staff to proceed with as shown below:

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Preliminary Cost Estimate</b>
<b>1</b>	Area 2 – Inlet/outlet piping	Alternative 1 – Slope restoration and pipelines remain in place	\$120,600
<b>2</b>	Area 4 – Access roadway	Alternative 2 – Improve access roadway	\$547,500
<b>3</b>	Area 1 - Slope Restoration on the westside at the concrete block wall	Alternative 2 - Install permanent debris protection system	\$180,000
<b>4</b>	Area 3 – Drain/overflow piping	Alternative 1 – Slope restoration to protect roadway and pipeline remain in place	\$141,000
<b>5</b>	Area 5 – Slope area north of the reservoir site	Alternative 2 – Install a slope access system and an erosion control system to maintain the concrete ditches	\$132,000
		<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$1,121,100</b>

In addition, the Engineering Committee recommended that staff proceed with the installation of a 12-inch valve at Edmund #2 inlet/outlet lines and the installation of a seismic sensor/valve actuator system that can be controlled remotely to reduce the potential risk of losing water to its customers.

Finally, the Engineering Committee recommended that staff perform a further study of Area 2 - Inlet/outlet piping that will explore alternatives such as installation of the pipeline on a pier system (such as Shields Reservoir) within the existing slope. The scope of work for this study will be presented at the next Engineering Committee Meeting.