

**LAS VIRGENES - TRIUNFO
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
AGENDA**

CLOSING TIME FOR AGENDA IS 8:30 A.M. ON THE TUESDAY PRECEDING THE MEETING. GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54954.2 PROHIBITS TAKING ACTION ON ITEMS NOT ON POSTED AGENDA UNLESS AN EMERGENCY, AS DEFINED IN GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.5 EXISTS OR UNLESS OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54954.2(B) ARE MET.

5:00 PM

October 4, 2010

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

- A** The meeting was called to order at _____ p.m. by _____ in the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District office and the Clerk of the Board called the roll.

<u>Triunfo Sanitation District</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Left</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Dennis Gillette	_____	_____	_____
Tom Glancy	_____	_____	_____
Janna Orkney	_____	_____	_____
Linda Parks	_____	_____	_____
Michael Paule, Vice Chair	_____	_____	_____
<u>Las Virgenes Municipal Water District</u>			
Joseph Bowman	_____	_____	_____
Charles Caspary, Chair	_____	_____	_____
Glen Peterson	_____	_____	_____
Lee Renger	_____	_____	_____
Jeff Smith	_____	_____	_____

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- A** Moved by _____, seconded by _____, and _____, that the agenda for the October 4, 2010 meeting be approved as presented/amended.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public may now address the Board of Directors **ON MATTERS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA**, but within the jurisdiction of the Board. No action shall be taken on any matter not appearing on the agenda unless authorized by Subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54954.2

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

A Minutes: Regular meeting of September 7, 2010. Approve

5. ACTION ITEMS

A Tapia Water Reclamation Facility Alternative Disinfection Study: Request for Proposals (RFP)

Approve the request for proposals to perform a study comparing and recommending alternative disinfection technologies for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility.

B Tapia Water Reclamation Facility Process Air Study: Request for Proposals

Approve the Request for Proposals to perform process air evaluation for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility.

C Biosolids Alternative Study -- Approve Scope of Work

Approve the revised scope of work from MWH in the amount of \$97,800 for the Biosolids Alternative Study; and appropriate funds in the amount of \$97,800 to Capital Improvements Project #10475 to fund the study.

D Phase I Study: Site Specific Objectives for Trihalomethane Compounds. Approve Proposal from Robertson-Bryan, Inc.

Approve the proposal from Robertson-Bryan, Inc in the amount of \$28,210 to conduct a Phase I study for Site Specific Objectives for Trihalomethane Compounds and appropriate \$28,210 to work order 10478 to fund the study.

6. BOARD COMMENTS

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

A Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility: Biofilter Maintenance

9. CLOSED SESSION

10. ADJOURNMENT

**LAS VIRGENES - TRIUNFO
JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY
MINUTES**

5:00 PM

September 7, 2010

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

A CANCELLATION NOTICE: JPA REGULAR MEETING 9/7/10

The Joint Powers Authority at their Regular Meeting of June 7, 2010; authorized the Administering Agent/General Manager to issue a cancellation notice for the regular board meeting of Tuesday, September 7, 2010.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Members of the public may now address the Board of Directors **ON MATTERS NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA**, but within the jurisdiction of the Board. No action shall be taken on any matter not appearing on the agenda unless authorized by Subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54954.2

4. **BOARD COMMENTS**

5. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

6. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

7. **CLOSED SESSION**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Charles Caspary, Chair

ATTEST:

Michael Paule, Vice Chair

October 4, 2010 JPA Board Meeting

TO: JPA Board of Directors

FROM: Facilities & Operations

Subject: Tapia Water Reclamation Facility Alternative Disinfection Study: Request for Proposals (RFP)

SUMMARY:

On September 2, 2010, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) approved the renewal of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (Tapia). The new permit included a Cease and Desist Order (CDO) and Time Schedule Order (TSO) to assure a reduction in the concentrations of constituents known as disinfection by-products (DBPs). The CDO addresses one DBP, dichlorobromomethane, which has a final effluent limit of 46 µg/L, and an interim limit of 62 µg/L (monthly averages). The TSO addresses the sum of the concentrations of four DBPs, dichlorobromomethane (DCBM), dibromochloromethane (DBCM), chloroform and bromoform. The sum of the concentrations of these four constituents is called total trihalomethanes, or TTHM. The TTHM interim limit is 154 µg/L, and the final limit is 80 µg/L (monthly averages). TTHM limits only apply to discharge to the Los Angeles River, while DCBM limits apply to both Malibu Creek and Los Angeles River discharge.

Both the CDO and TSO give the same compliance schedule. The schedule is based upon the type of technology selected to reduce DBPs. If the JPA implements an alternative disinfection technology which involves a process change or replacement without substantial construction, final effluent limits must be met by March 3, 2012. If the JPA implements a technology that requires substantial planning, construction and permitting, final effluent limits must be met by September 3, 2014. The CDO and TSO also require the submittal of reports and updates to the RWQCB. The submittal of a work plan to evaluate, select and implement an alternative disinfection technology is due by February 2, 2011. To meet this deadline the JPA needs to issue an RFP to obtain a consultant to review alternative disinfection technologies, and provide recommendations on which technology to implement.

An RFP has been prepared by staff to solicit proposals from consultants to evaluate and recommend disinfection technologies that allow Tapia to meet final effluent limits.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve the request for proposals to perform a study comparing and recommending alternative disinfection technologies for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget provides \$50,000 funding for this study under CIP Job No. 10457, Tapia Alternative Disinfection Study. An appropriation will be requested upon award of the alternative disinfection study. Each JPA partner is allocated with a cost split of 70.6% for LVMWD, and 29.4% for Triunfo Sanitation District.

Prepared By: Brett Dingman, Reclamation Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

[Tapia WRF Alternative Disinfection RFP](#)

**Request for Proposals
Tapia Water Reclamation Facility: Alternative Disinfection Study**

Proposals due November 4, 2010 at 3:00 p.m.

**Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302
818-251-2100**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

Tapia Water Reclamation Facility: Alternative Disinfection Study

I. GENERAL AND BACKGROUND

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) is a California special district established in 1958. The service area encompasses 122-square miles in western Los Angeles County and includes the cities of Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village, as well as unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The District provides potable water, recycled water, wastewater treatment and composting services to a population of approximately 65,000. Triunfo Sanitation District (TSD), located within eastern Ventura County, is a joint powers authority partner (JPA) with LVMWD in wastewater, recycled water service and composting. The TSD service area is 50-square miles with a population of 30,000 for a portion of the City of Thousand Oaks, and surrounding unincorporated areas including the communities of Oak Park and North Ranch. The JPA operates the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (Tapia WRF) and the Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility.

The Tapia WRF was originally constructed in 1965 to treat 0.5 million gallons per day (MGD). Several expansions have increased the plant to its current capacity of 16.1 MGD, treating wastewater to the tertiary level. Tapia currently treats approximately 9.5 MGD which is disposed of through three different methods: recycled water use, the Los Angeles River or Malibu Creek. The District owns and operates an extensive recycled water system which is used to dispose of approximately 60% of the effluent each year. The remainder of the Tapia's effluent is disposed of by discharging to the Los Angeles River (outfall 005) or Malibu Creek (outfall 001) (Malibu Creek discharge is only allowed from November 15th to April 15th each year). Discharge to Malibu Creek and the Los Angeles River are regulated under a National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). Biosolids generated at Tapia are pumped approximately four miles to the Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility where they are processed by mesophilic anaerobic digestion, dewatering (centrifugation) and composting to produce a Class A "exceptional quality" compost product.

On September 2, 2010, the Regional Board renewed the NPDES permit for the discharge of treated wastewater from Tapia to the Malibu Creek and the Los Angeles River. The new permit included a Cease and Desist Order (CDO) for dichlorobromomethane (DCBM) and a Time Schedule Order (TSO) for total trihalomethanes (TTHMs). The CDO, TSO, and NPDES permit are included on the attached CD-Rom for reference. In the CDO an interim limit of 62 µg/L (monthly average), and the final limits of 46 µg/L (monthly average) and 64 µg/L (daily maximum) for DCBM are established for discharge to both Malibu Creek and the Los Angeles River. The TSO addresses TTHMs (TTHMs are the sum of the concentrations of dichlorobromomethane (DCBM), dibromochloromethane (DBCM), chloroform and bromoform). The TTHM interim limit is 154 ug/L (monthly average) and the final limit is 80 ug/L (monthly average). TTHM limits only apply to discharge to the Los Angeles River outfall. Both the CDO and the TSO have common schedules for compliance with options based upon the technology selected:

Option 1: If the Discharger chooses to implement an alternative disinfection technology, which necessitates a process change or replacement without substantial

construction and permitting activities (e.g. mixed oxidant generation, etc.), discharges from Outfalls 001, 002, 003, and 005 shall achieve full compliance with the final effluent limitations no later than March 3, 2012.

Option 2: If the Discharger chooses to implement an alternative disinfection technology, which involves substantial planning, construction, and/or permitting activities (e.g. chloramination, UV and ozone), discharges from Outfalls 001, 002, 003, and 005 shall achieve full compliance with the final effluent limitations no later than September 3, 2014.

The CDO/TSO requires the submittal of a work plan for approval to the (RWQCB) Executive Officer by February 2, 2011. This work plan is to evaluate, select and implement an alternative disinfection technology. The work plan shall contain the following components:

1. A time schedule that ends as soon as possible but no later than September 2, 2014.
2. A description of the alternative disinfection technology to be utilized.
3. A schedule for the design and installation of the alternative disinfection technology.
4. A schedule to optimize and evaluate the performance of the alternative disinfection technology, with a deadline no later than September 2, 2014.

To obtain compliance with the permit requirements at current (9 mgd) and future (12 mgd build out) flows, modifications must be made to the Tapia WRF. The District intends to obtain a consultant to perform an alternative disinfection evaluation to assess currently available disinfection alternatives that will allow Tapia's effluent to meet permit requirements for disinfection by-products. The evaluation needs to take into account that Tapia is an intermittent discharger. Discharge to Malibu Creek is prohibited from April 15th until November 15th of each year with three exceptions. Discharge to the Los Angeles River occurs during the Malibu Creek discharge prohibition. Typically, during the peak of summer (July-September), Tapia has no discharge to receiving waters due to 100% recycling of its effluent. During times of no discharge, use of an alternative disinfection technology may be suspended. For reference the Alternative Disinfection Study for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility completed by CH2M Hill in 1998 is included in the attached CD-Rom.

Consultants are also advised to consider a combination of the current disinfection process plus a parallel alternate disinfection process that would result in a combined effluent that complies with the disinfection by-product limits. In the early 1990s, during facility expansion construction, provisions were made to take a side stream of the filtered effluent and treat that portion with UV disinfection (or other) and then mix it with the de-chlorinated flow prior to discharge or to re-use as recycled water. Pipe spools were installed to the chlorine contact channel to allow diversion of a portion of the filtered effluent to an alternate disinfection system. A diagram is attached.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

The District wishes the consultant to complete an alternative disinfection evaluation which allows the Tapia WRF to meet the NPDES permit limits for DCBM and TTHMs during discharge periods. Proposals should include the consultant's general approach to the project, using the CH2M Hill report as a reference. Anticipated tasks in the scope of work include:

1. An evaluation of current, proven disinfection technologies which meet the requirements for disinfection under the current NPDES permit and Water Reuse Requirements (WRR). The evaluation includes assessing the advantages and/or disadvantages of each technology, impacts to other unit processes, potential effects on other water quality parameters, non-economic factors, etc.
2. Optional bench scale testing to determine the results of alternative disinfection technologies.
3. A cost/benefit analysis for the each of the evaluated technologies including operation and maintenance costs.
4. A recommended disinfection technology based upon the evaluation and cost.
5. A description of the scope of improvements (including ancillary equipment such as emergency power generation) necessary for the installation of the recommended alternative disinfection technology.
6. Provide a cost estimate for the installation of alternative disinfection technology.
7. Provide a tentative schedule for the design and installation of the alternative disinfection technology.
8. Provide a tentative schedule to optimize and evaluate the performance of the alternative disinfection technology after installation, with a deadline of no later than September 2, 2014.
9. Other scope of work tasks as identified by the Consultant.

Meetings with District staff, facilitated workshops and a JPA Board presentation during the course of the project should be included. Because the compliance with permit limits is mandated, the ability to complete the study in a timely manner is critical. The above scope of work must be substantially completed so that the required work plan can be submitted to the Regional Board by the **February 2, 2011**, due date.

III. MINIMUM CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

The proposals shall be evaluated by the District on the following criteria:

- 1) The quality of performance on similar projects in the past.
- 2) Expertise, qualifications and experience of proposed staff.
- 3) The ability to meet time schedules and complete the work within established budgets.
- 4) The ability to provide a comprehensive and understandable scope of work.
- 5) The firm's history and resource capacity to perform the requested service.
- 6) The experience and qualifications of assigned personnel.
- 7) Qualifications and use of sub-consultants.
- 8) Professional liability insurance in the amount of \$1 million.
- 9) Ability to execute the standard Agreement for Professional Services (Attachment).

IV. INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED

Please submit seven (7) copies of your proposal no later than 3:00 p.m. on November 4, 2010. Include the following:

- 1) Legal name of your firm, address, telephone number and the name of at least one principal.

- 2) A recommended scope of work, which clearly displays an understanding of the project.
- 3) A tentative schedule including milestones for completion.
- 4) Names and résumés of individual(s) proposed to perform the services.
- 5) Names, qualifications and principals of any sub-consultants to be utilized in providing the service(s).
- 6) Cost to perform the services, indicating level of effort.
- 7) Schedule of rates.
- 8) Similar projects as a reference.

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated based upon the following:

1. The quality of performance on past projects, including those on which the proposed team has worked together.
2. Expertise in the field of biological nutrient reduction in wastewater treatment.
3. The ability to propose and meet critical time schedules that emphasize value engineering and constructability.
4. The ability to complete the work within established budgets.
5. The ability to provide a comprehensive and understandable scope of work, including development of a program, which emphasizes economy of scale and efficiency of effort.
6. The overall quality and constructability of construction plans.
7. The firm's history and resource capacity to perform the requested service.
8. Cost of proposal in terms of overall value to the District.
9. The firm's internal quality control process.
10. The experience and qualifications of assigned personnel.
11. Qualifications and use of sub-consultants.
12. Interviews may be performed at the District's discretion.

VI. RFP SCHEDULE

Anticipated RFP schedule is as follows:

RFP Available	10/5/2010
Proposals Due	11/4/2010
Recommendation to Board for Engineering Services	12/6/2010

Any questions can be directed to Brett Dingman, Reclamation Manager, at (818) 251-2330 or bdingman@lvmwd.com.

October 4, 2010 JPA Board Meeting

TO: JPA Board of Directors

FROM: Facilities & Operations

Subject: Tapia Water Reclamation Facility Process Air Study: Request for Proposals

SUMMARY:

One of the capital improvement projects included as a part of the FY 2010-11 JPA budget is for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (Tapia) process air evaluation. Process air at Tapia is used to support the biological processes, to provide mixing in the basins and channels, and to provide scouring air for filter backwashing. Currently there are six blowers at Tapia which are used to provide process air. Three Roots 900 HP centrifugal blowers (22,500 cfm) provide process air during periods of high demand; typically only one Roots blower is in operation. There are also three Hoffman 250 HP centrifugal blowers (4,500 cfm) which provide process air during low demand periods and supplement the Roots blower. Typically two Hoffman blowers are operating when a Roots blower is not, and one Hoffman blower is periodically used to supplement the Roots blower.

In 2009 the biological nutrient reduction modifications were completed at Tapia. As a part of these modifications, anoxic zones were created in the aeration basins which resulted in a lower process air demand. To assure that the process air is used efficiently and economically, an RFP was developed to obtain a consultant to evaluate existing air demand at Tapia, and recommend potential improvements in its production, usage and delivery. The anticipated scope of work includes:

- A review of existing air demand and uses.
- Recommendations for improvements to reduce air usage.
- Recommendations on how to make the use of process air more efficient throughout the facility.
- Reasoning and recommendations for blower modifications, or the replacement of the existing blowers with more efficient blowers (including recommended blower model).
- A cost/benefit analysis for each of the recommendations.
- Identifying potential funding/savings (such as SCE rebates) for the recommended improvements.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve the Request for Proposals to perform process air evaluation for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The FY 2010-11 budget provides funding in the amount of \$156,000.00 for this study under CIP job no. 10452, Tapia Process Air Evaluation. Each JPA partner is allocated with a cost split of 70.6% for LVMWD, and 29.4% for Triunfo Sanitation District.

Prepared By: Brett Dingman, Reclamation Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

[Tapia WRF Alternative Disinfection Study RFP](#)

**Request for Proposals
Tapia Water Reclamation Facility: Process Air Evaluation**

Proposals Due December 17, 2010 at 3:00 p.m.

**Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302
818-251-2100**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

Tapia Water Reclamation Facility: Process Air Evaluation

I. GENERAL AND BACKGROUND

The Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) is a special district that was established in 1958. The service area includes 122-square miles in western Los Angeles County and includes the incorporated cities of Hidden Hills, Calabasas, Agoura Hills and Westlake Village, as well as unincorporated areas. The District provides potable water, recycled water and wastewater service to a population of approximately 65,000. The Triunfo Sanitation District (TSD), located within Ventura County, is a joint powers authority (JPA) with LVMWD in wastewater and recycled water service. The TSD service area is 50-square miles with a population of 30,000. The JPA operates the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (Tapia WRF) and The Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility.

The Tapia WRF was originally constructed in 1965 to treat 0.5 million gallons per day (MGD). Several expansions have increased the plant to its current capacity of 16.1 MGD, treating wastewater to the tertiary level. Tapia currently treats approximately 9.0 MGD which is disposed of through three different methods: recycled water use, the Los Angeles River or Malibu Creek. The District owns and operates an extensive recycled water system which is used to dispose of approximately 500 ac-ft of effluent each year. The remainder of Tapia's effluent is disposed of by discharging to the Los Angeles River or Malibu Creek (Malibu Creek discharge is only allowed from November 15th to April 15th each year). Discharges to Malibu Creek and the Los Angeles River are regulated under a National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Water Quality Control Board. Biosolids generated at Tapia are pumped approximately four miles to the Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility where they are processed by mesophilic anaerobic digestion, dewatering (centrifugation) and composting to produce an "exceptional quality" compost product.

Process air at Tapia is used to support the biological processes and to provide mixing in the aeration basins, re-aeration basins, primary influent feed channels, selector channel (Mixed Liquor feed), aeration basin feed channels, mixed liquor channel (aeration basin effluent channel), and RAS channel. Process air is also used to provide scouring air for filter backwashing. In 2003 and 2009, biological nutrient reduction modifications were constructed at the Tapia WRF. As a part of these modifications, anoxic zones were created in the aeration basins which resulted in a lower process air demand.

Currently there are six blowers at Tapia which are used to maintain a system pressure of 7.5 psi. Three Roots 900 HP centrifugal blowers (22,500 cfm) provide process air during periods of high demand. Typically, only one Roots blower is in operation. There are also three Hoffman 250 HP centrifugal blowers (4,500 cfm) which provide process air during low demand periods and supplement the Roots blower. Typically two Hoffman blowers are operating when a Roots blower is not, and one Hoffman blower is periodically used to supplement the Roots blower. None of the blowers have VFD's installed.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

The District wishes to hire a consultant to evaluate existing air demand at the Tapia WRF and recommend potential improvements in its production, usage, and delivery. Proposals should include the consultant's approach to the project. The anticipated scope of work includes:

- A review of existing air demand and uses.
- Recommendations for improvements to reduce air usage.
- Recommendations on how to make the use of process air more efficient throughout the facility.
- Reasoning and recommendations for blower modifications, or the replacement of the existing blowers with more efficient blowers (including recommended blower model).
- A cost/benefit analysis for each of the recommendations.
- Identifying potential funding/savings (such as SCE rebates) for the recommended improvements.

Meetings with District staff during the course of the project should be included.

III. MINIMUM CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

The proposals shall be evaluated by district staff on the following criteria:

- 1) The quality of performance on similar projects in the past.
- 2) Expertise, qualifications and experience of proposed staff.
- 3) The ability to meet time schedules and complete the work within established budgets.
- 4) The ability to provide a comprehensive and understandable scope of work.
- 5) The firm's history and resource capacity to perform the requested service.
- 6) The experience and qualifications of assigned personnel.
- 7) Qualifications and use of sub-consultants.
- 8) Professional liability insurance in the amount of \$1 million.
- 9) Ability to execute the standard Agreement for Professional Services (Attachment).

IV. INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED

Please submit five (5) copies of your proposal no later than 3:00 p.m. on December 17, 2010. Include the following:

- 1) Legal name of your firm, address, telephone number and the name of at least one principal.
- 2) A recommended scope of work which clearly displays an understanding of the project.
- 3) A tentative schedule including milestones for completion
- 4) Names and résumés of individual(s) proposed to perform the services.
- 5) Names, qualifications and principals of any sub-consultants to be utilized in providing the service(s).
- 6) Cost to perform the services, indicating level of effort.
- 7) Schedule of rates.
- 8) Similar projects for reference.

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated based upon the following:

1. The quality of performance on past projects, including those on which the proposed team has worked together.
2. The ability to propose and meet time schedules.
3. The ability to complete work within established budgets.
4. The ability to provide a comprehensive and understandable scope of work, including development of a program which emphasizes economy of scale and efficiency of effort.
5. The firm's history and resource capacity to perform the requested service.
6. Cost of proposal in terms of overall value to the district.
7. The firm's internal quality control process.
8. The experience and qualifications of assigned personnel.
9. Qualifications and use of sub-consultants.
10. Interviews may be performed at the District's discretion.

VI. RFP SCHEDULE

Anticipated RFP schedule is as follows:

RFP Available	10/5/2010
Proposals Due	12/17/2010
Recommendation to Board for Engineering Services	1/25/2011

Any questions can be directed to Brett Dingman, Reclamation Manager at (818) 251-2330 or via e-mail at bdingman@lvmwd.com.

October 4, 2010 JPA Board Meeting

TO: JPA Board of Directors

FROM: Facilities & Operations

Subject: Biosolids Alternative Study -- Approve Scope of Work

SUMMARY:

At the September 14, 2010 JPA meeting, staff was directed to provide a revised scope of work (SOW) for the Biosolids Alternative Study originally provided by MWH in 2009. The revised scope of work includes: determining operational costs for trucking, determining necessary capital improvements for trucking and decommissioning of the composting process, summarizing potential contractual components if dewatered biosolids were trucked to the Toland Landfill and project administration. The revised SOW will cost \$97,800.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve the revised scope of work from MWH in the amount of \$97,800 for the Biosolids Alternative Study; and appropriate funds in the amount of \$97,800 to Capital Improvements Project #10475 to fund the study.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget did not include funds for this study. An appropriation to Capital Improvement Project #10475 in the amount of \$97,800 is necessary to fund the study.

Prepared By: David R. Lippman, Director of Facilities and Operations

ATTACHMENTS:

[Revised Scope of Work - MWH](#)



MWH

BUILDING A BETTER WORLD

September 20, 2010

Mr. David Lippman
Director of Facilities and Operations
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302

Subject: Proposal for Professional Engineering Services for the Rancho Las Virgenes Alternative Biosolids Handling Analysis - Revised

Dear Mr. Lippman,

MWH is pleased to submit a revised proposal for Professional Engineering Services for the Rancho Las Virgenes Alternative Biosolids Handling Analysis. We have reduced the scope of work and the associated level of effort per your requests. We have also revisited the schedule and with this revised scope we believe that this work could be accomplished within four months of receipt of Notice to Proceed instead of the six months as originally proposed.

The revised Scope of Work and corresponding Fee Estimate are attached. MWH will comply with the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Professional Services Agreement with the exception of the Indemnification provision. The requested change is described in more detail in Appendix B of our October 9, 2009 proposal. Also enclosed is a revised hourly rate schedule that has been updated to reflect our current associated project cost charge that covers communications and miscellaneous reproduction costs.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions or comments. I can be reached at (626)568-6274 or (626) 893-0019. We look forward to working with you again.

Sincerely,

Roger Stephenson
Vice President and
Project Manager

John Robinson
Vice President

Attachments

Revised Scope of Work

Las Virgenes MWD Alternative Biosolids Handling Analysis

Scope of Work

Task 1 – Determine Operation Costs for Trucking

Biosolids handling operations cost will be determined or estimated as unit costs for consumables, labor, maintenance, operation and technical support for Trucking and Drying.

Unit costs will be based on District records, estimated levels of effort, and generally available information on operations costs, and will be reviewed by the District for general appropriateness.

Task 2 – Evaluate Rancho Las Virgenes

Identify requirements if composting at Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility (Rancho) is to be decommissioned and potential salvage value.

Subtask 2.1 Capital Improvements

This task will identify capital improvements that will be necessary to handle biosolids produced at the existing (9.5 mgd) and build out (12 mgd) conditions. These improvements may consist of:

- Loading facilities
- Truck scales
- Temporary storage, and
- Odor control.

Costs that will be excluded are costs that would be common such as digestion and dewatering. Specifically, capital costs to increase the digestion and dewatering facilities capacities to meet 12 mgd build-out conditions are excluded.

Subtask 2.2 Facility Decommissioning

Identify the Rancho facilities to be decommissioned if composting operations are ceased. Determine ongoing costs or salvage value associated with the decommissioned facilities.

Task 3 – Characterize Toland Landfill Facilities

Describe and summarize the potential contractual components of hauling the biosolids to the drying process at the Toland Landfill, based on the review of the existing agreements between the City of Thousand Oaks, and other agencies, and Ventura Regional Sanitation District. This task will also contain a description of the facilities at Toland to summarize the existing and future capacity. This will consist of a site visit to the Toland Landfill.

Task 4 – Technical Memoranda

MWH will summarize the findings of Task 1 through 3 in individual technical memoranda (TM). MWH will present the findings of the technical memoranda during the monthly meetings with the District Staff.

- Deliverables:
 - Draft TMs, six (6) hard copies and pdf for District review.
 - Final Draft TM, ten (10) hard copies and pdf for Presentation to the District Board.
 - Final TM Compilation, (10) bound copies, pdf version and native for files (Word, Excel, etc.)

Task 5 – Project Administration and Communications

This task consists of general project administration and communication activities that will be conducted as part of this project. Each month MWH staff will meet with key District Staff to review progress, raise and questions or issues that the team has encountered and provide a brief expenditure update. A monthly progress report will be submitted with the monthly invoice.

Four (4) monthly meetings will be held with District Staff. The first monthly meeting will serve as the kickoff meeting. Meetings will be held at either the District offices or at Rancho Las Virgenes. Following each meeting MWH will prepare draft meeting notes within two working days and provide an electronic copy for District review. Following receipt of comments, MWH will prepare the final notes and distribute in accordance with District direction. MWH will also designate a short block of time weekly for a conference call with District staff to discuss the progress of the project. It will be at the Districts discretion to cancel these calls.

Presentation for the JPA Board – (Optional)

Prepare a PowerPoint presentation for District staff review, incorporate any comments, for presentation to the JPA Board upon completion of the final draft report. MWH staff can attend and make the presentation or be available to answer questions as directed by staff.

**RANCHO LAS VIRGENES
ALTERNATIVE BIOSOLIDS HANDLING ANALYSIS**

FEE ESTIMATE

Task	Technical Advisors	Principal Professional - JL	Project Manager - RVS	Project Engineer - SJM	Professional - SH	Supervising Admin Assistant	Admin Assistant	CAD Hours	DIRECT COSTS			HOURS	
									Miscel. Miles	Miscel. Direct Costs		MWH Americans	Total Fee
TASK 1 - Determination of Operation Costs			12	15	20							47	7,423
TASK 1 SUBTOTAL			12	15	20			0	0	0	0	47	7,423
TASK 2 - Evaluation of Rancho Las Virgenes Facility												0	
Subtask 2.1 - Capital Improvements	4	8	40	36	50							138	23,140
Subtask 2.2 - Decommissioned Facilities	4	8	40	36	50							138	23,140
TASK 2 SUBTOTAL	8	16	80	72	100			0	0	0	0	276	46,280
TASK 3 - Evaluation of Toland Landfill												48	8,960
TASK 3 SUBTOTAL	4	0	20	24	0			150	0	150	0	48	8,960
TASK 4 - Technical Memoranda												0	
Subtask 4.1 Draft Technical Memoranda			16	19	44							79	12,123
Subtask 4.2 Final Technical Memoranda			8	8	10							26	4,404
TASK 4 SUBTOTAL	0	0	24	27	54			0	0	300	0	105	16,528
TASK 5 - Project Administration and Communications												0	
Monthly Invoicing and Progress Reports			4	8								28	3,819
Project Filing and Record Keeping Meetings	8		4	4								12	1,646
JPA Workshop (Optional)			12	19	20					164		59	9,874
			8	4	4					82		16	3,269
TASK 5 SUBTOTAL	8	0	28	31	24			0	246	396	0	115	18,608
TOTAL	20	16	164	169	198			0	396	696	0	591	97,800

MWH FEE PROPOSAL
(March 1, 2010 through April 30, 2011)
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Biosolids Handling Analysis RRF

The project is proposed to use salary cost as the basis of the fee estimate. The following table represents a typical value by personnel classification.

Schedule of Hourly Rates Billing Classifications	Hourly Rates
Principal-in-Charge	\$210.00
Project Manager	\$210.00
Technical Advisors	\$210.00
Principal Professional II	\$210.00
Principal Professional I	\$210.00
Supervising Professional	\$180.00
Senior Professional (Project Engineer)	\$140.00
Professional	\$120.00
Associate Professional	\$115.00
Senior Designer	\$115.00
Designer	\$110.00
Supervising Admin Assistant	\$85.00
Admin Assistant	\$85.00
Graphics/Repro	\$55.00

Compensation is based on a single not-to-exceed fee based on the following contract terms:

1. Payment of the invoiced amount for the professional engineering services shall be based on monthly invoices describing the work performed and expenses incurred during the preceding month.
2. Non-salary expenses and outside services attributable to the Project shall include:
 - Living and traveling expenses including mileage of employees when away from the home office on business connected with the services;
 - An Associated Project Cost ("APC") rate for telecommunications, postage, computers, word processors, incidental photocopying, and related equipment in the amount of \$9.50 per labor hour;
 - The identifiable costs of reproduction, printing and binding applicable to the project;

- A CAD rate in the amount of \$16.75 per computer aided design/drafting hour to cover the hardware, software and related expenses of CAD; and
 - The actual cost of outside and subcontracted services, and other direct costs identifiable to the project will be charged at the above-stated cost plus 20 percent markup to cover overhead, administration, other indirect costs and profit.
3. Payment shall be due within 30 days after date of monthly invoice describing the work performed and expenses incurred during the preceding month.
 4. MWH is proposing that rates for 2011 will be escalated by 5% but MWH will discuss the rate with the District prior to proceeding the billing if the project goes beyond April 30, 2011.

October 4, 2010 JPA Board Meeting

TO: JPA Board of Directors

FROM: Facilities & Operations

**Subject: Phase I Study: Site Specific Objectives for Trihalomethane Compounds.
Approve Proposal from Robertson-Bryan, Inc.**

SUMMARY:

The new NPDES permit for the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility includes requirements to reduce disinfection by-products in the effluent discharged to Malibu Creek and the Los Angeles River. These disinfection by-products are trihalomethane compounds, in particular DCBM and TTHM. These disinfection by-products can be reduced by changes to the disinfection process at Tapia. Potential solutions include UV disinfection, ozone disinfection and chloramination. Each of these will require the construction of capital facilities and increase operational costs.

Another possible solution is the development of site specific objectives (SSO) for these compounds, a regulatory solution. In essence, an SSO revises a water quality objective based on site-specific conditions that still provides protection of beneficial uses or does not impact the beneficial use. SSOs may be developed by the Regional Board in consultation with the State Water Resource Control Board, Environmental Protection Agency and the discharger. SSOs are not widely used, but recently SSOs were developed for three trihalomethane compounds for the New Alamo and Ulatis Creek for the City of Vacaville's Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant. Robertson-Bryan, Inc. (RBI), an environmental consulting firm, was instrumental in the development of Vacaville's SSO. RBI has provided a proposal to conduct a Phase I study to determine the efficacy of developing SSOs for Tapia's discharge. Generally the Phase I activities will consist of meetings with District staff, Regional Board staff and possibly EPA Region 9 staff. They will research the technical and regulatory basis of the DCBM and TTHM criteria, the site specific factors that may support the application of a different standard and the type of supporting documentation that would be needed to develop the SSOs. The conclusion of the Phase I study will provide the information needed by the JPA and Regional Board to determine if the development of SSOs is a viable option to constructing alternative disinfection facilities at Tapia.

Concurrently with the preparation of the Phase I SSO study, the preparation of a design report to determine the best engineering solution will also be proceeding. This parallel process is necessary to assure compliance with the regulatory deadlines in the permit for disinfection by-products.

Attached is a memo from Robert Larson describing the process for developing and adopting site specific objectives and the proposal from RBI.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve the proposal from Robertson-Bryan, Inc in the amount of \$28,210 to conduct a Phase I study for Site Specific Objectives for Trihalomethane Compounds and appropriate \$28,210 to work order 10478 to fund the study.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The fiscal year 2010-11 budget does not provide funds for this work so an appropriation of \$28,210 to work order 10478 is necessary.

Prepared By: David R. Lippman, Director of Facilities & Operations

ATTACHMENTS:

[RBI Proposal](#)



September 28, 2010

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

Mr. David Lippman
Director, Facilities and Operations
Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302-1994

Subject: Proposal to Conduct Phase I Study of the Efficacy of Developing Site-specific Objectives for Trihalomethane Compounds

Dear Mr. Lippman:

Robertson-Bryan, Inc. (RBI) is pleased to submit a proposal and cost estimate to conduct an initial "Phase I" study of the efficacy of developing site-specific objectives (SSOs) for trihalomethane (THM) compounds. RBI is uniquely qualified to assist Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (MWD) with this study. RBI developed SSOs for three THM compounds for New Alamo and Ulatis creeks, Solano County, California, that resolved an ongoing compliance issue for the City of Vacaville's Easterly Wastewater Treatment Plant. These SSOs were adopted by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board this year.

RBI understands that the renewed NPDES permit for the Las Virgenes MWD's Tapia Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) contains effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane (DCBM) and total trihalomethanes (TTHM) that the discharge cannot meet with current facilities. As such, the Las Virgenes MWD is concurrently investigating engineering and regulatory solutions (i.e., SSOs) as possible means for resolving this compliance issue.

Generally, the "Phase I" activities will consist of meetings with Las Virgenes MWD staff, meetings with Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) and possibly U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) staff, research into the technical and regulatory basis of the DCBM and TTHM criteria being applied in the Tapia WRF NPDES permit, the site-specific factors that may support application of different criteria, and the type of supporting technical information that would need to be developed to determine the appropriate SSOs. The study will be conducted according to the following scope of work.

1942 Broadway Suite 405
Boulder CO 80302
Phone 303.938.3088
Fax 303.938.6850

9888 Kent Street
Elk Grove CA 95624
Phone 916.714.1801
Fax 916.714.1804

881 Cumorah Court
Placerville CA 95667
Phone 530.295.1265
Fax 530.295.8174

I. SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 1: SITE-SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES RESEARCH

RBI will conduct research and review of technical and regulatory documents to: (1) identify the basis of the current DCBM and TTHM criteria and how they are being applied to the Tapia WRF discharge; (2) identify the factors that may be site-specifically adjusted to result in SSOs or different application of the current criteria; and (3) the type of information (e.g., special studies) that would need to be developed to support SSOs.

TASK 2: LAS VIRGENES MWD MEETINGS

RBI will attend a “kick-off” meeting at the Las Virgenes MWD offices. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the general SSO development and adoption process, RBI’s approach to the Phase I study, conduct a site visit of the affected water bodies (if necessary), and obtain any other information that may be relevant to the project. In addition, RBI will participate in one (1) additional meeting with Las Virgenes MWD staff via conference call to discuss project findings at the conclusion of the study. Hours budgeted are for preparation of meeting materials by RBI staff and attendance at the meeting by Dr. Michael Bryan.

TASK 3: AGENCY MEETINGS

SSOs must ultimately be approved by the Regional Water Board and U.S. EPA. Thus, RBI plans to participate in one (1) meeting with Regional Water Board and U.S. EPA representatives to discuss the potential for SSO development and identify site-specific concerns the agencies may have. Hours budgeted are for preparation of meeting materials by RBI staff and attendance at the meeting by Dr. Michael Bryan. Any additional discussion needed with agency staff will be done by phone and email under Task 5.

TASK 4: TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

RBI will prepare a technical memorandum from which Las Virgenes MWD will be able to make an informed decision regarding the efficacy of SSOs being the means to resolve the current compliance issues with the DCBM and TTHM compounds. The technical memorandum will summarize the SSO research (Task 1) and the regulatory factors/hurdles based on discussions with Regional Water Board and U.S. EPA staff (Task 3) and RBI’s previous experience developing SSOs. RBI will also identify the steps in the SSO development and adoption process and approximate timelines based on our experience. RBI will prepare an administrative draft technical memorandum for review and comment by Las Virgenes MWD. RBI will then prepare a final technical memorandum that addresses Las Virgenes MWD’s comments on the administrative draft.

TASK 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

This task provides hours for Dr. Michael Bryan (Principal-in-charge) and the Project Manager to oversee and direct RBI staff efforts on each task and to review interim work products. In addition, this task provides time for project coordination by phone, email, and fax with project

team members, budget and schedule tracking, and other duties to coordinate/administer the project.

Additional Assumptions of this Scope of Work

- RBI will respond to a single round of review comments on the administrative draft versions of reports and memoranda.
- The level of effort for this scope is limited to the hours budgeted. Should additional services be requested due to additional requests of Las Virgenes MWD that are not identified herein, or should analyses of greater scope or depth than identified and budgeted herein be required, RBI will notify Las Virgenes MWD to discuss the extent of any out-of-scope services needed/requested. Upon request, RBI will submit a supplemental scope and fee proposal for out-of-scope services.

II. SCHEDULE

The RBI team can begin providing professional services upon receipt of a signed contract, or written authorization to proceed, from the Las Virgenes MWD.

III. CONTRACT AND BILLING ARRANGEMENTS

RBI recommends a time-and-materials contract, not to exceed **\$28,210** without written authorization, to provide the professional services outlined herein (see **Attachment 1** for a detailed project budget). RBI will invoice Las Virgenes MWD monthly according to its 2010 rates (**Attachment 2**) for all RBI work activities completed in the prior month.

If you have any questions regarding this proposal, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 714-1802. We look forward to assisting the Las Virgenes with its NPDES permit compliance needs.

Sincerely,



Michael D. Bryan, Ph.D.
Partner/Principal Scientist

Attachment 1: RBI Budget

Attachment 2: 2010 Fee Schedule

ATTACHMENT 1

RBI Budget

	Michael Bryan Principal Scientist	Senior Engineer I	Project Scientist III	Staff Scientist I	Admin. Assistant	RBI Subtotal
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES						
Task 1: Site-specific Objectives Research	2	16	24			\$ 7,080.00
Task 2: Las Virgenes MWD Meetings	12	4	4			\$ 3,980.00
Task 3: Agency Meeting	12	4	8			\$ 4,620.00
Task 4: Technical Memorandum	6	24	16	2		\$ 8,340.00
Task 5: Project Management	8	10			1	\$ 3,590.00
Total Hours:	40	58	52	2	1	
Rate:	\$ 220.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 80.00	
Labor Subtotal:	\$ 8,800.00	\$ 10,150.00	\$ 8,320.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 27,610
DIRECT EXPENSES						
Travel for Meetings	\$ 600.00					
Direct Expenses Subtotal:	\$ 600.00					
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 28,210					

ATTACHMENT 2

2010 FEE SCHEDULE

Charges for project work performed by Robertson-Bryan, Inc. (RBI) will be calculated and billed at the hourly rates shown below.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RATE/HOUR

◆ Managing Partner	\$220.00
◆ Principal Engineer/Scientist	\$210.00
◆ Resource Director	\$195.00
◆ Senior Engineer/Scientist II	\$185.00
◆ Senior Engineer/Scientist I	\$175.00
◆ Project Engineer/Scientist III	\$165.00
◆ Project Engineer/Scientist II	\$160.00
◆ Project Engineer/Scientist I	\$145.00
◆ Staff Engineer/Scientist II	\$135.00
◆ Staff Engineer/Scientist I	\$130.00
◆ Technical Analyst	\$120.00
◆ Graphics/GIS	\$115.00
◆ Administrative Assistant	\$80.00
◆ Intern	\$55.00

Up to ten percent (10%) of subcontractor charges will be added to cover administrative costs. Hourly rates will be increased by a minimum of fifty percent (50%) for depositions, trials, and hearings.

INVOICING AND PAYMENTS

Invoices will be issued on a monthly basis for all work performed on a project. Payment is due upon receipt of the invoice.

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Lippman
FROM: Bobbi Larson
SUBJECT: PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF SITE-SPECIFIC
WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES
DATE: September 10, 2010

This memorandum provides a brief overview of the process and requirements for adoption of site-specific water quality objectives. The State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP), which governs the implementation of water quality objectives for toxic pollutants, provides:

If a priority pollutant criterion or objective is inappropriate for a particular water body (i.e., it does not protect the beneficial uses or, based on site-specific conditions, a less stringent standard may be warranted), a water quality objective that differs from the applicable criterion or objective may be developed for the site. A RWQCB may develop site-specific objectives whenever it determines, in the exercise of its professional judgement [sic] that it is appropriate to do so. (SIP at p. 31.)

Site-specific water quality objectives are to be developed in a manner consistent with State and federal law and regulations. In accordance with the State's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, objectives must provide for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses based on consideration of the factors listed in Water Code section 13241. In accordance with the Clean Water Act (CWA) and federal regulations (40 C.F.R. § 131.11), the objectives must be based on sound scientific rationale and protect the designated beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Site-specific objectives may be developed for protection of aquatic life beneficial uses and those related to human health. The SIP, which applies to constituents identified in the California Toxics Rule (CTR), such as dichlorobromethane (DCBM), allows for the use of any scientifically defensible methods appropriate to the situation to derive the objectives.

David Lippman

Re: Process for Development and Adoption of Site-Specific Water Quality Objectives

September 10, 2010

Page 2

(SIP at p. 33.) The procedures or methods for developing the objectives are to be specified in a workplan. The most straightforward approach for modifying the DBCM criterion would be to apply an alternative risk level. The CTR effluent limitations were established using a 10^{-6} risk level.¹ Establishing or modifying water quality standards (i.e., beneficial uses and water quality criteria/objectives) may involve complex and resource intensive studies. According to the State Water Board, a detailed workplan will normally be needed because early planning and coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is critical to the development of a successful study. (SIP Appendix 5, p. 5-2.)² A site-specific objective adopted by a Regional Water Board may include a compliance schedule for coming into compliance with the new objective.

The SIP calls for the Regional Water Board to consider initiating a site-specific objective under the following conditions:

- The Regional Water Board receives a written request for a site-specific study (accompanied by a preliminary commitment to fund the study and subject to the development of a workplan); and
- Either: (1) a priority pollutant objective is not achieved in the receiving water; or (2) a discharger under an NPDES permit demonstrates that the discharge does not or may not meet an existing or potential effluent limitation based on the priority objective; and
- A demonstration that the discharger cannot be assured of achieving the objective and/or effluent limitations through reasonable treatment, source control and pollution prevention measures. (SIP at p. 32.)

The process for developing and adopting site-specific objectives can be time and resource intensive, as adoption of a Basin Plan amendment by the Regional Water Board and approvals by the State Water Board and the Office of Administrative Law are required. U.S. EPA must also approve all new or revised standards before they go into effect for CWA purposes. (33 U.S.C. § 1313(c)(3); 40 C.F.R. § 131.21(c); *Alaska Clean Water Alliance v. Clarke*, 1197 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11144, 6-7 (W.D. Wash. 1997).) U.S. EPA reviews standards to determine whether they meet the requirements of the CWA and federal regulations, including whether analyses performed are adequate, designated uses and objectives are

¹ This approach would not address the total trihalomethane (TTHM) objective, given that it is based on a drinking water maximum contaminant level (MCL) calculated using a less protective risk level. The Regional Water Board has additional flexibility with regard to TTHMs, however, since there is no numeric objective for TTHMs in the Basin Plan and the effluent limitation in the Tapia permit was based on an interpretation of a narrative objective.

² More information about the type of stakeholder process envisioned by the State Water Board is set forth in Appendix 5 of the SIP.

David Lippman

Re: Process for Development and Adoption of Site-Specific Water Quality Objectives

September 10, 2010

Page 3

compatible throughout the water body, and downstream water quality standards are protected. (Water Quality Standards Handbook, Introduction and § 6.2.) In the case of DCBM, which is a CTR criterion, U.S. EPA would also have to amend the CTR.

When the Regional Board modifies any criterion promulgated under the NTR or CTR with less stringent site-specific objective, implementation of the objective must await the completion of federal amendment of the criterion to reflect the modification. While EPA will endeavor to expedite this rulemaking process, the time and resources required to review the objective and amend the NTR and CTR on a case-by-case basis will likely postpone the implementation of the objective.³

Site-specific objectives for disinfection byproducts were adopted in May 2010 for New Alamo and Ulatis Creeks in the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed. The amendment to the Basin Plan is pending before the State Water Board. The staff report and supporting technical documents are available on the Central Valley Regional Water Board website using the following link:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/alamocreek.shtml.

RLL:mb

³ In light of the time and procedural hurdles involved, it might be advisable to develop site specific objectives for all of the CTR criteria for disinfection byproducts, to avoid a situation where reasonable potential for another of the individual constituents arises at a later time and leads to new effluent limitations.

October 4, 2010 JPA Board Meeting

TO: JPA Board of Directors

FROM: Facilities & Operations

Subject: Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility: Biofilter Maintenance

Las Virgenes-Triunfo Joint Powers Authority approved funding for this matter in the Joint Powers Authority Budget. The Las Virgenes Board, as the administering agent, authorized the General Manager/Administering Agent to approve a purchase order for biofilter media supply, removal, replacement and disposal to Viramontes Express in an amount not to exceed \$38,930.00 at the September 14, 2010, board meeting.

SUMMARY:

For the past seven years, Viramontes Express has supplied the wood chip media required for the annual biofilter maintenance. They have been successful through the competitive bid process at providing this material due to ownership of the appropriate chipping, grinding and screening equipment at their facility in Corona, CA. Rather than renting the equipment needed for biofilter media replacement for the last four years, staff has contracted with Viramontes Express to remove and dispose of the spent media, as well as provide and place the new media. Viramontes owns a fleet of loaders and dump trucks designed to handle biofilter media. Since this equipment is not available to local rental yards, Viramontes' work is efficiently completed on time with minimal disruption to plant operation.

The replacement of the media in biofilter zones 1-4 is scheduled to be completed by this fall. Zones 1-4 are larger than zones 5-6 (which were replaced in March of this year), therefore, the cost is higher. Viramontes Express has submitted a proposal in the amount of \$35,430.00 (tax not included) to remove and dispose of the old biofilter media, and provide and place new media. An additional \$3,500.00 is necessary to account for taxes.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The current FY 2010-11 budget allocates \$95,000.00 for Odor Control at Rancho Las Virgenes Composting Facility, under account number 751820.5417.

Prepared By: Brett Dingman, Reclamation Manager