Santa Clara Valley Water District
Capital Improvement Program Committee Meeting

Teleconference Zoom Meeting

REGULAR MEETING
AGENDA

Monday, November 9, 2020
10:00 AM

Note: The finalized Board Agenda, exception items and supplemental items will be posted prior to the meeting in accordance with the Brown Act.
Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Capital Improvement Program Committee  

REGULAR MEETING  
AGENDA  

Monday, November 9, 2020  10:00 AM  Teleconference Zoom Meeting  

IMPORTANT NOTICES  

This meeting is being held in accordance with the Brown Act as currently in effect under the State Emergency Services Act, the Governor’s Emergency Declaration related to COVID-19, and the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20 issued on March 17, 2020 that allows attendance by members of the Committee, staff, and the public to participate and conduct the meeting by teleconference, videoconference, or both.  

Members of the public wishing to address the Committee during a video conferenced meeting on an item not listed on the agenda, or any item listed on the agenda, should use the “Raise Hand” or “Chat” tools located in Zoom meeting link listed on the agenda. Speakers will be acknowledged by the Committee Chair in the order requests are received and granted speaking access to address the Committee.  

Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water) in complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests individuals who require special accommodations to access and/or participate in Valley Water Committee meetings to please contact the Clerk of the Board’s office at (408) 630-2711, at least 3 business days before the scheduled meeting to ensure that Valley Water may assist you.  

This agenda has been prepared as required by the applicable laws of the State of California, including but not limited to, Government Code Sections 54950 et. seq. and has not been prepared with a view to informing an investment decision in any of Valley Water’s bonds, notes or other obligations. Any projections, plans or other forward-looking statements included in the information in this agenda are subject to a variety of uncertainties that could cause any actual plans or results to differ materially from any such statement. The information herein is not intended to be used by investors or potential investors in considering the purchase or sale of Valley Water’s bonds, notes or other obligations and investors and potential investors should rely only on information filed by Valley Water on the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board’s Electronic Municipal Market Access System for municipal securities disclosures and Valley Water’s Investor Relations website, maintained on the World Wide Web at https://emma.msrb.org/ and https://www.valleywater.org/how-we-operate/financebudget/investor-relations, respectively.
Join Zoom Meeting

https://valleywater.zoom.us/j/95508666563

Meeting ID: 955 0866 6563

One tap mobile:  +16699009128,,95508666563# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location:  +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

1. Roll Call.

2. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

Notice to the Public: Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on any item not listed on the agenda should access the "Raise Hand" or "Chat" tools located in Zoom meeting link listed on the agenda. Speakers will be acknowledged by the Committee Chair in order requests are received and granted speaking access to address the Committee. Speakers comments should be limited to three minutes or as set by the Chair. The law does not permit Committee action on, or extended discussion of, any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the matter may be placed on a future agenda. All comments that require a response will be referred to staff for a reply in writing. The Committee may take action on any item of business appearing on the posted agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

3.1. Approval of October 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes.  

Recommendation: Approve the minutes.  
Manager: Michele King, 408-630-2711
Attachments: Attachment 1: 101920 CIP Committee Minutes
Est. Staff Time: 5 Minutes

4. ACTION ITEMS:


Recommendation: Receive updates on projects in the planning and feasibility phase, discuss resources needs, and make recommendations, as necessary.
Manager: Lisa Bankosh, 408-630-2618
Christopher Hakes, 408-630-3796
Heath McMahon, 408-630-3126
Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
Attachments: Attachment 1: Planning and Feasibility Report
Est. Staff Time: 20 Minutes
Follow-up Review of the Capital Project Delivery Process.

Recommendation:

A. Review and discuss the updated Capital Project Delivery Process;

B. Review and discuss the addition of the following Board engagement points into the Capital Project Delivery Process for capital projects with unusually complex fiscal, jurisdictional, environmental, or community considerations:

   i. During the Planning/Feasibility Phase, after identification of the Feasible Alternatives, but before selection of the Recommended Alternative, bring forward a presentation to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee regarding the Feasible Alternatives and staff's initially proposed Recommended Alternative and, if recommended by the CIP Committee, present to the Board for feedback in order to inform the selection of the Recommended Alternative; and

   ii. For the projects for which the Board provided feedback regarding the Recommended Alternative, should changes to the project occur during the Planning and initial Design Phases that result in a significant deviation from the Recommended Alternative, staff will return to both the CIP Committee and the Board to provide information and receive feedback, as necessary, prior to the public review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document;

C. Review and discuss the list of capital projects that staff has identified as meeting the criteria for additional Board engagement; and

D. Recommend presenting the updated Capital Project Delivery Process, the list of capital projects that may require additional Board engagement, and the additional Board engagement/approval points to the Board for consideration, or provide alternative recommendations and feedback, as necessary.

Manager: Tina Yoke, 408-630-2385
Sue Tippets, 408-630-2253
Aaron Baker, 408-630-2135

Attachments:
Attachment 1: Update Capital Project Delivery Process
Attachment 2: Recommended Additional Board Engagement Point
Attachment 3: Additional Board Engagement Project

Est. Staff Time: 10 Minutes
4.3. Review Significant Project Plan Updates Since Adoption of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021-25 Capital Improvement Program Five-Year Plan.
Recommendation: Review Significant Project Plan Updates Since Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2021-25 (FY 21-25) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Five-Year Plan.
Manager: Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
Christopher Hakes, 408-630-3796
Heath McMahon, 408-630-3126
Est. Staff Time: 10 Minutes

Recommendation: Receive information on upcoming consultant agreement amendments for capital projects.
Manager: Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
Est. Staff Time: 10 Minutes

4.5. Review 2020 Capital Improvement Committee Work Plan.
Recommendation: Review the 2020 Capital Improvement Program Committee Work Plan, and make adjustments as necessary.
Manager: Michele King, 408-2630-2711
Attachments: Attachment 1: 2020 CIP Committee Work Plan
Est. Staff Time: 10 Minutes

5. INFORMATION ITEMS:

6. CLERK REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION OF COMMITTEE REQUESTS.
This is an opportunity for the Clerk to review and obtain clarification on any formally moved, seconded, and approved requests and recommendations made by the Committee during the meeting.

7. ADJOURN:

7.1. Adjourn to Regular Meeting at 10:00 a.m., on December 14, 2020, via Zoom video teleconference.
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:
Approval of October 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the minutes.

SUMMARY:
In accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act, a summary of Committee discussions, and details of all actions taken by the Capital Improvement Program Committee, during all open and public Committee meetings, is transcribed and submitted to the Committee for review and approval.

Upon Committee approval, minutes transcripts are finalized and entered into the Committee’s historical record archives, and serve as the official historical record of the Committee’s meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: 101920 CIP Committee Minutes

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Michele King, 408-630-2711
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2020
10:00 AM

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water) Capital Improvement Program Committee (Committee) was called to order via Zoom video conference at 10:00 a.m.

1.1 Roll Call.

Committee members in attendance were District 4 Director Linda LeZotte, District 6 Director Tony Estremera, and District 5 Director Nai Hsueh, Chairperson presiding, constituting a quorum of the Committee.

Staff members in attendance were Michele King, Clerk, Board of Directors, J. Aranda, A. Baker, L. Bankosh, S. Berning, W. Blackard, R. Blank, J. Collins, M. Cook, J. Del La Piedra, N. Dominguez, R. Fuller, M. Ganjoo, C. Hakes, L. Hoang, J. Martin, H. McMahon, A. Nicholas, L. Orta, M. Potter, M. Richardson, L. Rossiter, D. Taylor, S. Tippets and T. Yoke

2. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

Chairperson Hsueh declared time open for public comment on any item not on the agenda.

Mr. William Sherman, San Jose resident discussed questions he received from his community regarding Proposition S, Safe, Clean Water and Natural Flood Protection Program, regarding why this measure on the ballot now and why it is presented as an ongoing program and does not have a sunset date to end the program.

The Committee referred Mr. Sherman’s questions to staff to prepare a response.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

3.1 Approval of September 14, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

Recommendation: Approve the minutes.
The Committee considered the attached minutes of the September 19, 2020 meeting. It was moved by Director LeZotte, seconded by Director Estremera, and carried that the minutes be approved as presented.

4. ACTION ITEMS


Recommendation: Receive and discuss information regarding the status of capital projects in the design phase.

Chair Hsueh reviewed the information on this item, per the attached Committee Agenda Memo, and corresponding presentation materials contained in Attachment 1 were reviewed by staff as follows: Mr. Chris Hakes, Deputy Operating Officer, reviewed items 1 through 3, Mr. Heath McMahon, Deputy Operating Officer reviewed Items 4 through 9, Ms. Rechelle Blank, Deputy Operating Officer, reviewed Items 10 – 22.

Regarding Item 8, South County Recycled Water Pipeline, staff reported the project design is nearing 100 percent completion and ready for advertisement in 2021. The Committee advised staff of the Board’s long-term concern of continued investments in the South County recycled water program, and that it was likely the Board would not approve advertisement until agreements are reached with Morgan Hill/Gilroy on governance issues. Staff reported they were working to resolve issues with governance structure, policy, and project cost share. Letters have been sent to the cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill inviting them to meet with Valley Water to discuss the project.

The Committee noted the information without formal action.

4.2. Review Capital Project Delivery Process.

Recommendation: A. Review and discuss the addition of the following Board engagement points into the Capital Project Delivery Process for capital projects with unusually complex fiscal, jurisdictional, environmental, or community considerations:

i. During the Planning/Feasibility Phase, after identification of the Feasible Alternatives, but before selection of the Recommended Alternative, bring forward a presentation to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee regarding the Feasible Alternatives and staff’s initially proposed Recommended Alternative and, if recommended by the CIP Committee, present to the Board for feedback in order to inform the selection of the Recommended Alternative; and

ii. For the projects for which the Board provided feedback regarding the Recommended
Alternative, should changes to the project occur during the Planning and initial Design Phases that result in a significant deviation from the Recommended Alternative, staff will return to both the CIP Committee and the Board to provide information and receive feedback, as necessary, prior to the public review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.

B. Recommend presenting these additional Board engagement/approval points to the Board for consideration, or provide alternative recommendations and feedback, as necessary.

Ms. Jessica Collins, Business Planning and Analysis Manager, reviewed the information on this item, per the attached Committee Agenda Memo, and corresponding presentation materials contained in Attachment 1.

The Committee directed staff modify the Project Delivery Process (Attachment 1) to differentiate between Board engagement information and action points and bring this back to the Committee for further discussion.

The Committee directed staff identify current projects per the Project Delivery Process that are good candidates for Board engagement during the planning/design phase.


Recommendation: A. Receive overview of the Annual Capital Improvement Program Process and Integrated Financial Planning Schedule; and

B. Review list of Currently Unfunded Capital Projects.

Ms. Collins reviewed the information on this item, per the attached Committee Agenda Memo, and corresponding presentation materials contained in Attachment 1.

The Committee requested the Preliminary Capital Improvement Program presentation to the Board include a clear depiction of the status of the South County Recycled Water Pipeline project and funding scenario.


Recommendation: Receive information on upcoming consultant agreement amendments for capital projects.

Ms. Lisa Bankosh, Acting Deputy Operating Officer, reviewed the information on this item, per the attached Committee Agenda Memo.
The Committee noted the information without formal action.

4.5. Review 2020 Capital Improvement Committee Work Plan.

Recommendation: Review the 2020 Capital Improvement Program Committee Work Plan, and make adjustments as necessary.

Chair Hsueh reviewed the information on this item, per the attached Committee Agenda Memo, and corresponding presentation materials contained in Attachment 1.

Chair Hsueh noted the following items to be included in the November 9, 2020 CIP Committee agenda, in addition to standing items:

• Capital Project Monitoring – Planning/Feasibility
• Review Project Delivery Process for Capital Projects
• Review Significant Project Plan Updates

5. INFORMATION ITEMS.

None.

6. CLERK’S REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION OF COMMITTEE REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Ms. Natalie Dominguez, Assistant Deputy Clerk II, confirmed there were no new Committee Recommendations and Requests for Board consideration.

The following direction to staff was recorded:

Item 4.2:

• The Committee directed staff modify the Project Delivery Process (Attachment 1) to differentiate between Board engagement (information) and action points and bring this back to the Committee for further discussion.
• The Committee directed staff identify current projects per the Project Delivery Process that are good candidates for Board engagement during the planning/design phase.

Item 4.3:

The Committee requested the Preliminary Capital Improvement Program presentation to the Board include a clear depiction of the status of the South County Recycled Water Pipeline project and funding scenario.
7. **ADJOURN**

Chairperson Hsueh adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m., to the next scheduled meeting at 10:00 a.m., on Monday, November 9, 2020, via Zoom video teleconference.

Natalie F. Dominguez, CMC
Assistant Deputy Clerk II

Approved:
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive updates on projects in the planning and feasibility phase, discuss resources needs, and make recommendations, as necessary.

SUMMARY:
The CIP Committee’s 2020 Workplan includes monitoring of capital projects during all phases of delivery. Staff will prepare a list of active projects to submit to the Committee each month and will provide detailed information on those where potential and/or significant issues have been identified. The projects presented for discussion will be organized by phases: planning/feasibility; design; and construction. Staff will present projects to the CIP Committee for review one phase at a time. Projects currently in the planning/feasibility phase are being presented this month.

Attachment 1 is a list of projects in the planning/feasibility phase. A verbal report will be provided at the meeting with more detailed information about recent developments as requested by the Committee.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Planning and Feasibility Report

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Lisa Bankosh, 408-630-2618
Christopher Hakes, 408-630-3796
Heath McMahon, 408-630-3126
Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
## Capital Project Monitoring - November 2020
### Planning and Feasibility Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Notes, Upcoming Board Actions or potential issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91084019</td>
<td>Dam Seismic Stability Evaluation</td>
<td>Seismic stability evaluations for Coyote, Chesbro and Uvas Dams on track for completion by December 2021. Spillway evaluations for Lenihan and Stevens Dams started in October and are on track; Outlet pipe inspection for Stevens Creek took place in December 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>91954002</td>
<td>Pacheco Reservoir Expansion Project</td>
<td>Problem Definition Report in development; Preliminary discussions of alternatives assessment underway; Field investigations of all affected private properties are underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92C40357</td>
<td>FAHCE Implementation</td>
<td>In response to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Coyote Creek portion of the Fish and Aquatic Habitat Collaborative Effort (FAHCE) is being coordinated with the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>95044002</td>
<td>SCADA Implementation Project</td>
<td>Staff has completed the benchmarking and scope development for procuring consultant services. RFP is expected to be out for solicitation in the next month with consultant selection by Spring 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91304001</td>
<td>Expedited Purified Water Program - P3</td>
<td>San Jose City Council (Sept 1, 2020) and Santa Clara City Council (Oct 13, 2020) approved items directing city staff to participate in negotiations with Valley Water. Additional information to be reviewed at Recycled Water Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>93234044</td>
<td>Penitencia WTP Residuals Management Project</td>
<td>Project Plan to be completed in November 2020. Beginning preparation of a RFP for design consultant services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26174043</td>
<td>Coyote Creek, Montague Expressway to Tully Road</td>
<td>Feasible alternatives completed in December 2019. Recommended project determined in winter 2020. Preferred project alternative presented to the public in summer 2020. Due to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order, project was split into two projects: Coyote Creek Flood Management Measures and Coyote Creek Flood Protection Project. Projects in preliminary design phase. Draft Planning Study Report nearly completed. Section 1126 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) PMP work is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26324001</td>
<td>Upper Penitencia Ck, Coyote Ck-Dorel Drive</td>
<td>Recommended project identified July 2019; USACE does not support multi-objective project; project will proceed with Phase 1 and Phase 2 work, as approved by the Board of Directors in December 2019. Per Board direction on December 17, 2019, $21M (uninflated) transferred from this project to Coyote Creek. Draft Planning Study Report nearly completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>00044026</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Shoreline</td>
<td>USACE is proceeding with feasibility study for Phase 2. On January 23, 2020, the USACE completed the alternatives milestone evaluation and recommended to focus the Phase 2 Feasibility Study on Economic Impact Areas (EIAs) EIAs 1-4 (from San Franciscoquito Creek in Palo Alto to Permanente Creek in Mountain View). Phase 2 was scoped down to EIAs 1-4 due to risks associated with schedule and funding. The Tentative Selection Plan is scheduled for completion in April 2021. USACE is requesting future funding for a Phase 3 Feasibility Study for EIAs 5-10 (from Permanente Creek in Mountain View to Guadalupe River in San Jose).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30154019</td>
<td>Guadalupe River - Tasman to Hwy 880</td>
<td>Problem Definition Report completed July 2019; Alternatives analysis underway; public meeting held October 1. Planning study report delayed by six months to spring of 2021 due to extensive list of alternatives and the work required to analyze.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capital Project Monitoring - November 2020

#### Planning and Feasibility Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Notes, Upcoming Board Actions or potential issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26154003</td>
<td>Upper Guadalupe River from SPRR to Blossom Hill Road (Reaches 7-12)</td>
<td>In February 2020, USACE received approval of $1.5 million in funding to perform a general re-evaluation report (GRR). Valley Water will cost share the study by contributing $1.5 million. The general re-evaluation report will evaluate alternatives for the project, with the goal of making the project more competitive for federal funding. Under USACE Guidelines, they are planning to complete the GRR in 3 years by September 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20444001s</td>
<td>Salt Ponds AS-11 Restoration</td>
<td>Draft Feasibility study on the realignment of Calabazas and San Tomas Creeks completed and undergoing quality control review. Final report to be presented to the Board for study direction by the end of 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>62044001</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Fish Passage Barrier Analysis</td>
<td>Consultant contract extended until June 30, 2020. Comments on draft report submitted to consultant in March 2020. Study completed in Summer of 2020 and will be presented in a virtual brown bag in November 2020. Consultant will develop conceptual designs for the most significant barriers to assist the project team in a prioritization study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>62044003</td>
<td>Ogier Ponds Planning Study</td>
<td>MOA for planning study being negotiated with landowner (County Parks). MOA expected to go before County Supervisors for approval in late 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>62044001</td>
<td>Metcalf Pond Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Per meeting with Steering Committee in December 2019, project team will revise Feasibility Study Objectives to broaden range of alternatives. Project team has engaged Steering Committee members with planning charrettes (problem definition and conceptual alternatives) in 2020. Draft Feasibility Study Report expected by December 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Resources Stewardship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Buildings & IT

No projects to report at this time
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:
Follow-up Review of the Capital Project Delivery Process.

RECOMMENDATION:
A. Review and discuss the updated Capital Project Delivery Process;

B. Review and discuss the addition of the following Board engagement points into the Capital Project Delivery Process for capital projects with unusually complex fiscal, jurisdictional, environmental, or community considerations:
   i. During the Planning/Feasibility Phase, after identification of the Feasible Alternatives, but before selection of the Recommended Alternative, bring forward a presentation to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee regarding the Feasible Alternatives and staff’s initially proposed Recommended Alternative and, if recommended by the CIP Committee, present to the Board for feedback in order to inform the selection of the Recommended Alternative; and
   
   ii. For the projects for which the Board provided feedback regarding the Recommended Alternative, should changes to the project occur during the Planning and initial Design Phases that result in a significant deviation from the Recommended Alternative, staff will return to both the CIP Committee and the Board to provide information and receive feedback, as necessary, prior to the public review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document;

C. Review and discuss the list of capital projects that staff has identified as meeting the criteria for additional Board engagement; and

D. Recommend presenting the updated Capital Project Delivery Process, the list of capital projects that may require additional Board engagement, and the additional Board engagement/approval points to the Board for consideration, or provide alternative recommendations and feedback, as necessary.

SUMMARY:
Each capital project follows a process for project delivery that includes project milestones within each phase of the project (e.g. planning/feasibility, design and construction phases), along with
corresponding Board member engagement points and Board engagement and action/approval points. This process is referenced in the Planning Phase Work Instructions and the Project Delivery Process Chart for Board Agenda Items.

On October 19, 2020, at the request of the CIP Committee and to address the Board’s prior feedback regarding the need for additional Board engagement points within the Capital Project Delivery Process, staff recommended additional Board engagement points for inclusion in the Process for the CIP Committee’s consideration and feedback.

Based upon feedback received during that meeting, staff has updated the Capital Project Delivery Process chart to clearly differentiate between Board member engagement and full Board engagement and/or action (Attachment 1). Please note, the steps in each phase may not apply to all capital projects.

During the October 19, 2020 CIP Committee meeting, staff proposed that capital projects which, during the course of feasibility analysis, planning, and design phases, develop unusual or unforeseen environmental or jurisdictional complexity (i.e., the level to which a project’s deliverables can be impacted by other entities or jurisdictions), fiscal impact, and/or or significant stakeholder engagement, may benefit from additional Board guidance. Staff also recommended that the need for such guidance from the full Board would be determined by recommendation of the CIP Committee, upon consideration of staff analysis.

As outlined in Attachment 1, newly proposed capital projects are presented to the Board each year as part of the Preliminary CIP approval process. Entering the first phase of the project, which comprises planning and feasible alternatives analysis, a problem definition report is presented to the Board in the form of a public outreach meeting. Conceptual alternatives and feasible alternatives are also presented to the Board and the public in a public meeting before the Board is updated on recommended alternatives, currently on an as-needed basis. A planning study report is then prepared and drafted before the project enters the design and construction phases.

While this established process allows for appropriate Board and public input for the majority of capital projects, a small number of unusually large and complex capital projects, as described above, may require additional engagement by the CIP Committee and, potentially, the full Board. As shown in Attachment 2, staff offers the following points of additional engagement for consideration:

i. During the Planning/Feasibility Phase, after identification of the Feasible Alternatives, but before selection of the Recommended Alternative, staff recommends bringing forward a presentation to the CIP Committee regarding the Feasible Alternatives and staff’s initially proposed Recommended Alternative and, if recommended by the CIP Committee presenting to the Board for feedback in order to inform the selection of the Recommended Alternative; and

ii. For the projects for which the Board provided feedback regarding the Recommended Alternative, should changes to the project occur during the Planning and initial Design Phases that result in a significant deviation from the Recommended Alternative, staff will return to both
the CIP Committee and the Board to provide information and receive feedback, as necessary, prior to the public review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.

In response to the staff’s October 19th presentation, the CIP Committee provided positive feedback regarding the recommended additional Board engagement points, but asked that staff return to the Committee with a list of potential projects in the planning/feasibility and design phases that meet the criteria identified above and may benefit from additional Board engagement. Staff reviewed the projects in each phase and identified a list of projects for the CIP Committee’s review (Attachment 3).

Staff is also requesting that the CIP Committee recommend these additional Board engagement/approval points to the Board for consideration, or provide alternative recommendations and feedback, as necessary.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
Attachment 1:  Updated Capital Project Delivery Process  
Attachment 2:  Recommended Additional Board Engagement Points in the Capital Project Delivery Process  
Attachment 3:  Proposed Project List for Additional Board Engagement

**UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:**
Tina Yoke, 408-630-2385  
Sue Tippets, 408-630-2253  
Aaron Baker, 408-630-2135
**Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

**Project Delivery Process**

*(Board Engagement/Action)*

**DRAFT – For Discussion Purposes Only**

---

**Project Milestones**

- Newly Validated Projects
- Problem Definition
- Conceptual Alternatives
- Feasible Alternatives
- Recommended Alternative
- Planning Study Report
- Board approves CIP
- Board approves changes, additions, & deletions to previous year’s CIP

**Board Member Engagement/Action**

- Board member briefed on public outreach - invited to attend public meeting
- Board member briefed on public outreach - invited to attend public meeting
- Board member briefed on public outreach - invited to attend public meeting
- Update the Board on project status, as appropriate. Discuss with the DO & Project Owner on the method & timing of this communication.

**Design**

- 30% CEQA Document
- 60% Engineer’s Report
- 90% Authorization to Advertise for Bids

- Board approves CEQA compliance document and approves project, when required
- Board holds public hearing & approves ER for projects funded by zones
- Board adopts PS&E and authorizes bid advertisement

**Construction**

- Award of Contract
- Notice of Contract Completion
- Board reviews bids & awards contract to responsible bidder with lowest responsive bid
- Board accepts completed project

---

*This is an example of the Project Delivery Process that may be followed and may not apply to all capital projects.*
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Project Delivery Process*

(Board Engagement/Action)

DRAFT – For Discussion Purposes Only

**Project Milestones**
- Newly Validated Projects
- Problem Definition
  - Conceptual Alternatives
  - Feasible Alternatives
- Board Approves CIP
  - Board approves changes, additions, & deletions to previous year’s CIP

**Board Member Engagement**

**Board Engagement/Action**

- Recommended Board Engagement Point (i)
  - Update the Board on project status, as appropriate. Discuss with the DO & Project Owner on the method & timing of this communication.
- Recommended Alternative
  - Board member briefed on public outreach - invited to attend public meeting
- Planning Study Report
  - Board member briefed on public outreach - invited to attend public meeting

**Design**

- 30% 60% 90%
- CEQA Document
- Engineer’s Report
- Authorization to Advertise for Bids
- Board adopts PS&E and authorizes bid advertisement
- Board reviews bids and awards contract to responsible bidder with lowest responsive bid
- Board accepts completed project

**Construction**

- Award of Contract
- Notice of Contract Completion

*This is an example of the Project Delivery Process that may be followed and may not apply to all capital projects.
For capital projects with unusually complex fiscal, jurisdictional, environmental, or community considerations:

i. During the Planning/Feasibility Phase, after identification of the Feasible Alternatives, but before selection of the Recommended Alternative, bring forward a presentation to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee regarding the Feasible Alternatives and staff’s initially proposed Recommended Alternative and, if recommended by the CIP Committee, present to the Board for feedback in order to inform the selection of the Recommended Alternative; and

ii. For the projects for which the Board provided feedback regarding the Recommended Alternative, should changes to the project occur during the Planning and initial Design Phases that result in a significant deviation from the Recommended Alternative, staff will return to both the CIP Committee and the Board to provide information and receive feedback, as necessary, prior to the public review of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.
## Potential Capital Projects for Additional CIP Committee/Board Engagement

Rationale for additional CIP Committee/Board engagement (E.g. Projects with unusual or unforeseen environmental or jurisdictional complexity (i.e., the level to which a project’s deliverables can be impacted by other entities or jurisdictions), fiscal impact, and/or significant stakeholder engagement, may benefit from additional Board guidance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91954002</td>
<td>Pacheco Reservoir Expansion Project</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95044002</td>
<td>SCADA Implementation Project</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>93044001</td>
<td>Water Treatment Plant Implementation Project</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>95044001</td>
<td>Distribution Systems Implementation Project</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91864005</td>
<td>Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91874004</td>
<td>Calero Dam Seismic Retrofit - Design &amp; Construct</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>91894002</td>
<td>Guadalupe Dam Seismic Retrofit - Design &amp; Construct</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Meets all criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26174043</td>
<td>Coyote Creek, Montague Expressway to Tully Road</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility and Design</td>
<td>High jurisdictional complexity, fiscal impact and stakeholder engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26324001</td>
<td>Upper Penitencia Ck, Coyote Ck-Dorel Drive</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>High jurisdictional and environmental complexity. (Good example - multi-objective project.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26154003</td>
<td>Upper Guadalupe River from SPRR to Blossom Hill Road (Reaches 7-12)</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>High jurisdictional complexity and fiscal impact. (Good example - key decision on level of funding.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20444001s</td>
<td>Salt Ponds A5-11 Restoration</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Environmental complexity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>62044001</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Fish Passage Barrier Analysis</td>
<td>Planning/Feasibility</td>
<td>Significant stakeholder engagement. (No board action required. The project will conclude with the acceptance of the study.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26044001</td>
<td>Almaden Lake Improvements</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Meets all criteria; however, the project has advanced beyond the recommended additional board engagement points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Supply

- No projects to report at this time.

### Flood Protection

- No projects to report at this time.

### Water Resources Stewardship

- No projects to report at this time.

### Buildings & IT

- No projects to report at this time.
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:
Review Significant Project Plan Updates Since Adoption of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2021-25 Capital Improvement Program Five-Year Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:
Review Significant Project Plan Updates Since Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2021-25 (FY 21-25) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Five-Year Plan.

SUMMARY:
The scope, schedule, and cost increases summarized below will be reflected in the FY 22-26 Preliminary CIP, which is scheduled to be presented to the CIP Committee in December 2020 and to the Board in January 2021.

Summaries of the significant project plan updates for capital projects since the FY 21-25 CIP Five-Year Plan was adopted are provided below:

**Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project No. 91864005. Changes to Scope, Schedule, and Cost.** On June 23, 2020, Valley Water’s Board of Directors conducted a public hearing on the Engineer’s Report and the CEQA Emergency Exemption Determination for the Anderson Dam Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order Compliance Project (Anderson Dam FOCP) and approved the Project. The approval incorporates actions required to comply with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) directive to Valley Water to immediately implement interim risk reduction measures to protect the public from risk of dam failure due to seismic activity. The proposed FOCP will ensure compliance with the FERC Order by (a) allowing Valley Water to safely, reliably, and expeditiously drawdown Anderson Reservoir’s (Reservoir) level and maintain the Reservoir level at a required lower elevation; (b) minimizing risks associated with exceeding the restricted Reservoir level because of an undersized outlet structure, by constructing a new, low-level outlet; (c) prioritizing the interim downstream protection of residents and property; and (d) minimizing the public health and safety and environmental impacts of Reservoir drawdown.

Approval of Anderson Dam FOCP has increased the project cost by approximately $102.9 million over the next five years, increasing the overall total project cost to approximately $616.4 million. This amount could increase as the FOCP elements and ADSRP continue to progress.
**Pacheco Reservoir Expansion Project No. 91954002. Changes to Schedule and Cost.**
Initial geotechnical analysis of the site is complete. The feasible alternative analysis conducted as part of the San Luis Low Point Improvement Project and the Pacheco Reservoir Expansion Project, indicates that based on the soil characteristics present on site, more foundation work will be required than anticipated during the Water Storage Investment Program application process. This will also complicate design and construction of the spillway and conveyance pipeline, extending the planning schedule by six months and the construction schedule by four years. When combined with updates required to inflate the project costs to the projected mid-point of construction, it is expected that the total project cost will exceed $2 billion. An evaluation of the feasible alternatives will be presented to the Board for discussion so that an alternative may be selected to move the design forward and update the project cost.

**Penitencia Water Treatment Plant Residuals Management Project No. 93234044. Changes to Schedule, Cost, Scope.** The changes to the scope of the Penitencia Water Treatment Plant Residuals Management Project No. 93234044 include the addition of a washwater clarification facility; modifications to existing washwater equalization basins for additional storage capacity; the addition of a sludge mixing tank; and the implementation of a newer and more automated sludge dewatering technology utilizing centrifuge technology, which will replace the current belt press system. Adding additional work to this project's scope will extend the planning and design phases to approximately four years and the construction phase to two years. These changes will result in an increase in the total project cost of approximately $30 million, resulting in a new total project cost of $39 million in uninflated dollars.

**South County Recycled Water Pipeline Project No. 91094010. Changes to Schedule.** The Project schedule has been extended by two years due to delays with community development in Gilroy, whereby installed recycled water pipelines are upsized to increase conveyance redundancy and water reuse availability. Project interruptions are also attributable to delays in planning approval and construction as a result of the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Construction is now anticipated to end in the summer of 2022.

**Expedited Purified Water Program - Indirect Potable Water Reuse Project No. 91304001. Changes to Schedule and Cost.** Per direction by Valley Water Board of Directors, construction for the Indirect Potable Reuse Project will be advanced by two years, and is now slated to begin in FY25 instead of FY27. The design schedule has been reduced to two years (prior duration was six years) and the construction duration has been updated to three years (prior duration was six years). Advancing the project schedule will result in an increase in the total project cost of approximately $6.1 million over the next six years, increasing the overall total project cost to approximately $537.1 million.

**Palo Alto Flood Basin Tide Gate Structure Improvements Project No. 10394001. Changes to Schedule and Cost.** The project schedule has been updated to extend the planning and environmental phases by one year due to additional modeling, alternative comparisons, and revised structure alignment based on internal review comments. Right of way acquisition, construction, and close-out have all been extended by two years due to recent geotechnical recommendations to construct over 2.5 miles of levee trail surface.
improvements. These improvements will cost approximately $2.3 million and take place prior to constructing the tide gate structure replacement in order to prevent structural damage to the existing levees. Construction Phase costs have also increased because all excavated soil is now planned to be exported off site and deposited at Pond A8. Since October 19, 2019, the total overall project cost with inflation has increased by $6.335 million to $39.1 million.

**Permanente Creek Flood Protection Project, Bay to Foothill Expressway, Project No. 26244001. Changes to Schedule and Cost.** The Permanente Creek Flood Protection Project will be considered fully completed with the construction of the Rancho San Antonio Flood Detention Basin. The construction of Rancho San Antonio has been delayed due to the discovery of cultural resources and delays associated with the completion of the treatment of these cultural resources. Based on these delays, staff had previously estimated a construction completion and close-out date of December 2022 (FY23). Staff has since revised the estimated construction completion date to December 2021, with construction close-out projected for June 2022 (FY22).

The Project cost has, however, been impacted by the delays due to the discovery and treatment of the cultural resources, as well as due to difficulties associated with soil off-haul and finding a suitable dump site, certain construction tasks, such as planting and trail restoration, which cannot be completed until the remaining excavated soil has been removed from the Project site. As a result, the Project Plan for this Project has been updated to reflect an increase in expenditures for additional services necessary to complete the construction, including additional labor and consultant services, leading to an increase of $9.5 million (with inflation); this includes a planned budget adjustment that staff plans to bring to the Board for approval in early December 2020. If approved by the Board, the new total inflated project cost will be $98.8 million.

**Lower Penitencia Creek Improvements, Berryessa to Coyote Creeks Project No. 40334005. Changes to Construction Schedule.** Construction on this project had been anticipated to begin in the summer of 2020. Due to negotiations with the City of Milpitas on the Master Agreement, negotiations with Caltrans on an encroachment permit and in order to address City and other internal comments on the plans and specifications, construction has been delayed to summer 2021 and is anticipated to be advertised for construction in January 2021. This delay in schedule poses no change to the total project cost nor to its original scope.

**Upper Llagas Flood Protection Project, Buena Vista Avenue to Llagas Road, Project Nos 26174051s. Changes to Schedule and Cost.** This project comprises four separate projects based on phase: one for LERRDs costs, such as real estate acquisition, (Project No. 26174051); one for construction, (Project No. 26174052); one for technical studies, (Project No. 26174053), which has been completed; one for design/construction support, (Project No. 26174054). The schedule for the three active projects has been delayed two-and-a-half years due to the acquisition of the required regulatory permits for all phases of the project. The delay impacted the cost of design/construction support portion of the contract, resulting in an increase of $46k for Project No. 26174054, resulting in a new total project cost of $28.8 million.
In addition, the Project team has increased the project cost for the construction contract portion of Project No. 26174052 by approximately $22 million (uninflated), so that construction on the local-funding only project (Phase 2A) can be completed. The increase to the estimated Phase 2A construction costs can be attributed to additional utility relocations that will need to be completed during and coordinated with construction efforts, increased tunnel costs associated with testing and stockpiling of excavated tunnel materials for possible naturally occurring asbestos, the prohibited tunnel night work, City of Morgan Hill Hale Avenue Extension Project (to be reimbursed by the city), Covid-19 protocols, and additional level of Best Management Practices during construction (i.e. temporary soundwall to reduce construction noise). Staff plans to ask the Board to approve the plans and specifications for the Phase 2A Project and authorize staff to advertise for construction in early December 2020, with an expected award date in February 2021.

**South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, Project EIA 11, Project No. 00044026. Changes to Schedule.** In December 2019, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) advertised Reaches 1, 2 & 3 for construction. Bids came in over the acceptable USACE threshold and had to be rejected. The project was scheduled for construction to commence during FY20. The USACE anticipates re-advertising Reaches 1, 2 & 3 for construction bids in December 2020 and plans to begin construction in Spring/Summer 2021 for a period of 3 years. For Reaches 4 & 5, 60% design completion is anticipated in October 2020. USACE anticipates construction of Reaches 4 & 5 to start in Spring/Summer 2024 for a period of 3 years. Consequently, project close-out is going to be extended by 2.5 years from June 30, 2026 to December 31, 2028.

**Capital Construction Management System Project No. 95074039. Changes to Scope, Schedule, Cost, Name.** This project is being updated to expand the scope of the project, originally implemented to find construction management solutions for Water Utility projects, to include Dam Safety and Capital Delivery, Watersheds Design and Construction, Buildings and Grounds, as well as Information Technology projects. In addition, other units have expressed interest in using portions of the system for their business areas. These divisions include: Treated Water, Raw Water, Water Supply, Watershed Environmental Planning, Watershed Operations and Maintenance Engineering Support, Construction Contracts and Support, Business Planning and Analysis, and Records. The scope of this project will be expanded to include projects not only in construction, but in planning and environmental phases, as well as the permitting phase. To reflect these changes in scope, the project will shift from Fund 61 to an allocated project. Due to the expanded scope, the total project cost will increase by approximately $1.3 million, bringing the total project cost to approximately $2.5 million. In addition, the project name will be changed from Capital Construction Management System to Capital Project Management Information System to more clearly align with the project definition and objectives. The implementation schedule of this project will be expanded one year to account for staff resource availability, outreach to a larger stakeholder group and a larger, more complex implementation. To reflect the expanded scope, the project is transferring from a Fund 61 project to an allocated project.
ATTACHMENTS:
None.

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
Christopher Hakes, 408-630-3796
Heath McMahon, 408-630-3126
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive information on upcoming consultant agreement amendments for capital projects.

SUMMARY:
At the March 28, 2017 meeting, the Board of Directors approved revising the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee's purpose to include monitoring implementation progress of key projects in the CIP. At their June 29, 2020 meeting, the CIP Committee requested this topic be added as a standing item on all future CIP Committee meeting agendas, and that staff provide updates on consultant agreement amendments for capital projects which may include modifications to scope, schedule, and/or budget.

At this time, there are four consultant agreement amendments for capital projects available for the Committee’s review.

1. Amendment No. 6 to Agreement A3366A with RMC Water and Environment for additional design services and engineering support services during construction for the Upper Llagas Creek Flood Protection Project No. 26174052 (R. Blank - INFORMATION ONLY). Valley Water is undertaking the Upper Llagas Creek Flood Protection Project in partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Morgan Hill to provide 1% flood protection to approximately 1,100 homes and 500 businesses along West Little Llagas Creek, East Little Llagas Creek, and Llagas Creek. The Project is approximately 13.9 miles long and is located in the City of Morgan Hill, City of Gilroy, and various unincorporated areas of Santa Clara County, including San Martin.

The Project description has been updated in Amendment No. 6 to incorporate the decision made by Valley Water’s Board of Directors to modify the scope of Phase 2 Construction (Phase 1 is currently being built) into Phases 2A and 2B, and reallocates remaining, unspent funds from completed tasks to tasks not yet fully performed. In addition, Amendment No. 6 will extend the Agreement term from December 31, 2021 to December 31, 2025 to provide sufficient time for Consultant to provide engineering design support services through construction of Phases 2A and 2B.
Staff prepared for CEO approval Amendment No. 6 to Agreement A3366A with RMC Water and Environment (Consultant) for additional design services and additional engineering support services during construction for the Upper Llagas Creek Flood Protection Project No. 26174052. The Amendment will incorporate administrative changes, including the Consultant’s name change from RMC Water and Environment to Woodard and Curran, the name changes for subcontractors Geo-Logic and McMillen Jacobs, changes to Consultant’s key staff, updates to insurance requirements, and Valley Water’s standard Terms and Conditions.

2. Amendment No. 8 to Agreement A3676A with URS Corporation for engineering design services for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project No. 91864005 (C. Hakes).

**Current Agreement**

The Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project (ADSRP) will correct dam seismic deficiencies and otherwise meet all current Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) dam safety design standards. On February 20, 2020, Valley Water received a letter order from FERC to immediately implement ADSRP-related interim risk reduction measures, including construction of a low-level outlet tunnel in advance of the larger ADSRP.

The original Agreement A3676A between Valley Water and URS Corporation provides for the firm to perform engineering design services for ADSRP. The recommended Amendment to the consultant agreement with URS Corporation will enable Valley Water’s continued compliance with February 20, 2020 FERC order.

**Amendment No. 8 Not-to-Exceed Fees**

Amendment No. 8 provides for an increase in the not-to-exceed fees by $17 million for a new not-to-exceed fee of $48.4 million for the Consultant to provide additional further engineering design services for the Anderson Dam Tunnel Project (ADTP) during design and construction phases and continuing design services for the larger ADSRP for a three year period commencing from January 2021 up to December 2023.

**Amendment No. 8 Additional Scope of Services**

Additional design services to be provided include engineering design services during construction of the ADTP (from approximately February 2020 to December 2023); monitoring an asbestos and metals air monitoring program for both projects; investigate and design the ADSRP unlined spillway, design reservoir rim landslide mitigation for the ADTP and other miscellaneous investigations and designs.

Valley Water follows best practices project management by amending a project design agreement prior to start of construction, after the design is complete; the details and complexity of construction have been defined; and the extent of design engineering support for construction need has been assessed. With design documents complete for the ADTP
(external regulatory review is in progress), it is timely to add the engineer-of-record design services during construction to the Agreement scope of services now.

Similarly, the extent of asbestos and metals air monitoring program are now defined, following the finalization of investigations, analysis and design. The monitoring plan in the Amendment applies to both ADTP and the larger ADSRP. Baseline monitoring (one-year duration each for ADTP and ADSRP) will be performed and this Amendment also includes a three-year regular air monitoring for ADTP. The regular monitoring for ADSRP for a period of 6 to 7 years will be included in a future amendment. The need to design for the ADSRP unlined spillway only became evident during the process of design and was not included in the original scope. Similarly the details and extent of challenges of the reservoir rim landslides during construction of the ADTP has only become apparent now and therefore is included in the Amendment.

Staff and the consultant are currently drafting and negotiating the revised scope of services and correlating fees. Staff plans to recommend the Board authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute Amendment No. 8 to Agreement A3676A with URS Corporation for an amount not-to-exceed an additional $17M.

3. Amendment No. 9 to Agreement A3555A with Black and Veatch Corporation for project management services for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project No. 91864005 (C. Hakes).

**Current Agreement**

The Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project (ADSRP) will correct dam seismic deficiencies and otherwise meet all current Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) dam safety design standards. On February 20, 2020, Valley Water received a letter order from FERC to immediately implement ADSRP-related interim risk reduction measures, including construction of low-level outlet tunnel in advance of the larger ADSRP.

The original Agreement A3555A with Black and Veatch Corporation provides for the firm to perform project management services for the ADSRP. The proposed Amendment to the consultant agreement with Black and Veatch Corporation will enable Valley Water's continued compliance with February 20, 2020 FERC order.

The original Agreement was amended to add project management services during planning and design phases for Calero Dam Seismic Retrofit project, Guadalupe Dam Seismic Retrofit project, and the Almaden Dam Improvements project.

**Amendment No. 9 Not-to-Exceed Fees**

The Agreement current total not-to-exceed (NTE) fees are anticipated to be depleted by
December 31, 2020. Amendment No. 9 provides for an increase in the not-to-exceed fees by $13.0 million for a new not-to-exceed fee of $31.7 million. The increased fees will pay for the Consultant to provide project management services for the Anderson Dam Tunnel project (ADTP) during finalization of design and throughout construction, as well as complete the design phases for both the ADSRP and the Guadalupe Dam Seismic Retrofit projects for a three year period commencing from January 2021 up to December 2023.

**Amendment No. 9 Additional Scope of Services**

Amendment No. 9 provides for significant additional services to be performed by Black & Veatch to support construction of the ADTP and finalizing design of the ADSRP and Guadalupe Seismic Retrofit projects including:

1. Assist Valley Water staff in providing overall management oversight during the construction phase of the ADTP including attendance at onsite construction-related meetings with or on behalf of Valley Water staff and oversight and monitoring of construction costs and schedule.
2. Review draft construction change orders prepared by the construction management consultant; provide an independent review, estimate, and recommendations.
3. Project document control audits and Project safety audits, when requested
4. Assist Valley Water staff with management of the ADTP Construction Management Agreement and construction Contract
5. Review design phase consultant’s engineering deliverables, design consultant’s deliverables QA/QC compliance for ADTP and ADSRP.
6. Organize and participate in workshops such as Risk Management Workshops, etc. for ADTP and ADSRP.
7. Manage and organize the FERC mandated Board of Consultants (BOC).
8. Provide project management services for Guadalupe Dam Seismic Retrofit Project including technical reviews of consultant deliverables and organizing and participating in workshops.

**Amendment No. 9 Extends Agreement Term**

Amendment No. 9 will also extend the term of the Agreement from June 30, 2023 to December 31, 2023.

Staff and the consultant are currently drafting and negotiating the revised scope of services and correlating fees. Staff plans to recommend the Board authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute Amendment No. 9 to Agreement A3555A with Black and Veatch Corporation for an amount not-to-exceed an additional $13M.

4. **Agreement with COWI North America Inc. for construction management services for the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project No. 91864005 (Anderson Dam Tunnel Project only) (C. Hakes)**. The Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project (ADSRP) will correct dam seismic deficiencies and otherwise meet all current Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
(FERC) and California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) dam safety design standards. On February 20, 2020, Valley Water received a letter order from FERC to immediately implement ADSRP-related interim risk reduction measures, including construction of low-level outlet tunnel in advance of the larger ADSRP. The recommended consultant agreement with COWI North America Inc. will enable Valley Water’s continued compliance with February 20, 2020 FERC order.

The scope of this construction management Agreement provides for the Consultant to perform professional construction management services for only the Anderson Dam Tunnel project (ADTP) for a three-year period commencing January 2021 through December 2023. The scope of Consultant’s work includes Construction Project Management, Preconstruction Services, Quality Assurance and Quality Control, Safety Management, Training, Testing, Start-Up and Commissioning, Construction Inspections, Partnering, Claims and Disputes Management, Environmental Compliance Services, Acceptance and Closeout

Staff and the consultant are currently drafting and negotiating the scope of services and correlating fees. Staff plans to recommend the Board authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute the Agreement with COWI North America Inc. for an amount not-to-exceed $21M.

ATTACHMENTS:
None.

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Rechelle Blank, 408-630-2615
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Capital Improvement Program Committee

SUBJECT:
Review 2020 Capital Improvement Committee Work Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:
Review the 2020 Capital Improvement Program Committee Work Plan, and make adjustments as necessary.

SUMMARY:
Work Plans are created and implemented by all Board Committees to increase Committee efficiency, provide increased public notice of intended Committee discussions, and enable improved follow-up by staff. Work Plans are dynamic documents managed by Committee Chairs and are subject to change. Committee Work Plans also serve to assist to prepare an Annual Committee Accomplishments Reports.

The 2020 Capital Improvement Program Committee (CIP) Work Plan is contained in Attachment 1. Information in this Plan document was provided by staff as follows:

Discussion of topics as stated in the Plan have been described based on information from the following sources:

- Items referred to the Committee by the Board;
- Items requested by the Committee to be brought back by staff;
- Items scheduled for presentation to the full Board of Directors; and
- Items identified by staff.

The 2020 CIP Work Plan contained in Attachment 1 is presented for the Committee’s review to determine topics for discussion in 2020.

All meetings have been scheduled to occur on the second Monday of each month in 2020 in accordance with the Committee’s charter, with the exception of the meetings in April and May 2020, which were cancelled due to the COVID-19 Shelter-in-Place Order; the meetings in June and July 2020, which were special meetings; and the October meeting, which has been rescheduled to October 19, 2020, due to the holiday schedule.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: 2020 CIP Committee Work Plan

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Michele King, 408-2630-2711
# CIP Committee 2020 Workplan

## Capital Project Monitoring
- **Construction**
  - X
- **Design**
  - X
- **Planning/Feasibility**
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
- **Contracts Compliance Process Review**
  - X
- **Review Alternate Contracting Process for Anderson Dam Project**
  - X

## CIP Implementation
- **Review Project Delivery Process for Capital Projects**
  - X

## CIP Development
- **CIP Planning Process**
  - Canceled due to COVID-19
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
- **Review Significant Project Plan Updates**
  - X
- **Committee Review of Initially Validated Projects**
  - X
- **Annual CIP Process and Integrated Financial Planning Calendar Overview**
  - X
- **Preliminary CIP Review**
  - X

## Standing Items
- **Upcoming Consultant Agreement Amendments**
  - X
- **Workplan**
  - X
  - X
  - X
- **Minutes**
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X
  - X