



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

**AGENDA
MESA WATER DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Tuesday, May 17, 2016
1965 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92627
3:30 p.m. Special Board Meeting**

**ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, May 17, 2016 at 3:30 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Non-Agendized Matters: Members of the public are invited to address the Board on matters which are not on the Agenda. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. The Board will set aside thirty (30) minutes for public comments.

Agendized Matters: Members of the public may comment on Agenda items before action is taken, or after the Board has discussed the item. Each speaker is limited to five (5) minutes.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Items recommended for approval at this meeting may be agendized for approval at a future Board meeting.

1. Water Loss Audit Update

ACTION ITEMS:

2. MWRP Finished Water Quality Polishing System Construction
3. 2016 Public Health Goals Report

REPORTS:

4. Developer Project Status Report
5. Mesa Water® and Other Agency Projects Status Report
6. Water Quality Call Report
7. Committee Policy & Resolution Review or Development
8. Operations Department Status Report
9. Municipal Water District of Orange County Activities Update
10. Orange County Water District Activities Update
11. Ocean Desalination Projects
12. Report of the General Manager
13. Directors' Reports and Comments



INFORMATION ITEMS:

14. Elite Customer Service

In compliance with California law and the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need disability-related modifications or accommodations, including auxiliary aids or services in order to participate in the meeting, or if you need the agenda provided in an alternative format, please contact the District Secretary at (949) 631-1206. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable Mesa Water District (Mesa Water®) to make reasonable arrangements to accommodate your requests.

Agenda materials that are public records, which have been distributed to a majority of the Mesa Water Board of Directors (Board), will be available for public inspection at the District Boardroom, 1965 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA and on Mesa Water's website at www.MesaWater.org. If materials are distributed to the Board less than 72 hours prior or during the meeting, the materials will be available at the time of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT



Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Stacie Sheek, Customer Services Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: Water Loss Audit Update

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only.

STRATEGIC PLAN

- Goal #2: Practice perpetual infrastructure renewal and improvement.
- Goal #3: Be financially responsible and transparent.
- Goal #6: Provide outstanding customer service.

BACKGROUND

In 2010, the American Water Works Association (AWWA) released a model to calculate operational efficiency of water production, distribution, and metering systems. The model is designed to more accurately gauge operational efficiency using water loss as the main driver.

As a member of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (Council), Mesa Water District (Mesa Water®) is committed to the implementation of the Council's water conservation best management practices. BMP 1.2 – Water Loss Control requires the completion of a yearly water audit using the AWWA/IWA methodology and the AWWA Free Water Audit Software.

Mesa Water® retained the services of Black & Veatch Corporation (B&V) to complete an independent water loss audit for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

There are five different levels of the Data Validity Score: Level I (0-25), Level II (26-50), Level III (51-70), Level IV (71-90), and Level V (91-100). The following is a summary of the 2014 and 2015 audits:

Audit Year	Data Validity Score	Level
2013	83	IV
2014	84	IV

Mesa Water's score for both audits is Level IV, Excellent, on the AWWA grading matrix.

The following recommendations made by the consultant have been implemented:

- Meter Testing (Age/Volume/Pressure)
- OC44/Test Huntington Beach Meter
- Create a Water Loss Working Group
- Split-Out Large Billed Metered Customers
- Import/Export Allocation Verification



- Remove the Recycled Water from the Water Loss audit
- Well Production & Import/Export Meter Testing
- Conduct Pilot Billing System Assessment
- Well Production Meter Low Flow Analysis
- Optimization Study for Pump Curve Efficiency
- Service Line Leaks & Meter Leaks Tracked on GIS Database

DISCUSSION

To identify which modifications to existing non-revenue water (NRW) management-related practices would enable Mesa Water® to improve its Data Validity Score to Tier V (91 or higher), an assessment was performed on the 2015 water audit documentation completed by B&V.

The scoring for the water audit is based on five major categories: Water Supplied, Authorized Consumption, Water Losses, System Data & Costa Data. Each of these categories is made up of criteria that has individual weighted scoring. The AWWA Water Loss Audit Software does not provide a direct breakdown of the weighting for each category, however, an overall weighting has been identified by a trial and error approach. Table 1 is a summary of Mesa Water’s performance for 2013 and 2014 for each of the categories:

Table 1

Audit Parameter	2013	2014	% Weight
1. Water Supplied	29	29	35
2. Authorized Consumption	17	17	20
3. Water Losses	12	13	15
4. System Data	4	4	5
5. Cost Data	21	21	25
Total Score	83	84	100

Key drivers have also been identified in the scoring as having a substantial impact as follows:

- Water Supplied (Volume from Own Sources): 100% of treated water production sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted semi-annually, with less than 10% found outside of +/- 3% accuracy. A third party knowledgeable in the M36 methodology reviews procedures.
- Authorized Consumption (Billed Metered, Unbilled Unmetered): At least 99% of customers exist with volume-based billing from meter reads. At least 95% customer meter reading success rate exists with a minimum 80% meter reading success rate with Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) or Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) trials underway.
- Water Losses (Apparent Loss): Clear policies exist to identify all known unauthorized uses of water. Staff and procedures exist to provide enforcement of policies and detect violations.



- Water Losses (Systematic Data Handling Errors): Sound written policy and procedures exist for new account activation and oversight of customer billing operations. Robust computerized billing system gives high functionality and reporting capabilities that are utilized, analyzed and results reported each billing cycle.

The 2015 Water Loss Assessment provided the following major findings when considering the aforementioned drivers:

1. Mesa Water’s Non-Revenue Water (NRW) management performance is very good compared to local and a small sample of validated national results. The term "Non-revenue" Water is defined to reflect the distributed volume of water that is not reflected in customer billings. NRW is specifically defined as the sum of Unbilled Authorized Consumption (water for firefighting, flushing, etc.) plus Apparent Losses (customer meter inaccuracies, unauthorized consumption and systematic data handling errors) plus Real Losses (system leakage and storage tank overflows). In this way, the term "Non-revenue" Water includes the sum of the varied and disparate types of losses and authorized unbilled consumption typically occurring in water utilities.
2. Mesa Water’s Infrastructure Leakage Index is very low compared to other agencies. Infrastructure Leakage Index is the ratio of the Current Annual Real Losses to the Unavoidable Real Losses that is calculated as part of the Water Audit software. A Current Real Loss consists of physical water losses within the system (i.e. water mains, reservoirs, service connections). An Unavoidable Real Loss is a theoretical reference value representing the technical low limit of leakage that could be achieved if all of today’s best technology could be successfully applied. The ILI is a highly effective performance indicator for comparing the performance of utilities in operational management of real losses. A score of “1” indicates that current real losses are equal to the technical low limit of leakage achievable if all of today’s technology was successfully applied. A score of less than “1” is possible, but unlikely. Mesa Water’s ILI score of 1.23 is in the 95 percentile.

Next Steps

Based on the assessment of the water audit data, Mesa Water’s Data Validity Score can be enhanced to Tier V in three key areas as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Audit Parameter	2014	Possible Points	Achievable Points
1. Water Supplied	29	35	2-3
2. Authorized Consumption	17	20	2-3
3. Water Losses	13	15	1-2
4. System Data	4	5	0
5. Cost Data	21	25	0
Total Score	84	100	5-8



The following tasks would increase the Data Validity Score by approximately 2-3 points in each category allowing an overall increase of approximately 7 points necessary to achieve a score of 91:

1. **Production Meter Adjustments:** This work effort involves documenting (including trending) adjustments to production and import meter flows and having a 3rd party review the data in accordance with the Water Audits and Loss Control Programs. Specific requirements would include documenting the errors found during the calibration process performed at least annually on Mesa Water's meters and additional errors derived from testing of these meters using the strap-on ultrasonic flow meter recently purchased at all production and import stations. Documenting the errors found (percentage or volume) would be applied to the recorded flows entered in the annual water audit.

Mesa Water® is in the process of replacing all of its production meters with magnetic flowmeters through the Well Automation Project and the OC-44 Meter Replacement Project. Magnetic flow meters are highly accurate (+/- 0.25%) and can only be calibrated in the factory. Mesa Water® currently performs independent flow meter testing semi-annually per the AWWA M36 process using an independent ultrasonic meter or pitot tube technologies. However, independent ultrasonic or pitot tube testing is only accurate to approximately +/- 10%. The M36 requirement of using the independent flow meter testing to correct production data is in conflict with the actual accuracy thresholds of the technology. Rather, the real benefit of this activity is not to provide calibration correction data, but to alert operations staff that a highly accurate meter is not registering within an order of magnitude of its actual production rate.

Cost: Mesa Water® will continue to perform this activity semi-annually to meet the requirements of the M36 process. Operations and Engineering staff as part of the Operations Work Plan perform this activity. Mesa Water® will formerly document the process to ensure it is included in future Water Loss Audits. This activity costs approximately \$30,000 per year in staff time.

2. **Customer Meter Testing:** This work effort involves performing ongoing testing of customer meters using a statistically significant rationale for the installed meter population, representative of the range of meter sizes, types and manufacturers, to justify meter change-out cycle. This involves annually selecting a total population of approximately 200 to 250 in-service meters covering each meter size serving residential customers (meters smaller than the commercial meter size of 1-1/2-inch and larger) and conducting accuracy tests to identify a replacement cycle based on deterioration of meter age or volume of water consumed.

Cost: The cost of this testing program is estimated at \$40,000 annually. This cost involves the extraction and replacement of various meters by Mesa Water® Operations staff, shipping of the meters to an authorized testing lab, and analysis of the meter testing data.

3. **Flushing Volumes Analysis:** This work effort involves estimating and documenting flushing volumes and other authorized (metered and unmetered) uses such as testing of fire service lines and document policies for those uses. Specific customers user categories would include usage by the Costa Mesa Sanitary District, City street cleaning and sweeping crews,



approximately 100 fire lines, fire hydrant testing, and water main construction and repair-related activities. The volume of water will be estimated and documented, if possible, to confirm the volume entered annually in the water audit. Retrieval of this information would involve research of recordkeeping of tank fills, hydrant testing, firefighting incidents, and water main construction activities conducted and available for the audit period or estimates would be involved if specific event information is not available.

Cost: This work effort is estimated to cost approximately \$30,000 to \$50,000. This will involve a combination of internal staff time and support services to compile and document the required information.

4. **Demand Profiling:** This work effort includes conducting demand profiling for commercial accounts to confirm appropriateness of meter type and size of meters. A selected number of commercial account meters will be monitored annually using either manually installed time-of-day recorders, such as Meter Masters owned by Mesa Water®, or by monitoring AMI-based data collected from such meters to determine the profile of demand on a 24-hour basis for a period of at least three days. This will enable confirmation that the actual flow ranges are matched with the standard range for optimal accuracy for the installed meter, as specified by AWWA standards for the type and size. A sample of about 20-25 commercial accounts representing a cross-section of meter types and sizes will need to be monitored.

Cost: The estimated cost for this program is \$15,000 to \$20,000. This work includes set up and removal of the Meter Masters by Mesa Water® staff consulting support services to analyze the information and provide a report of the demand profiling findings along with recommendations for changes to meter sizes.

Econometrics: The cost of the aforementioned activities is approximately \$140,000. Other areas of opportunity for increases to Mesa Water’s water loss management performance are more challenging to obtain. For example, some of these areas consist of daily mass balancing between supply production and consumption usage. These areas of improvements require substantial capital investment in full implementation of an AMI/AMR metering system, which would cost several millions of dollars. Mesa Water® has taken an approach to focus on the lower cost water loss management strategies and approaches to achieve a higher overall score.

The cost-effectiveness of Mesa Water’s Non Revenue Water management program is best determined by establishing the economic levels of apparent and real losses. These are the levels at which the value of the losses is approximately equal to the expenditures made by Mesa Water® to manage them.

Table 3 demonstrates Mesa Water’s FY15 water losses and associated revenue impacts:

Table 3

Water Type Loss	Quantity (AF)	Percent of Loss	Revenue Loss
Authorized Consumption	282	1.6	\$431,164
Water Losses	494	2.8	\$755,303
Apparent Losses	264	1.5	\$403,643
Total	1,037	5.9	\$1,590,110



Authorized consumption consists of water usage that is mostly unbillable non-revenue water (i.e. MWRf sewer discharge, well blow down, etc.). A small reduction in this loss can be made, but it is for proper maintenance of the water system. Water losses are losses attributed to main line and service line leakage. Improvement has been made in this category through a highly vetted computerized maintenance management system (CMMS) and capital improvement programs. Apparent losses consist of inaccurate meters (worn meters as well as improperly sized meters) and unauthorized consumption (theft or illegal use). Improving this category of water loss could be made through implementing steps 1, 2 and 4 at a cost of approximately \$90,000.

Mesa Water’s Water Loss Audit Program implementation will result in expenditures of \$140,000 to assist in redirecting water losses totaling approximately \$403,643. Mesa Water® will continue to monitor and review the expenditures for existing activities related to apparent and real loss management and the estimated volume and value of losses recovered by these activities. If the expenditures exceed the value of the losses, Mesa Water® will adjust its program to achieve greater cost-effectiveness and work on implementing strategies that have an acceptable cost-benefit ratio.

Schedule: Mesa Water® will be focusing on implementing the aforementioned water loss strategies during fiscal year 2017. A water loss audit will be scheduled at the completion of FY2017 to gauge an increase in performance. These results will be shared with the Board at a future Engineering and Operations Committee meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

\$11,832 was budgeted in fiscal year 2015, \$9,466 funds have been spent to date in fiscal year 2015.

	<u>Project Estimate Amounts</u>	<u>Project Cost Amounts</u>
Initial Project Estimate (FY 2015)	\$ 11,832	
Original Contract		\$ 11,832
Change order		0
Requested funding		<u>0</u>
Revised Contracts		<u>\$ 11,832</u>
Actual spent to date		\$ 9,466
Revised Project Estimate	\$ 11,832	

ATTACHMENTS

None.



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Phil Lauri, P.E., Engineering and Operations Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: MWRF Finished Water Quality Polishing System Construction

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend that the Board of Directors award a contract to J.R. Filanc Construction Company for \$795,424 and a 10% contingency for a not-to-exceed amount of \$874,966 to perform the MWRF Finished Water Quality Polishing System Project and authorize execution of the contract.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal #1: Provide a safe, abundant, and reliable water supply.
Goal #2: Practice Continuous Infrastructure Renewal and Improvement
Goal #6: Provide outstanding customer service.

PRIOR BOARD ACTIONS

On June 13, 2013 Board of Directors awarded a contract to Trussell Technologies (Trussell) to develop and perform a pilot test to develop a water quality polishing strategy for the Mesa Water Reliability Facility finished product water to provide superior water quality aesthetics.

On September 12, 2013 Board of Directors approved a change order to Trussell to design and perform a bench scale pilot test for a water quality polishing strategy for the Mesa Water Reliability Facility.

On February 13, 2014 Board awarded a contract to Carollo Engineers (Carollo) to perform MWRF Finished Water Quality Polishing Pilot and Scrubber Modifications Project.

On October 21 2014 it was recommended at the E&O Committee Meeting that a permanent, full-scale design of the SBS feed system be implemented.

On May 14, 2015 Board awarded contract to Carollo to perform design of the MWRF Improvements Project including water quality polishing and miscellaneous improvements to the treatment system.

BACKGROUND

On January 9, 2013, the Mesa Water Reliability Facility (MWRF) was put into service making Mesa Water® 100% locally reliable. The MWRF produces excellent water quality that meets all state and federal drinking water standards.

Mesa Water® strives to bring consistency in water quality and taste among all of its water supply sources. However, due to the unique nature of the MWRF raw water quality, consumers may be sensitive to small changes in the finished water quality product. As such, staff proactively monitored the introduction of the MWRF supply source to ensure that there were no noticeable changes in any key aesthetic indicators. To ensure superior water quality for all customers, Mesa



Water® proactively and continuously refined the MWRf finished product water quality blend by adjusting the treatment process and monitoring water quality and aesthetics throughout the distribution system.

In an effort to quickly respond to customer concerns and to understand potentially changing water quality parameters, Mesa Water® requested assistance from Trussell. Trussell was initially tasked with evaluating and analyzing the MWRf treatment process, distribution system water quality parameters, and overall compliance sampling protocols to provide insight to the MWRf's finished product water quality.

Review of the findings of the bench testing conducted by Trussell determined that further evaluation via a full-scale pilot system implementation was necessary to determine the optimal dose of a water quality polishing additive and estimate the cost to operate the system.

Mesa Water® awarded a contract to design, construct and perform the temporary full-scale pilot demonstration phase of work to Carollo Engineers. Construction of the full-scale pilot was completed in early March 2014. The pilot project ran through the fall of 2014. The final pilot testing results demonstrated that 2.5 milligrams per liter of a water quality polishing additive provided the optimum results. Due to the tremendous success and effectiveness of the piloting project, the pilot facility continues to operate under a conditional permit until permanent facilities are designed and constructed.

In May 2015 Mesa Water® contracted with Carollo Engineers to perform the design of the full scale water quality polishing and miscellaneous improvements to the Mesa Water Reliability Facility treatment system. The project included design of permanent water quality polishing facilities, addition of a degasifier cleaning system, improvements to the pH adjustment system, and the addition of water quality monitoring instrumentation equipment

DISCUSSION

The design and specifications for the MWRf Improvements Project was completed and put out to bid in April 2016. Ten prospective contractors (Pascal & Ludwig Constructors, R.C. Foster, Stephen Doreck Equipment, Schuler Constructors, Pacific Hydrotech Corp., S.S. Mechanical, Inc., J.A. Salazar Construction, Mike Bubalo Construction, J.R. Filanc Construction Company, and Jamison Engineering) were contacted for a site visit (April 18, 2016) and requested to submit a bid for the aforementioned project. Three contractors (J.R. Filanc Construction Company, S.S. Mechanical, Inc., and Pacific Hydrotech Corp.) attended the site visit. Two bids were received on May 4, 2016 from the following contractors:

- J.R. Filanc Construction Company (\$795,424), and
- Pacific Hydrotech Corp. (\$900,384)

The proposed project bids have been evaluated and found to be compliant with all the bid package requirements. Construction is scheduled to last 180 calendar days from notice to proceed. It is recommended that a not-to-exceed construction contract be awarded to J.R. Filanc Construction Company for \$795,424 plus a 10% contingency for a not-to-exceed amount of \$874,966 to perform the MWRf Improvements Project.



FINANCIAL IMPACT

\$618,000 is budgeted in fiscal year 2017. The requested funding will come from Cash on Hand.

	Scenario 1	
	Project Estimate <u>Amounts</u>	Project Cost <u>Amounts</u>
Initial Project Estimate (FY 2017)	\$ 618,000	
Original Contracts		\$ 0
Change orders		\$ 0
Requested funding		<u>\$ 874,966</u>
Revised Contracts		<u>\$ 874,966</u>
Actual spent to date		\$ 0
Revised Project Estimate	\$ 874,966	

ATTACHMENTS

None.



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Phil Lauri, P.E., Assistant General Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: 2016 Public Health Goals Report

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend that the Board of Directors accept the Report on Mesa's Water Quality relative to 2016 Public Health Goals and receive comments from the public at the July 14, 2016 Board of Directors meeting.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal #1: Provide a safe, abundant, and reliable water supply.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION/DISCUSSION

None.

DISCUSSION

SB 1307 (Calderone-Sher; effective 01/01/97) added new provisions to the California Health and Safety Code which mandate that a Public Health Goals report be prepared by July 1, 1998, and every three years thereafter. The attached 2016 Public Health Goals (PHG) Report is intended to provide information to the public in addition to the annual Consumer Confidence Report that is made available online to customers each year.

California Health and Safety Code Section 116365 requires the State to develop a Public Health Goal for every contaminant with a primary drinking water standard or for any contaminant California is proposing to regulate with a primary drinking water standard. A Public Health Goal is the level which poses no significant health risk if consumed for a lifetime. The process of establishing a Public Health Goal is a risk assessment based strictly on human health considerations. The 2016 PHG Report compares Mesa Water's drinking water quality with PHG's adopted by California Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and with the maximum contaminant level goals (MCLG's) adopted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The report also provides a cost estimate to treat each constituent below the PHG. PHG's and MCLG's are not enforceable standards and no action to meet them is mandated.

The law requires that a public hearing be held for the purpose of accepting and responding to public comment on the report. The public hearing is scheduled for the Board meeting of July 14th.

Mesa Water's system complies with all of the health-based drinking water standards and maximum contaminant levels required by the California State Water Resources Control Board Division of Drinking Water and the USEPA. No additional measures are recommended to achieve distribution compliance.



FINANCIAL IMPACT

Consistent with prior years, the estimated cost of preparing the report and advertising a public hearing on this agenda item is budgeted at \$7,000 in account #60405-300.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: 2016 Public Health Goals Report

2016 Public Health Goals Report

Mesa Water District

1.0 Introduction

The Calderon-Sher Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996 requires public water systems in California serving greater than 10,000 connections to prepare a report containing information on 1) detection of any contaminant in drinking water at a level exceeding a Public Health Goal (PHG), 2) estimate of costs to remove detected contaminants to below the Public Health Goal using best available technology, and 3) health risks for each contaminant exceeding a Public Health Goal. This report must be made available to the public every three years. The initial report was due on July 1, 1998, and subsequent reports are due every three years thereafter.

This report has been prepared to address the requirements set forth in Section 116470 of the California Health and Safety Code. It is based on water quality analyses during calendar years 2013, 2014, and 2015 or, if certain analyses were not performed during those years, the most recent data available. The report has been designed to be as informative as possible, without unnecessary duplication of information contained in the Consumer Confidence Reports, which are made available to customers by July 1st of each year.

There is no regulatory guidance explaining requirements for the preparation of Public Health Goal reports. However, a workgroup of the Association of California Water Agencies Water Quality Committee has prepared suggested guidelines for water utilities to use in preparing Public Health Goal reports. These guidelines were used in the preparation of this report, and include tables of cost estimates for best available technology. The State of California provides the Association of California Water Agencies with numerical health risks and category of health risk information for contaminants with Public Health Goals. This health risk information is appended to the Association of California Water Agencies guidelines.

2.0 California Drinking Water Regulatory Process

California Health and Safety Code Section 116365 requires the State to develop a Public Health Goal for every contaminant with a primary drinking water standard or for any contaminant California is proposing to regulate with a primary drinking water standard. A Public Health Goal is the level which poses no significant health risk if consumed for a lifetime. The process of establishing a Public Health Goal is a risk assessment based strictly on human health considerations. Public Health Goals are aspirational targets that do not have to be feasible, measurable, or attainable and are not required to be met by any public water system.

The State office designated to develop Public Health Goals is the California Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). The Public Health Goal is then forwarded to the California State Water Resources Control Board, Division

of Drinking Water (DDW) and Environmental Management for use in revising or developing a Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) in drinking water. The MCL is the highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water. California MCLs cannot be less stringent than federal MCLs and must be as close as is technically and economically feasible to the Public Health Goals. The DDW is required to take treatment technologies and cost of compliance into account when setting a MCL. Each MCL is reviewed at least once every five years.

Section 116470(b)(1) of the Health and Safety Code requires public water systems serving more than 10,000 connections to identify each contaminant detected in drinking water that exceeded the applicable PHG.

Section 116470(f) requires that where OEHHA has not adopted a PHG for constituent, water suppliers are to use the established maximum contamination level goals (MCLGs) adopted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). MCLGs are the federal equivalent to PHGs.

3.0 Identification of Contaminants

The Mesa Water District (Mesa Water®) system has approximately 23,500 service connections serving 110,000 people. The following constituents were detected at one or more locations within the drinking water system at levels that exceed the applicable PHGs or MCLGs:

- **Arsenic** – Arsenic is a naturally occurring contaminant. In addition, arsenic is a waste product from many industrial production processes. Arsenic was measured above the PHG level in Mesa Water® groundwater and in surface water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan);
- **Hexavalent Chromium** – Hexavalent chromium is present in several industrial waste products. Internal corrosion of household pipes is also a source of hexavalent chromium. Hexavalent chromium was measured above the PHG level in Mesa Water® groundwater and in surface water purchased from Metropolitan;
- **Gross Alpha Particle Activity (Gross Alpha)** – Gross Alpha is naturally occurring contaminant. It is present above the PHG level in surface water purchased from Metropolitan;
- **Gross Beta Particle Activity (Gross Beta)** – Gross Beta is naturally occurring contaminant. It is present above the PHG level in surface water purchased from Metropolitan;
- **Uranium** – Uranium is naturally occurring contaminant. It was measured above the PHG level in Mesa Water® groundwater and in surface water purchased from Metropolitan;
- **Coliform** – Coliform bacteria are naturally present in the surface and groundwater, and are used as an indicator that other, potentially-harmful, microorganisms may be present.

Chart A shows the applicable PHG or MCLG and MCL for each contaminant identified above. The chart includes the maximum, minimum, and average concentrations of each contaminant in drinking water supplied by Mesa Water® in calendar years 2013 to 2015.

4.0 Numerical Public Health Risks

Section 116470(b)(2) of the Health and Safety Code requires disclosure of the numerical public health risk, determined by the OEHHA, associated with the MCLs, Action Levels, PHGs and MCLGs. Available numerical health risks developed by the OEHHA for the contaminants identified above are shown on Chart A. Only numerical risks associated with cancer-causing chemicals have been quantified by the OEHHA.

Arsenic – OEHHA has determined that the health risk associated with the PHG is one theoretical excess case of cancer in a million people and the risk associated with the MCL is 2 theoretical excess cases of cancer in 1,000 people exposed for a 70-year lifetime.

Hexavalent Chromium – OEHHA has determined that the health risk associated with the PHG is one theoretical excess case of cancer in a million people and the risk associated with the MCL is 5 theoretical excess cases of cancer in 10,000 people exposed for a 70-year lifetime.

Gross Alpha – The USEPA has determined that the health risk associated with the MCLG is 0 and the risk associated with the MCL is up to 1 theoretical excess case of cancer in 1,000 people over a lifetime exposure.

Gross Beta – The USEPA has determined that the health risk associated with the MCLG is 0 and the risk associated with the MCL is 2 theoretical excess cases of cancer in 1,000 people over a lifetime exposure.

Uranium – OEHHA has determined that the health risk associated with the PHG is one excess case of cancer in a million people and the risk associated with the MCL is 5 theoretical excess cases of cancer in 100,000 people over a lifetime exposure.

5.0 Identification of Risk Categories

Section 116470(b)(3) of the Health and Safety Code requires identification of the category of risk to public health associated with exposure to the contaminant in drinking water, including a brief, plainly worded description of those terms. The risk categories and definitions for the contaminants identified above are shown on Chart A.

6.0 Description of Best Available Technology

Section 116470(b)(4) of the Health and Safety Code requires a description of the best available technology, if any, that are available on a commercial basis, to remove or reduce the concentrations of the contaminants identified above. The best available technology are discussed in Section 7.0 and shown on Chart A.

7.0 Costs of Compliance Using Best Available Technologies and Intended Actions

Section 116470(b)(5) of the Health and Safety Code requires an estimate of the aggregate cost

and cost per household of utilizing the best available technologies identified to reduce the concentration of a contaminant to a level at or below the PHG or MCLG.

The following sections summarize the estimated cost of compliance and cost per Mesa Water® household to reduce the concentration of contaminants to a level at or below the PHG or MCLG. All costs estimates are adjusted to 2015 cost of construction.

Arsenic - The best available technologies for removal of arsenic in water for large water systems are: activated alumina, coagulation/filtration, lime softening, ion exchange, and reverse osmosis. Arsenic was detected above the Public Health Goal in treated surface water purchased from Metropolitan and in two Mesa Water® wells. One of these two wells are currently inactivated and planned to be destroyed and hence, not factored in the treatment cost estimate. Mesa Water® is in compliance with the MCL for arsenic. The estimated cost to reduce arsenic levels in Metropolitan water and in the Mesa Water® well to below the Public Health Goal of 0.004 µg/L using ion exchange was calculated. Because the Detection Limit for the purpose of Reporting (DLR; i.e., the level at which the DDW is confident about quantification being reported) for arsenic is 2 µg/L, treating arsenic to below the PHG level means treating arsenic to below the DLR of 2 µg/L. There are numerous factors, including feasibility, that may influence the actual cost of reducing arsenic levels to below the Public Health Goal. Achieving the water quality goal for arsenic could range from \$2,499,000 to \$2,688,000 per year, or between \$106 and \$114 per household per year.

Hexavalent Chromium – The best available technologies for removal of hexavalent chromium are reduction/coagulation/filtration, strong or weak anion exchange and reverse osmosis. Groundwater from Mesa Water® wells and surface water purchased from Metropolitan were sampled twice between 2013 and 2015 as federally required in the third Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR3). The method detection limit of 0.03 µg/L used for UCMR3 is significantly lower than the State’s DLR of 1 µg/L for hexavalent chromium compliance monitoring. Hexavalent chromium levels measured in Mesa Water® wells and Metropolitan water were below the DLR of 1 µg/L. However, at the method detection limit of 0.03 µg/L used for UCMR3, hexavalent chromium was detected above the Public Health Goal in five Mesa Water® wells and in treated surface water purchased from Metropolitan. One of these wells is since inactivated. Mesa Water® is in compliance with the MCL for hexavalent chromium. The estimated cost to reduce hexavalent chromium levels in the four groundwater wells and Metropolitan water to below the Public Health Goal of 0.02 µg/L using reduction/coagulation/filtration was calculated. There are numerous factors, including feasibility, that may influence the actual cost of reducing hexavalent chromium levels to below the Public Health Goal. Achieving the water quality goal for hexavalent chromium could range from \$7,383,000 to \$46,492,000 per year, or between \$314 and \$1,978 per household per year.

Gross Alpha, Gross Beta, and Uranium - The only best available technology for the removal of gross alpha in water for large water systems is reverse osmosis, which can also remove gross beta, and uranium (and arsenic). Gross alpha and beta were detected above the MCLG in surface water purchased from Metropolitan. Uranium was detected above the PHG in one groundwater well and in water purchased from Metropolitan. However, the groundwater well has since been inactivated and planned to be destroyed. The estimated cost of providing treatment using reverse osmosis to reduce radionuclide levels in Metropolitan water to the applicable MCLG or PHG was calculated. Achieving the water quality goals for all the radionuclides could range from \$1,452,000 to \$2,575,000 per year, or between \$62 and \$110 per household per year.

Total Coliform - During 2013 to 2015, approximately 100 to 125 samples were collected each month for coliform analysis. During four of these thirty six months, the coliform levels were found positive in 1 to 2% of the samples. The MCL for coliform is 5% positive samples of all samples per month and the MCLG is zero. The reason for the coliform drinking water standard is to minimize the possibility of the water containing pathogens which are organisms that cause waterborne disease. Because coliform is only a surrogate indicator of the potential presence of pathogens, it is not possible to state a specific numerical health risk. While USEPA normally sets MCLGs “at a level where no known or anticipated adverse effects on persons would occur”, it indicates that it cannot do so with coliforms.

Coliform bacteria are “indicator” organisms that are ubiquitous in nature and are not generally considered harmful. They are used because of the ease of monitoring and analysis. If a positive sample is found, it indicates a potential problem that needs to be investigated and follow up sampling must be completed. It is not at all unusual for a system to have an occasional positive sample. It is difficult, if not impossible, to assure that a system will never get a positive sample. Therefore, no estimate of cost has been included.

Chloramine is added at sources to assure that the water served is microbiologically safe. The chlorine residual levels are carefully controlled to provide the best health protection without causing the water to have undesirable taste and odor or increasing disinfection byproduct level. This careful balance of treatment process is essential to continue supplying our customers with safe drinking water.

Total Cost of Compliance: The estimated cost of compliance to meet PHG level for all the constituents (except coliform) identified for Mesa Water® sources can vary from approximately \$9 Million to \$49 Million, or between approximately \$376 to \$2,088 per household per year.

8.0 Recommendations for Further Action

Section 116470(b)(6) also requires a brief description of any actions the water purveyor intends to take to reduce the concentration of the contaminant and the basis for that decision. Mesa Water’s drinking water quality meets or exceeds all state and federal drinking water standards set to protect public health. To further reduce levels of the constituents identified in this report that are already below the health-based MCLs established to provide “safe drinking water”, additional costly treatment processes would be required. The effectiveness of the treatment

processes to provide significant reduction in constituent levels at these already low values is uncertain. The health protection benefits of these further hypothetical reductions are not at all clear and may not be quantifiable. Therefore, no action is proposed.

For additional information, please contact Ms. Kaying Lee, Water Quality and Compliance Supervisor at (949) 207-5491, or write to Mesa Water District, 1965 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92627.

Chart A
2016 PUBLIC HEALTH GOALS REPORT
Mesa Water District

PARAMETER	UNITS OF MEASUREMENT	PHG OR (MCLG)*	MCL	CONCENTRATION		CATEGORY OF RISK	Cancer Risk at PHG or MCLG	Cancer Risk at MCL	BEST AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGIES	AGGREGATE COST PER YEAR (a)	COST PER HOUSEHOLD PER YEAR
				AVERAGE	RANGE						
INORGANIC CHEMICALS											
Arsenic	µg/L	0.004	10	ND	ND - 2.8	C	1 X 10 ⁻⁶	2.5 X 10 ⁻³	AA,C/F,IX,LS,RO	\$2,499,000 - \$2,688,000 (b)	\$106 - \$114
Hexavalent Chromium	µg/L	0.02	10	0.29	0.06-0.68	C	1 X 10 ⁻⁶	5 X 10 ⁻⁴	R/C/F, IX, RO	\$7,383,000 - \$46,492,000 (c)	\$314 - \$1,978
RADIOLOGICAL											
Gross Alpha Particle Activity	pCi/L	(0)	15	1.75	ND- 4	C	0	1 X 10 ⁻³	RO	\$1,452,000 - \$2,575,000(d)	\$62 - \$110
Gross Beta Particle Activity	pCi/L	(0)	50**	3.5	ND- 6	C	0	2 X 10 ⁻³	IX,RO	\$1,452,000 - \$2,575,000(d)	\$62 - \$110
Uranium	pCi/L	0.43	20	2.5	1- 3	C	1 X 10 ⁻⁶	5 X 10 ⁻⁵	RO	\$1,452,000 - \$2,575,000(d)	\$62 - \$110
All Radionuclides (and Arsenic)									RO	\$1,452,000 - \$2,575,000(d)	\$62 - \$110
Total Cost of Compliance										\$8,835,000 - \$49,067,000	\$376 - \$2,088

* MCLGs are shown in parentheses. MCLGs are provided only when no applicable PHG exists.

**Judged by OEHHA

RISK CATEGORIES

C (Carcinogen) = A substance that is potentially capable of producing cancer.

ABBREVIATIONS

PHG = Public Health Goal
MCL = Maximum Contaminant Level
MCLG = Maximum Contaminant Level Goal
µg/L = micrograms per liter or parts per billion
pCi/l = picoCuries per liter

FOOTNOTES

- (a) Wells that are inactivated and planned to be destroyed are not included in cost estimates.
- (b) Estimated cost to remove Arsenic using Ion Exchange.
- (c) Estimated cost to remove hexavalent chromium by reduction/coagulation/filtration
- (d) Estimated cost to remove radionuclides (and arsenic) by reverse osmosis.

TREATMENT/CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES

AA = Activated Aluminum LS = Lime Softening
C/F = Coagulation/Filtration IX = Ion Exchange
R/C/F = Reduction/Coagulation/Filtration RO = Reverse Osmosis

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2065	1677 Superior	Tract Homes	New plans received 2/27/14. Plans have been routed to other departments for plan review 3/11/14. Field investigation completed 3/17/14. Plans reviewed and sent for revisions 3/20/14. Mylars received, fees paid, and plans signed 5/5/14. Abandonment done and installed 800' pipe 6/30/14. Board accepted easement on 7/10/14 and meters set. Tested water line and tied into system on 7/28/14. Installed 18 - 1" meters on 11/20/14. Installed 6 - 1" meters on 6/5/15. Phased development project - Construction and inspections in progress. Installed 12 - 1" meters on 1/28/16. Inspector completed a site visit to check status on 4/20/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2083	2600 Harbor Blvd.	Orange Coast Cadillac	Plans received on 3/12/14. Initial comments sent to Engineer via email 3/27/14 and official plan check with check prints completed 4/24/14. Revised plans received from Engineer 4/27/14. Revised plans did not address comments. Comments sent back to Engineer 4/29/14. Revised plans received 5/9/14. Notified Engineer that plans need to include fireline improvements in addition to meter and service relocations. Engineer stated that the fireline improvements were still under design and a re-submittal would not be immediate. Awaiting revised plans containing fire line improvements. Checked status with Engineer on 8/7/14. Developer stopped by on 10/7/14 to ask about status and was reminded that Engineer has not yet submitted revised plans. Developer again stopped by on 10/30/14 and was reminded that Engineer is awaiting revised plans. Revised plans submitted 12/4/14. Coordinating with developer on plan check comments. Plans reviewed and ready for permit issuance. Water service agreement application for new service and payment voucher mailed to the developer. Fees paid on 5/27/15. Mylars signed on 6/25/15. Permit issued 8/6/15. Hot-tapped watermain and ran fireline on 9/1/15. Abandonment of 1" and 1.5" service on 10/3/15. Irrigation meter installed on 10/12/15 (4/6/16)
MC 2099	1974 Meyer Place	5 New Homes	Revised plans submitted on 2/29/16. Fees paid on 3/1/16. Permit issued on 4/6/16. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2118	220 E. 16th St.	Home Remodel (Complete Remodel)	Plans received and plan check fees paid 08/27/14. Plan check complete 8/28/14. Following plan check, and while awaiting corrected plans, inaccuracies in Mesa Water records were discovered, and inspector was requested to field verify the actual conditions. 2nd set of plans were revised to reflect actual conditions, and plan check finalized on 10/02/14. Mylars received and fees paid on 10/14/14. Permit issued on 10/21/14, and issued inspection checklist on 10/27/14. Mesa Water inspector reported no activity onsite 5/5/15. Contractor came into Mesa Water Plan Check Desk to discuss project status on 8/25/15. Pre-construction meeting held on 10/7/15. Inspector checked status of the project on 12/2/15. 1" water service installed on 2/24/16. 2 - 1" meters and boxes installed on 2/29/16. Site was inspected and contractor was given a checklist of remaining items. (5/4/16)
MC 2119	236 E. 16th St.	Home Remodel (Complete Remodel)	Plans received and fees paid 08/27/14. Plan check complete 8/28/14. Following plan check, and while awaiting corrected plans, inaccuracies in Mesa Water records were discovered, and inspector was requested to field verify the actual conditions. 2nd set of plans were revised to reflect actual conditions, and plan check finalized on 10/2/14. Mylars received and fees paid on 10/14/14. Permit issued on 10/21/14, and issued inspection checklist on 10/27/14. Contractor contacted on 8/10/15 to obtain status of project. Contractor scheduled to complete work, waiting for inspection to be scheduled. Pre-construction meeting held on 10/7/15. 1" water service installed on 2/24/16. 2 - 1" meters and boxes installed on 2/29/16. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2126	573 Victoria	37 New Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid 10/7/14. Design of improvements found not to be satisfactory, and a meeting was held on 10/23/14 to discuss design alternatives. New meeting held on 2/6/15. Awaiting revised plans from developer. Revised plans submitted 4/6/15. Plans sent back for second revision 4/7/15. Plans sent back for third revision 7/17/15. Plans currently in fourth plan check 7/30/15. Plans approved and permit issued on 8/20/15. Hot-tap and service abandonment on 10/20/15. Pipeline installation ongoing 10/22/15. Pipeline pressure tested on 11/23/15. Bac-T testing completed on 11/30/15 & 12/1/15. Mainline turned on 12/25/15. Meter boxes installed and angle-stops locked on 1/19/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2134	2026 Placentia	15 New Homes	Plans received and fees paid on 10/30/14. Plans reviewed on 10/30/14 and circulated for Dept. signatures. Plan check comments issued to Engineer on 11/13/14. Received revised plans 1/6/14. Plan check completed and permit issued 2/9/15. PreCon meeting held 2/11/15. Inspection ongoing as work progresses. Main hot-tap performed on 5/5/15. Services installed by contractor on 5/7/15. 16 - 1 inch meters installed and locked on 7/6/15. Inspector checked status of the project on 12/2/15. Backflow tested on two model units on 2/25/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2149	1620-1644 Whittier Ave and 970 16th St	89 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid 2/2/14. Working with developer to receive more information about the floor plans and irrigation as of 2/3/15. Hydraulic model is being performed by RBF. Conceptual Plan Check Completed and returned to customer 4/20/15. Second plan check returned to customer on 5/1/15. Third plan check returned to customer on 5/21/15. Permit issued on 7/23/15. Pre-con meeting held on 7/27/15. Pipeline installation on 10/21/15. Pressure test and chlorination on 11/5/15. Bac-T testing completed on 11/24/15 and 11/25/15. Waterline tied-in at Whittier, Newhall, and West 16th Street and angle-stops locked on 12/14/15. 4 - 1" meters installed on model homes on 2/25/16. 1 - 1.5" irrigation meter and 1 - 1" domestic meter installed on 4/5/16. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2165	341 16th Place	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid 4/22/15. First plan check completed and returned to developer 4/30/15. Mylars received on 8/6/15. Permit issued on 8/13/15. Installed 1 - 1" service on 9/28/15. Installed 2 - 1" meters on 10/1/15. Second home in process of being built. (5/4/16)
MC 2168	650 Hamilton	24 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid 4/30/15. Comments returned on 5/21/15. Permit issued on 6/16/15. Fireline installed and turned on 9/29/15. Meters and boxes installed and locked on 1/21/16. Irrigation backflow tested and flow-thru system on models tested 3/31/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2176	3059 Country Club Drive	Single Family Home - Addition	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 6/5/15. Second submittal received on 7/15/15. Second plan check returned on 7/31/15. Permit issued 8/13/15. USA call out on 11/30/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2177	125 East Baker Street	240 Unit Apartment Complex	Concept plans received and plan check fees paid on 6/11/15. First plan check comments returned on 7/31/15. Second plan check returned on 8/20/15. Third plan check submitted on 10/8/15. Additional information provided on 10/28/15. Hydraulic model initiated on 11/5/15. Additional information requested on 12/28/15 and information was provided on 1/4/16. Hydraulic model completed on 3/1/16, Mesa Water system improvements are not required. Revised plans submitted on 4/6/16. Mylar drawings and payment received 5/2/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2181	250 Flower Street	Remodel	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 6/22/15. Comments returned on 7/22/15. Second submittal received on 10/29/15 and returned on 11/6/15. Final submittal and fees submitted on 11/30/15. Permit and mylar drawings signed on 12/10/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2184	1670 Tustin Ave	Remodel	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 7/1/15. Comments were not picked-up at Plan Check Desk until 10/6/15. Final plans and fees submitted on 11/6/15. Permit issued on 11/17/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2187	2245 Tustin Ave	Single Family Home	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 7/8/15. Second plan check submitted on 7/31/15 and comments returned on 8/17/15. Fees paid on 3/1/16. Permit issued on 3/11/16. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2196	580 Anton Ave	250 Unit Apartment Complex	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 7/28/15. Plan check comments returned 8/28/15, requesting information to complete a hydraulic model. Requested information provided on 10/25/15. Hydraulic model initiated on 11/5/15. Hydraulic model completed on 2/1/16, Mesa Water system improvements are not required. Fees paid and permit issued on 2/9/16. Pre-con held on 2/29/16. Abandoned waterline on 3/15/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2199	225 Ogle St.	Single Family Home	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 7/30/15. Mylars and fees submitted on 9/17/15. Permit issued on 9/21/15. Project ownership changed and new agreement signed on 12/8/15. Pre-con meeting on 4/12/16. 1 - 1 inch meter and box installed on 4/18/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2202	2880 Mesa Verde Drive East	10 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 8/19/15. First submittal returned on 9/11/15. Second submittal received 10/29/15 and returned on 11/6/15. Permit issued on 12/10/15. 6" manifold installed on 1/19/16. Services installed on 1/20/16. 10 - 1" meters and 1 - 5/8" meter installed and locked on 1/28/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2203	1239 Victoria Street	28 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 8/25/15. Second submittal received on 10/25/15 and returned on 11/6/15. Mylars and fees delivered on 11/25/15. Permit issued on 11/30/15. Pre-con held on 1/4/2016. Installed 2 - 8" manifolds on 1/14/16. Installed services on 1/28/16. Abandoned existing services on 1/29/16. 28 - 1" meters installed and locked on 2/22/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2204	1672 Placentia	31 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 8/26/15. Plan check picked up by customer on 10/6/15. Second plan check submitted on 2/11/16 and returned on 2/26/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2206	247 E 23rd St	Single Family Home	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/21/15. Plans did not require changes. Fees paid on 11/25/15. Permit issued on 12/1/15. Pre-con held on 1/27/16. 1 - 1" meter installed on 2/4/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2207	1654 Oahu Pl	Single Family Home	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/22/15. Permit issued on 10/1/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2208	353 & 355 Rochester St.	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/22/15. First submittal picked up on 10/23/15. Second plan check submitted on 11/19/15. Second plan check completed 12/3/16. Second plan check picked up from counter on 2/29/16. Third plan check submitted on 3/14/16, awaiting pick-up at the plan check desk. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC 2210	3086 Warren Lane	Single Family Home	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/22/15. First submittal picked up on 10/23/15. Project architect contacted on 12/17/15, project does not require fire sprinklers. Awaiting irrigation drawings. (5/4/16)
MC 2212	1499 Monrovia Ave	Fireline installation	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/29/15. First submittal picked up on 10/23/15. Second plan check submitted on 10/29/15. Second plan check returned on 11/13/15. Mylars delivered on 11/23/15. Fees paid and permit issued on 12/13/15. (5/4/16)
MC 2213	847 W 16th St	Tenant Improvement / Fireline Installation	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 9/29/15. First submittal picked up on 10/26/15. Second submittal provided on 3/22/16 and returned on 4/4/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2214	1944 Church St	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 10/5/15. First submittal returned on 10/26/15. Fees paid on 12/15/15. Permit issued on 1/29/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2215	119 Cecil Pl	3 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 10/5/15. First submittal returned on 10/26/15. Fees paid on 12/15/15. Permit issued on 1/29/16 (5/4/16)
MC 2216	320 E 18th St	4 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 10/5/15. First submittal returned on 10/26/15. Fees paid on 12/15/15. Permit issued on 1/29/16 (5/4/16)
MC 2224	286-288 15th Street	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 11/18/15. Plans were determined to be incomplete and additional information was requested on 11/19/15 and provided on 12/28/15. First plan check returned on 12/30/15. Second plan check submitted on 1/25/16. Second plan returned on 2/24/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2225	215 Knox Place	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 11/18/15. Plans were determined to be incomplete and additional information was requested on 11/19/15 and provided on 12/28/15. First plan check returned on 12/30/15. Second plan check submitted on 1/25/16. (5/4/16)
MC 2230	217 Cabrillo	2 Attached Dwellings	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 12/22/15. Plan check in progress. First plan check returned on 1/25/16. Second plan check submitted on 1/26/16. Second plan check returned on 2/2/16. Fees paid and permit issued on 3/11/16. (5/4/16)
MC2232	189-191 Merrill Place	2 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 2/1/16. Plan check completed on 2/12/16 and picked up on 2/29/16. Second plan check received on 3/10/16. Awaiting pick up at the plan check desk. (5/4/16)

DEVELOPER PROJECT STATUS REPORT

PROJECT STATUS - DEVELOPER PROJECTS			
FILE NO.	PROJECT ADDRESS	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROJECT NOTES/STATUS
MC2233	1560 Placentia	81 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 1/20/16. Request for additional information requested on 1/28/16. Requested information submitted on 2/24/16. Plan check picked up on 4/18/16. (5/4/16)
MC2234	338 Hanover Drive	Meter Upgrade	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 1/21/16. Plan check completed 1/28/16. Fees paid and permit issued on 4/22/16. 1 - 1 inch meter and ball valve installed on 5/3/16. (5/4/16)
MC2235	671 W 17th Street	177 Condos	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 1/21/16. Hydraulic model initiated 2/24/16. Second plan check submitted on 3/24/16 and awaiting pick up at plan check desk. (5/4/16)
MC2236	527-531 Bernard Street	10 Single Family Homes	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 2/8/16. Plan check returned on 2/12/16. Second plan check received on 4/21/16. Second plan check in progress. (5/4/16)
MC2237	2245 Santa Ana Avenue	Meter Upgrade	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 2/29/16. Plan check completed 3/24/16. Awaiting fee payment. (5/4/16)
MC2240	222 E 15th Street	Meter Upgrade	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 3/25/16. Plan check picked up on 4/20/16. Awaiting fee payment. (5/4/16)
MC2241	2990 Mesa Verde Dr E	Fireline installation	Plans received and plan check fees paid on 3/25/16. Plan check picked up 4/20/16. Second plan check received on 4/28/16. Second plan check in progress. (5/4/16)

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT
May 2016

Project Title: OC-44 Transmission Main Leak

File No.: MC 1977

Description: Replace damaged section of pipeline

Status: Notice of intent to issue permit was granted by California Coastal Commission on 3/14/13. Staff is working on preparing a plan to monitor the disturbed area. Requested RBF to review the Habitat Restoration Plan and provide recommendations 7/2/14. Working with MBI on developing Permit Application and CEQA documents for OC-44 repair and proposed slip-lining project (see below OC-44 Replacement and Rehabilitation Evaluation and Cathodic Protection Study MC 2034)

Project Title: MWRW Finished Water Quality Polishing Project

File No.: MC 2039

Description: Enhance finished water quality at the MWRW via Pilot Scale test

Status: Technical memo completed 4/13. Initiated bench test on 6/24/13. Draft bench test report received 8/5/13. Next steps are to refine dosing, perform a full-scale pilot test, and estimate design and construction costs. Notice to proceed on pilot test design given on 9/17/13. Full scale pilot test plan submitted to CDPH for approval 10/15/13. CDPH approved the plan 11/7/13. Carollo Engineers finalized construction plans and conducted pre-bid meeting 11/26/2013. Bids are due 12/12/13. Only one bid received. Carollo requested bids from additional contractors. Second bid received on 1/8/14. J.R. Filanc Construction, Inc. lowest bidder. Project kick off meeting took place on 2/24/14. Installation of the SBS Addition System is to be completed 3/14/2014. The Full Scale Pilot Start Up and testing started on March 19, 2014 and completed May 27, 2014. Report to be submitted on 7/3/2014. Meeting with Trussell Technologies to discuss staff comments held on 7/30/14. Meeting to review next phase recommendations held on 8/19/14. Revised Draft Final Report submitted August 27, 2014. Staff reviewed the Report and provided comments. The re-revised Draft Report submitted 10/9/14. Staff reviewed the report and recommended for approval continued operations of the full-scale polishing pilot until a permanent full-scale system can be implemented (E&O Committee meeting 10/21/14). Request for extension of the operation of the MWRW Water Polishing Project pilot testing past December 4, 2014 granted by DDW on November 11, 2014. Developing RFP for design of the permanent SBS addition system (2/6/15). RFP distributed 2/27/15 and proposals received 3/26/15. Selection interviews held on 4/9/15. Team Carollo/Trussell is proposed for the project. Proposal approved by E&O Committee 4/21/2015 and Board 5/14/2015. Contract with Carollo finalized 6/12/15 and the kickoff meeting held on 6/17/15. Preliminary Design Report received 8/3/15. Progress meeting and conference call with Carollo to discuss the review comments was held on 8/25/15 and 10/1/15, respectively. 60% design package submitted on 10/28/15. Review comments sent to Carollo on 11/23/15. Meeting with Carollo to discuss water chemistry and chemical dosing systems at the

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

MWRF held on December 7, 2015. 90% design submitted on 2/1/16. Staff reviewed the submittal, provided comments and discussed the comments and project requirements at the meeting held on 3/2/16. Design completed on 4/1/16. Project sent out to bid on 4/4/2016. Two bids received on 5/4/16. Staff is reviewing the bids. (5/5/16)

Project Title: OC-44 Replacement and Rehabilitation Evaluation and Cathodic Protection Study

File No.: MC 2034

Description: Evaluate potential repair and replacement options

Status: Contract awarded to RBF Consulting 2/12/13. Kick-off meeting held on 2/21/13. TM 1, 2 and 3 reviewed by Mesa Water® and City of Huntington Beach. Revised TM 1 and 3 submitted 6/12/13. Final study report due 7/31/13. Staff requested RBF to perform hydraulic modeling and habitat assessment to supplement original SOW. A meeting with MWDOC, MET and RBF to analyze possible new service connections on the OC Feeder held on 6/25/13. Workshop to discuss TM's held on 7/2/13. Meeting to discuss PDR, permitting, work plan and design concerns held on 7/16/13. Draft PDR and final design scope proposal received 8/6/13. Hydraulic studies "Evaluation of MWD Water Supply Facilities" and "Analysis of Emergency Supply from OC-44 and OCF" received 8/8/13. Staff reviewed the PDR and Hydraulic Study reports and submitted comments to RBF 9/12/13. Received proposal for design of OC-44 Pipeline Rehabilitation Project 9/24/13. Proposal approved by E&O Committee 11/19/13 and by Board on 12/12/13. Staff prepared change order to RBF. Kick-off meeting held on 01/22/14. Project on progress. Outreach coordination meetings with project stakeholders took place on 2/14/2014. RBF is working with City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, and Irvine Company on receiving permits for surveying and geotechnical boring work. Orange County Health Care Permit issued 3/24/2014. Geotechnical boring conducted on 3/28/14. The county of Orange permit was issued April 7, 2014. Biological and Topographic Survey started in mid-April and will continue through the end of July. Scour analysis completed on May 29, 2014. Jurisdictional Delineation completed on 6/30/2014. Project progress meeting with RBF and City of Huntington Beach held on 7/2/14 to review environmental assessment and predesign requirements. The design of the pipeline rehabilitation started on 7/8/2014. 60% plans and specifications submitted for review 9/8/2014. Staff is coordinating with City of Huntington Beach and finalizing review of the design package. Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration submitted 11/2/14. Staff is reviewing the submittal (11/6/14). 60% review meeting with City of Huntington Beach and RBF held on 12/1/14. 90% design submittal received on 2/5/15. Notice of Intent (NOI) posted at County Clerk and State Clearinghouse on 1/29/15. Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) posted on Mesa Water® website and distributed to agencies/parties identified on distribution list on 1/29/15. Permit applications submitted to the regulatory agencies, legal notice posted in the Daily Pilot, and hard copy of IS/MND posted at front counter on 1/29/15 for public review. The

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

review period concluded 2/27/15. Three comment letters received. Prepared written responses to the comments and held public hearing at the Board Meeting on 4/9/15. 90% design submittal comments sent back to RBF on 3/26/15. Additional questions from RBF analyzed in coordination with the City of Huntington Beach and comments provided to RBF on 6/1/15. Progress meeting with RBF and City of Huntington Beach held 7/1/15. RBF is working with the regulatory agencies on obtaining encroachment permits and/or certifications. On 7/16/15 the consultant is scheduled to meet with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to discuss initial comments and obtain additional directions. Due to USACE staff shortage the permit is anticipated to be issued in March 2016. RBF is working with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) on drafting the 401 Water Quality Certification for the project. The 401 Water Quality Certification was issued on 9/29/15. Comments to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) draft agreement were sent by RBF on 7/17/15. The CDFW permit is predicted to be issued in late October, 2015. In mid-June, 2015 RBF provided response to the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) comments. The comments from CCC were received in the late July, 2015 and the permit is expected to be issued in mid-November, 2015. Permit from Caltrans obtained on August 17, 2015. 100% design package submitted on 7/21/15. Scour protection evaluation and recommendations submitted on 11/5/15. The CDFW should be issued by 12/18/15. The USACE has indicated that their permit should be issued in mid-January 2016. The Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) has been updated by Michael Baker (former RBF) to reflect the USACE's process and submitted to Mesa Water® for review on 1/8/16. Once the HMMP is revised and approved (1/19/16) it will be forward to all agencies, including Coastal Commission. Draft 1602 Streambed Permit obtained on 12/18/15. Final 1602 Streambed Permit pending CDFW will be issued while HMMP is accepted. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' 404 permit received on 2/10/16. Revised HMMP sent to CCC for review and approval. Project is pending CCC's approval at an upcoming hearing. On 2/29/16 a meeting with Fletcher Jones Motorcars, City of Newport Beach, MBI (former RBF), and City of Huntington Beach was held to discuss issues associated with proposed construction activities. Per request of CCC a dewatering plan was prepared and submitted for approval. It is anticipated that the project will be presented to the CCC on the July 2016 public hearing in San Diego. Final bid set will be completed once all permits are issued. Project in progress (5/5/16).

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

Project Title: Well Automation and Rehabilitation

File No.: MC 2101

Description: Rehabilitate all clear water wells and add remote control SCADA capabilities

Status: Design: RFP for Design Services released on 7/1/2014. Pre-proposal meeting held on 7/9/2014. 6 proposals received on 7/28/2014; interviewed 3 shortlisted firms on 8/6/2014. Recommendation to award contract to Carollo Engineers approved by E&O on 8/19/2014; Board approval requested on 9/11/2014. Project kickoff meeting held on 10/1/2014. Draft Permit plan received for review on 11/3/14. . Well Standardization workshop held on 11/21/14 to align on site layouts, chemical tank sizing, and instrumentation. Draft Preliminary Design Report received on 1/12/2015, and reviewed in workshops on January 21, 2015 and February 3, 2015, and March 3, 2015. 60% received on April 13, 2015. Meeting to resolve review comments scheduled for April 27, 2015.

Construction Management (CM) Services: Released and RFP for CM services on December 30, 2014 Preproposal meeting held on January 12, 2015. Four (4) proposals were received on January 26, 2015. Three proposers were interviewed on February 4, 2015, and the recommended Contract with RBF was approved by the Board on March 12, 2015.

60% design received on April 13, 2015. General 60% Design Review workshop held on April 27, 2015 and electrical/instrumentation review workshop held on May 11, 2015. Working on optimizing construction sequence. Electrical design workshop scheduled for June 25, 2015. 90% design submittal received on July 15, 2015. Engineer's Estimate of probable cost at 90% is approximately \$10.1. Workshop to review and address 90% comments held on July 29, 2015. Contractor prequalification package sent to eight (8) General Contractors on July 18, 2015. Four prequalification applications were received on August 17, 2015. 100% Design received on September 16, 2015. Notice Inviting Sealed Bids was released to four prequalified contractors on October 5, 2015. Job Walks were conducted on October 13, 2015 for prequalified Prime Contractors and on November 3, 2015. Addenda and clarifications in response to bidder's questions have been issued. Bid opening was extended to January 7, 2016 to allow for recent changes for new Well 9 layout. Four bids were received on January 7, 2016. An action item to award a contract to the lowest bidder was approved by the Engineering and Operations Committee on January 16, 2016 and by the full Board on February 11, 2016. Notice to proceed was sent on April 4, 2016. Preconstruction meeting held on April 12, 2016. Three Requests for Information have been received from the Contractor and reviewed by the Design Engineer. The Contractor's Schedule of Values and Submittal Schedule were received on May 9, 2016.

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT
May 2016

Project Title: Two New Wells

File No.: MC 2158

Description: New wells and real estate services to identify and acquire property

Status: Change Order to Well Rehabilitation and Automation approved at January 20, 2015 E&O to retain Carollo and subconsultant Geotechnical Consultants Inc. (GTC) to provide typical well site layout and hydrogeological investigation to identify promising locations for two new 2,000-gpm clear wells. Met with Real Estate Professionals on February 2, 2015, to discuss scope of work for well site property identification and acquisition. Met with OCWD Chief Hydrogeologist on March 24, 2015, to identify study area for new well sites. Gave Notice to Proceed to Real Estate company on May 4, 2015, and provided consultant report on preferred well site property characteristics. Real Estate consultant developed an advertisement postcard to describe the type of property needed, and sent it to over 1,000 commercial and industrial property owners in the study area. Three sites have been presented for evaluation. Also met with the Laguna Beach County Water District (LBCWD) Manager of Engineering & Operations on October 13, 2015, to discuss development of a jointly-owned well on property in Fountain Valley owned by LBCWD. An offer to purchase one site was presented to the property owner on November 16, 2016. The owner has not responded, and the offer time frame has expired. An offer for a different property was prepared and presented on January 6, 2016. Owner has decided to lease the property rather than selling. A third property is being evaluated by staff and OCWD for potential interference from the OCWD mid-basin injection. Travel time analysis results from OCWD showed that the property is inside the six month travel time window. A meeting was held on February 22, 2016, with OCWD and DDW to discuss the travel time analysis, and DDW determined that it would not issue a permit for a drinking water well at the site. A meeting with the City of Santa Ana Water Department was held to discuss the possibility of a jointly-owned well on a City of Santa Ana-owned site. An offer to purchase was presented to a property owner for an underutilized portion of a property on May 4, 2016. A response from the owner is expected by May 18, 2016.

Project Title: Well 9B

File No.: MC 2229

Description: Replacement of Well 9

Status: Kickoff meeting was held on January 22, 2016. Well design criteria for depth, expected screen intervals, and expected pumping rate were established. Well design decisions include a continuous diameter of 18 inches with stainless steel casing and wire wrapped screen. Detailed design is in process. Draft bid documents reviewed and returned on March 25, 2016. Bid documents were released on April 22, 2016. The pre-bid site meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2016.

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

Project Title: MWRF Parking Project

File No.: MC 2052

Description: Conduct parking layout design

Status: Parking study prepared by Onward Engineering in November 2013. The Board approved alternative # 3 Parking Along the MWRF Frontage on Gisler Ave. on 3/15/2014. RFP for the parking design in consultants' review (11/6/14). RFP sent out to consultants 11/25/14. Proposals due 12/19/14. Interview with three consultants held on 1/7/15. Recommendation brought to January E and O for consideration of approval and will be brought to the Board on 2/12/15 for approval. Project approved 2/12/15. Kick-off meeting held on 2/19/15. Design in progress. 30% design submittal submitted 3/23/15. Staff met with C.J. Segerstrom and discussed concept and details of the proposed parking layout. Segerstrom verbally approved the project. City of Costa Mesa approved the concept and currently consultant is evaluating the landscape requirements with the City of Costa Mesa. E and O Committee accepted the conceptual design and provided comments on 5/19/15. The condition approval from Segerstrom received on 6/29/15. Staff is working with the designer (CivilSource), Mesa Water's attorney, and City of Costa Mesa on addressing Segerstrom's comments. Staff is reviewing the Initial Study/Summary of Findings Report received on 8/3/15. Staff has addressed all Segerstrom's requests included in their 6/29/15 letter and prepared a response letter. Approved construction plans were received from the City of Costa Mesa on 12/29/15. The final bid package completed 3/15/16. Encroachment Permit Application submitted to the City on 3/6/16. Hold Harmless Agreement for the Installation of Off-Site Parking Improvements within Public Right-of-Way received on 5/4/16. Permit anticipated to be issued by May 20, 2016. (5/5/16)

Project Title: OC 44 Import Stations Flow Meter Replacement

File No.: MC 2088

Description: Provide design for replacement of Flow Meters in the OC 44 Import Turnouts No. TO-2, TO-4, and TO-5

Status: Task Order No. RBF-3 for preparing construction drawings, technical specifications, and bid documents for the flow meter replacements in the import turnouts No. TO-2, TO-4, and TO-5 issued to RBF Consulting on July 23, 2014. . 75% plans and specifications submitted for review 10/7/2014. Staff is reviewing the submittal (10/9/2014). The review comments returned back to the consultant 11/4/14. Design of new pressure gauges, pressure transmitters, and related improvements were added to the scope in December 2014. Design in progress. 90% design package submitted for review on 2/20/15. Working with consultant and CLA-VAL on reviewing the design (3/6/15). 100% design submitted on 3/10/15. The comments to the 100% design sent back to the designer 4/30/15. Final design package received on 5/27/15. Mesa Water® staff is reviewing the package and working with RBF on addressing final

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

comments 6/8/15. Project solicited 6/17/15 and pre-bid walk held on 6/29/15. Bids opened on 7/10/15. Staff recommended that the Board of Directors award a contract to the lowest bidder Jamison Engineering. E & O Committee recommended approval on 7/21/15. Board approved the project on 8/10/15. The kick-off meeting held on 8/17/15. Staff has finalized the contract and issued Notice to Proceed on 9/16/15. Project team is in the submittal review process. Progress meetings held on 2/2/16 and 3/2/16. Construction begun on April 4, 2016. The Contactor replaced 16" valve in Santa Ana Pressure Reducing Station on April 6, 2016 and meters in TO-2, TO-4, and TO-5 on April 29, 2016. Contractor continues working on remaining tasks of the project including programming valve controls and integrating with SCADA. (5/5/16)

Project Title: Reservoir 1 and 2 Improvements

File No.: MC 2111

Description: Installation of gas flow meters at Reservoir 1 and Reservoir 2,

Status: Staff prepared Scope of Work and sent a request for quote to on-call Engineering consultant (As-Needed Design Consultant) to provide:

Design and specifications for installation of gas meters for Res 1, Res 2, and Well 5. Evaluation and design of Res 1 Air Vent Covers and Roof Membrane, and design for replacement of Res 1 silencers. Request for quote sent out 3/5/15. Brady Engineers selected for the project. Kickoff meeting held on 4/7/15. 30% design package submitted 5/27/15. Designer is working on addressing the review comments and continuing the design (7/10/15). Well 5 gas meter moved into the well automation and rehabilitation project scope of work. 100% Design Package received on 8/4/15. Meeting with the designer to discuss reviewers' comments held on 8/10/15. The designer is revising the design and final bid package is anticipated to be submitted on 9/4/15. The final bid package submitted on 10/12/15. Staff has reviewed the submittal (11/5/15). Project advertised for bid on April 6, 2016. Pre-Bid meeting held on 4/20/16. Bids are due on 5/17/16. (5/5/16)

Project Title: Pipeline Testing Program

File No.: MC 2112

Description: Implement Resolution No. 1442 Replacement of Assets to annually perform non-destructive testing of 1% of the distribution system, and destructive testing of segments that are shown to have less than 70% of original wall thickness by non-destructive testing.

Status: Identifying segments for FY 2015 non-destructive testing and arranging for excavation and removal of segments that tested below 70% remaining wall thickness in FY2014 non-destructive testing. Released a Request for Proposal for a consultant to administer the program and develop standard operating processes on February 6, 2015. Three proposals were received on February 26, 2015, and interviews conducted

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

on March 4, 2015. A contract with RBF was approved by the Board on April 9, 2015. Kickoff meeting held on April 21, 2015. Project status meeting held on June 8, 2015. Draft deliverable of prioritization of asbestos concrete pipe (ACP) for non-destructive testing received on June 26, 2015; updated draft received on August 7, 2015. Draft deliverable with recommendations for non-destructive testing technologies for metallic pipe received on August 7, 2015. Draft evaluation of destructive testing laboratories and tests received on August 21, 2015; final report received on September 16, 2015. Echologics performed non-destructive testing of 3 miles of ACP from July 13-17, 2015. Draft report received on August 14, 2015; final report received on September 1, 2015. Based on the Echologics reports from 2013 and 2015, ten ACP segments were selected for sampling and destructive testing. Three ferrous material pipelines with a history of repairs were also selected for field sampling and destructive testing. Draft bid documents for field sampling received on October 16, 2015. Final bid documents were released to three on-call contractors on November 23, 2015, for bids. Pre-bid meeting was held on December 7, 2015 and attended by all three of the bidders. Three bids were received on December 16, 2015. All bids exceeded the budget and the General Manager's signing authority. An action item to approve a contract with the low bidder was approved by the Engineering and Operations Committee on January 19, 2016, and by the Board on February 11, 2016. Notice to Proceed with field sampling was given on March 7, 2016. An encroachment permit from the City of Costa Mesa was received on April 25, 2016. Field sampling began on May 16, 2016, and is expected to be complete by July 1, 2016. Samples will be sent to MEIC Lab in Portland, Oregon, for destructive testing. Lab results, including estimates of remaining useful life, are expected in August 2016.

Project Title: MWRF Outreach Center

File No.: MC 2147

Description: Report on the feasibility of reconfiguring and potentially expanding the functional uses of the MWRF Operations and Administration Building to include a multi-purpose room and educational forum.

Status: Mesa Water® is coordinating with IBI Group (designer) on the feasibility of implementing an education and outreach center at the MWRF. Kick-off meeting was held on 6/1/2015. Program Requirement Questionnaire meetings were held on 6/9/2015 and 6/17/15. Program Report delivered to Mesa Water® for review on 7/7/2015. 60% design concepts are scheduled for submittal on 08/14/15. 100% concept design received on 09/29/15. Virtual rendering received on 10/6/15. Concept designs presented at the October Board Workshop. A follow-up planning session was held at the November Engineering and Operations Committee Meeting to capture the Board's input on evaluating reduced cost options and to revisit the existing Boardroom improvements. Board directed staff to develop a scope of work to evaluate scaled down layouts of the MWRF Outreach Center and revisit expanded layouts of the main Boardroom. Engineering and Operations Committee approved a contract amendment

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

with IBI Group to reflect the revised scope of work. Item was approved by the Board February 11, 2016. IBI Group performed an inspection of the existing Boardroom on February 25, 2016 and are in the process of developing conceptual layouts. Staff review and meeting occurred on April 11, 2016. IBI Group is in the process of finalizing cost estimates.

Project Title: Mesa Water® Main Office HVAC Study

File No.: MC 2171

Description: Evaluate the existing HVAC system and provide recommendations for improved efficiency and operations of the system.

Status: Mesa Water® has contracted with Goss Engineering Inc. to perform this study. Kick off meeting was held January 13, 2016. Goss Engineering performed a field survey of both main campus buildings over the course of three days. Draft report with results and recommendations is currently being reviewed by staff.

Project Title: Reservoirs 1 & 2 Pumps, Controls, and Chemical System Assessment Project

File No.: MC 2173

Description: Evaluate the existing Pumps, Controls, and Chemical Systems at Reservoirs 1 & 2. The project includes lab testing of pump efficiency, physical assessment of pumps and pipework, assessment of the existing control system, and preliminary design of a chemical dosing system. Recommendations for improved efficiency and operations of the system will be included in a final report.

Status: Mesa Water® has contracted with Hazen & Sawyer to perform this study. Kick off meeting was held September 30, 2015. The consultant performed a field survey of both Reservoirs 1 & 2 over two days. A preliminary outline of technical memo 1 was provided on December 11, 2015. Initial data requests were responded to by December 7, 2015, with follow up responses provided on January 7, 2016 (SCADA Data) and February 9, 2016 (Jockey Pump Data). Pump testing scope of work has been reviewed by Mesa Water® and returned to the Consultant for revision. TM-1 has been reviewed by staff and returned to the consultant. Pump extraction plan and bid documents are to be submitted by the Consultant the week of May 23, 2016.

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

Project Title: South Coast Plaza Pipeline Repair

File No.: MC 2218

Description: Water main repair due to failed 12" main.

Status: On October 19, 2015, a 50-year old waterline near the western end of the interior roadway of South Coast Plaza at Bristol Street (across from Anton Boulevard), ruptured and impacted the soils supporting the pavement. At the rupture location the pavement caved-in resulting in a deep sinkhole (approximately 30 feet by 20 feet at the ground surface) undermining a South California Edison (SCE) high voltage (12 KVA) duct bank and roadway infrastructure (sidewalk, light poles, palm trees, etc.). Beyond the immediate location of the waterline rupture, the asphaltic concrete pavement was uplifted under the water pressure and the base course was filled with water, soaking the upper parts of the clay subgrade. Mesa Water® used its on-call contractor and consulting resources to facilitate the work. The project was completed on Thursday, October 29, 2015. Staff reviewed the contractors' invoicing and recommended approval. The Finance Committee approved payment of the invoices on 12/21/15 and the claim was submitted to ACWA JPIA. Staff is coordinating with ACWA JPIA and providing all information necessary to evaluate the claim. (5/5/16)

Project Title: Other Agency Project Coordination

File No.:

Description: Median construction in Placentia Ave. between Wilson St. and Adams Ave.

Status: Mesa Water® 16" main runs 5' East of the street center line. Mesa Water® is coordinating with designer and City on design of necessary protection and root barrier for the water main. 85% design plans received on (12/22/14). Plan review in progress 1/8/15. Plan review comments sent to the City 2/6/15. Mesa Water® provided update comments to landscaping plans on 6/17/15. Mesa Water® continuing to coordinate with the City, Stivers and Associates, Inc., and City Designer on layout of project. Revised final plans submitted for Mesa Water® review on 11/19/15. Staff reviewed the submittal in cooperation with Mesa Water® landscape consultant (Stivers Associates) and submitted comments to the City Designer on 12/28/15. The comments have been accepted by the Designer and Final Plans were submitted on 2/9/16. New comments sent to the designer on 2/18/16. The revised final plans received on 3/21/16 and approved by Mesa Water® on 3/31/16. (5/5/16)

MESA WATER® AND OTHER AGENCY PROJECTS STATUS REPORT

May 2016

Project Title: Other Agency Project Coordination

File No.:

Description: Water main relocation in New Hampshire Ave. due to Greenville-Banning Channel Improvements by County of Orange.

Status: Relocation of 12" water main is required due to enlarged box culvert on Greenville-Banning Channel. Task Order No. RBF-2 issued to RBF Consulting on June 24, 2014 for design of the relocation. Mesa Water® is coordinating with County of Orange and RBF. Design in progress. Hydraulic analysis received from RBF 9/12/14 indicated that taking the New Hampshire pipeline out of service during construction of the Greenville-Banning Channel will have no adverse impacts on the distribution system (8/9/14). Mesa Water® is working with OCFCD on finalizing the cooperative agreement. E&O Committee approved the agreement 11/18/14. Pipeline relocation design package submitted to Mesa Water® on 1/31/15. Mesa Water® is coordinating with OCFCD and consultant to address final comments. Plans and specifications for the pipeline relocation completed 3/3/15 and forwarded to OCFCD on 3/5/15. Project was delayed until Spring of 2016. Attended the pre-construction meeting on 7/21/15. Construction meeting with OCFCD's contractor Sukut Construction held on 4/7/16. Staff is coordinating with OCFCD and Sukut on project schedule. (5/5/16)

Water Quality Call Report

April 2016

Date: 4/4/2016
Source: phone
Address: east side Costa Mesa
Description: Customer noticed chlorine odor got stronger lately but only notices the chlorine when filling the tub. The water doesn't taste good and is hard. She is interested in seeing the water quality data.
Outcome: Assured customer that we check the distribution system at least twice a week for chlorine residual levels and they continue to be in normal range. Showed customer how to view the latest WQ Report on Mesa Water's website and explained about the tables. Customer was satisfied.

Date: 4/5/2016
Source: phone/visit
Address: 2721 Sandpiper Dr.
Description: Customer noticed cloudy water for about the last 2 weeks and says that the water tastes brackish.
Outcome: During field visit, sample was collected at the outside hose bib and the kitchen faucet. Chlorine, pH, and temperature readings were within normal range. Water was clear in both samples. Staff tasted water with customer and customer commented that the water does not taste brackish, it just tastes different. Explained to customer that taste and odor can be very subjective depending on the person's sensitivity. Customer was satisfied.

Date: 4/6/2016
Source: phone/visit
Address: 1724 Minorca Pl
Description: Customer asked if we have more air in our water lately. He's been experiencing spurts of air from plumbing fixtures over the last month.

Outcome: During site visit, water sample was drawn from outside hose bib and no air was observed. Customer has small water spout in kitchen area which has an instant water heater and filter system. Customer said that the air issue is with the water spout only. Staff observed trapped air coming out of the small water spout and customer was advised to contact the manufacturer or a plumber.

Date: 4/11/2016
Source: phone
Address: 825 Center Street #J255
Description: Customer noticed chlorine odor in the water and wants to see water quality data.

Outcome: Assured customer that we check the distribution system at least twice a week for chlorine residual levels and they continue to be in normal range. Showed customer how to view the latest WQ Report on Mesa Water's website and explained about the tables. She asked for information on home treatment devices and was e-mailed the link to the state's Residential Home Treatment Devices. She responded saying that she has confidence our water meets state and federal regulations but is concerned that drinking water regulations are out of date and do not adequately protect the American public's health in the face of an increasingly toxic environment.

Date: 4/22/2016
Source: phone
Address: Huntington Beach
Description: Customer concerned about the odor in the water.

Outcome: Informed resident to contact Huntington Beach Water Department.

Date: 4/22/2016
Source: email/phone
Address: 435 Fair Drive Apt 2
Description: Customer emailed on Thursday evening (4/21) with concerns about the odor in the water and wanted to know if it's safe to use.
Outcome: Contacted customer and he stated that they are no longer are experiencing the odor in the water. They will call back if the odor returns.

Date: 4/22/2016
Source: phone
Address: 1786 Hummingbird Dr.
Description: Customer noticed the water does not taste "good" recently.
Outcome: Assured customer that the water continues to meet state and federal drinking water standards. Explained to her that some people are more sensitive to taste than others and may notice the change in source water. Mesa Water® utilizes multiple sources to meet system demands. She was satisfied with the call and will check back if she has other concerns.

Date: 4/25/2016
Source: Phone/visit
Address: 1600 Adams (Fitness Center)
Description: Manager of the fitness center called with concerns of a sulfur taste in water.
Outcome: Collected water sample from outside the building closest to the meter. No sulfur odor was detected in the water and pH, chlorine, and temperature were within normal range. The manager was not present during the site visit but spoke with the receptionist who was not aware of any problems with the water. Staff met with the manager two days later and both of them tasted the water from the drinking fountain and it tasted pleasant. Manager stated the complaint initiated from one of his customer who had the same concern 3 years ago.

Date: 4/27/2016

Source: Phone

Address: 3164 Manistee

Description: Customer has notices black granules in the aerators during the past couple of months. Customer has a treatment system in the kitchen.

Outcome: Spoke with customer and he has not noticed the black granules at the front hose bib. It appears the home water treatment device may be the cause of the black granules. Customer maintains the unit himself. Staff recommended that customer replace filter cartridges as necessary and follow manufacturer's maintenance schedule. Customer was advised to flush his pipes to remove the black granules. Staff offered to stop by and check the water at the front hose bib but customer declined saying he will check it and call if he has further questions.

**MESA WATER DISTRICT
COMMITTEE POLICY & RESOLUTION
REVIEW OR DEVELOPMENT**

ENGINEERING & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Policy Assignments for 2016

Policy Name	Resolution	Date Adopted	Revision Schedule	Next Review
Rules and Regulations for Water Services (will include review of meter capacity charges and easement procedures)	Resolution No. 1470	02/09/16	Review and update as needed	
Standard Specifications and Drawings	Resolution No. 1449	08/14/14	Review and update as needed	

Water Operations Status Report
July 1, 2015 - April 30, 2016

Operations Department Status Report	Wk Unit	Plan Days	Act Days	Plan Qty	Act Qty	Plan Cost	Actual Cost
01 - HYDRANTS							
WD-0101 - HYDRANT MAINTENANCE	HYDRANTS	140	87	2807	1792	\$120,120	\$57,169
WD-0102 - HYDRANT PAINTING	HYDRANTS	11	5	351	100	\$8,786	\$4,131
WD-0103 - HYDRANT REPAIR	HYDRANTS	43	31	50	38	\$46,271	\$22,762
WD-0104 - DAMAGED HYDRANT	HYDRANTS	0	20	0	7	\$0	\$16,660
	Program 01 TOTAL	194	143			\$175,177	\$100,722
02 - VALVES							
WD-0201 - DISTRIBUTION VALVE MAINTENANCE	VALVES	99	109	2132	2260	\$86,485	\$74,242
WD-0202 - NIGHT VALVE MAINTENANCE	VALVES	0	2	0	27	\$0	\$1,125
WD-0203 - REPLACE VALVE BOX	BOXES	21	3	25	3	\$19,584	\$2,151
	Program 02 TOTAL	120	114			\$106,069	\$77,518
03 - METERS							
WD-0301 - NEW METER INSTALLATION	METERS	8	15	42	175	\$21,553	\$51,618
WD-0302 - RAISE REPLACE METER BOX	BOXES	25	10	63	24	\$26,610	\$7,037
WD-0303 - METER LEAK INVESTIGATE/REPAIR	INV/REP	16	27	126	180	\$15,467	\$23,688
WD-0304 - METER FLOW TEST	TESTS	0	0	4	0	\$704	\$0
WD-0305 - ANGLE STOP/BALL VALVE REPLACE	REPLACE	50	52	99	106	\$50,777	\$36,431
WD-0306 - LARGE METER TEST/REPAIR - C	TESTS	8	9	50	41	\$17,405	\$6,585
	Program 03 TOTAL	107	113			\$132,516	\$125,359
04 - MAIN LINES							
WD-0401 - MAIN LINE REPAIR	REPAIRS	60	68	10	12	\$57,247	\$47,707
WD-0402 - AIR VAC MAINTENANCE/REPAIR	AIR VACS	13	21	66	155	\$12,034	\$13,258
WD-0404 - DEAD END FLUSHING	LOCATIONS	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0
	Program 04 TOTAL	73	89			\$69,281	\$60,965
05 - SERVICE LINES							
WD-0501 - SERVICE LINE REPAIR	REPAIRS	46	35	12	15	\$45,602	\$25,129
WD-0502 - ABANDON SERVICE LINE	SERVICES	12	0	4	0	\$9,585	\$0
WD-0503 - RELOCATE SERVICE LINE	SERVICES	6	0	2	1	\$6,493	\$104
	Program 05 TOTAL	64	35			\$61,680	\$25,233
06 - CAPITAL							
CAP AV - CAPITAL AIR VACUUM REPLACE	AIR VACS	2	1	4	1	\$3,302	\$612
CAP BI - CAPITAL BYPASS & METER INSTALL	REPLACE	21	3	2	1	\$30,202	\$6,843
CAP FH - CAPITAL HYDRANT UPGRADE	HYDRANTS	231	93	33	14	\$310,976	\$105,839
CAP HV - CAPITAL HYDRANT VALVE	VALVES	16	56	6	9	\$23,681	\$47,749
CAP LM - CAPITAL LARGE METERS	METERS	45	34	180	114	\$176,794	\$66,138
CAP MV - CAPITAL MAINLINE VALVE REPLACE	VALVES	193	174	42	27	\$273,743	\$148,255
CAP SL - CAPITAL SERVICE LINE REPLACE	SERVICES	21	59	8	13	\$24,968	\$43,346
CAP SM - CAPITAL SMALL METERS	METERS	116	78	1157	795	\$172,765	\$93,843
CAP SS - CAPITAL SAMPLE STATION REPLACE	STATIONS	9	21	9	5	\$9,788	\$14,494
	Program 06 TOTAL	654	519			\$1,026,219	\$527,119
	TOTAL					\$1,570,942	\$916,916



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Phil Lauri, P.E., Assistant General Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: Municipal Water District of Orange County Activities Update

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only. No action is recommended at this time.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal #1: Provide a safe, abundant, and reliable water supply.
Goal #3: Be financially responsible and transparent.
Goal #7: Actively participate in regional water issues.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION/DISCUSSION

None.

DISCUSSION

This report on Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) issues is intended to brief the Committee and Board on activities relevant to Mesa Water District (Mesa Water®). The first section, "On-Going Issues", is a status update on current studies, reports, and/or policy work groups that staff are involved with. The second section, "Last Month's Issues", is a report on noteworthy items that were covered at the last month's MWDOC Board and Committee meetings. The last section, "Upcoming Issues", is a preview of new and forthcoming issues important to Mesa Water®. This format is intended to keep the Committee and Board informed about current and future items at MWDOC in order to provide direction to staff and its MWDOC representatives in a timely manner, if required.

ON-GOING ISSUES

MWDOC's RATE STUDY AND BUDGET

The MWDOC Board discussed the two remaining budget options; 1a and 1b and directed staff to pursue option 1a. Option 1a is a Ten-Year Rolling Average with Peaking; Fixed Revenue (38%) would be assessed on two charges:

1. Standby Charge – Demand Costs based on most recent Ten-Year (2006-2015) Rolling Average of Treated water sales (covers 22% of the Treatment Costs).
2. Demand Charge – Peaking charge to recover the on-demand costs of service based on agency's 3-year Maximum Cubic Feet per Second (cfs) (covers 16% of the Treatment Costs).



SWRCB DROUGHT REGULATIONS

On April 20, 2016, the SWRCB held a conference call with selected agencies to gather input on what the agencies would like to see modified or removed from the current emergency regulations. There was no discussion on the current declaration that is slated to expire October, 2016. MWDOC General Manager indicated that MWD will come out of allocations, the MWD Board will vote on this issue next month. The Associate General Manager provided an update to the group that currently 10,000 CFS could be pumped from the Delta, but due to the restrictions, 8,000 CFS is going to the Ocean and only 2,000 CFS is going to the State Water Project

MWDOC DROUGHT ALLOCATIONS AND WATER USAGE TRACKING

MWDOC and its member agencies continue to do well, no agency is over their allocations. 45,000 ac-ft. of surplus water has been offered to OCWD. As of April, OCWD has taken 27,000 ac-ft., leaving 18,000 ac-ft. available. OCWD is currently taking MWD water; if they stay at their planned deliveries they will take approx. 40,000 ac-ft. this fiscal year. The 45,000 ac-ft. offered had an additional estimated 7,000 ac-ft. of "buffer". If demands continue to stay low MWDOC may offer additional water to OCWD.

INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN (IRP) PHASE 2

MET continues to work on the IRP Phase 2 – Resource Implementation Policies, specifically: how (and in what manner) should MET create a diversified portfolio, what MET programs and policies should be changed to help meet resource targets, and what are the associated local and regional responsibilities.

MET staff provided a list of policy issues for the second phase of the IRP discussion:

- Regional and retail water supply reliability roles and responsibilities
- Future water conservation program and approach
- Local resources development and regional role
- Storage management goals and operational framework
- Transfers and exchanges approach

In response to the above list, MWDOC submitted the following list of suggested issues the Board should address:

- Encourage the further development of local resources within the Metropolitan service area
- Increase the water in Metropolitan's regional storage accounts
- Encourage sustainable groundwater management
- Optimize imported supplies
- Development a financially sustainable approach to water conservation



MWD's PROPOSED BIENNIAL BUDGET AND RATES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016/17 AND 2017/18

In March, Metropolitan held its Budget Board Workshop #3 and #4 which included an extensive review of the key components of the proposed budget and rates, a review of MET's Cost of Service report, MET's Capital Improvement Program, and proposed Fixed Treatment Charge. Metropolitan's proposed revenue requirements will total \$1.575 billion and \$1.574 billion for FY 2016/17 and 2017/18 respectively. To meet revenue requirements MET staff is proposing overall water rates and charges to increase 4.0% for both 2017 and 2018.

LAST MONTH'S ISSUES

AWARD OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT FOR DOHENY SLANT WELL AND MOBILE TEST FACILITY DECOMMISSIONING.

The General Manager was authorized to contract with Geoscience Support Services in the amount of \$185,122 for the Doheny Slant Well and Mobil Test Facility Decommissioning work. The work is being funded from the 2008 Doheny Desal Project.

ORANGE COUNTY'S DROUGHT PERFORMANCE – JANUARY 2016 REPORT

Orange County monthly % Savings vs. SWRCB Target: For the month of February 2016, Orange County retail water agencies reported total water savings of 9.11% (note: this is compared to February 2013 water usage). This falls short of Orange County's monthly conservation target of 22.00% by 12.89%. The cumulative savings for the eight months into the State Board's mandatory regulations total 22.28% vs. the Orange County Savings Goal of 22%.

O.C. Historical Water Usage: 2015-16 O.C. Water Demand is projected to be the lowest since 1983, using less than 500,000 A.F.

Annual Precipitation: Year-to-date annual rainfall for Orange County is at 7.46", 5" below the yearly average. The 5-year rainfall deficit is 28.88" (2011-12 to present).

MWDOC Actual Imported Water Usage vs. Imported Allocation Target: The total actual imported water usage for July through February totals 104,719 AF, which is 25,194 AF below the estimated allocation target (this includes OCWD purchases).

Based on actual imported water usage, Orange County is tracking below its allocation target. This is mainly due to retail agencies responding to the State Board's mandatory reduction targets. As a result of these savings, the MWDOC Board authorized the General Manager to offer member agencies a "secondary assignment" of unused imported water from MET's Allocation with appropriate conditions.

The current offer, as of March 28, 2016, of 'secondary assignment' unused imported water to OCWD is: 10,000 AF of untreated water, which will bring the total secondary assignment amount of 45,000 AF.



UPCOMING ISSUES

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

ATTACHMENTS

None.



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Phil Lauri, P.E., Assistant General Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: Orange County Water District Activities Update

RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only. No action is recommended at this time.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal #1: Provide a safe, abundant, and reliable water supply.
Goal #3: Be financially responsible and transparent.
Goal #7: Actively participate in regional water issues.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION/DISCUSSION

None.

DISCUSSION

This report on Orange County Water District (OCWD) issues is intended to brief the Committee and Board on activities relevant to Mesa Water District (Mesa Water®). The first section, "On-Going Issues", is a status update on current studies, reports, and/or policy work groups that staff are involved with. The second section, "Last Month's Issues", is a report on noteworthy items that were covered at the last month's OCWD Board and Committee meetings. The last section, "Upcoming Issues", is a preview of new and forthcoming issues important to Mesa Water®. This format is intended to keep the Committee and Board informed about current and future items at OCWD in order to provide direction to staff and its OCWD representatives in a timely manner, if required.

ON-GOING ISSUES

PROPOSED FY2016-17 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET

OCWD staff gave a presentation to the Water Issues Committee of seventeen (17) projects that are in the current budget request for FY 2016/17. The requested budget is \$32.9M. The projects are in various stages of progress, up to and including projects in construction. All long-term projects are funded by Debt Service, Grants, and Pay-Go. GWRS Final Expansion will come to the Board for final consideration in the summer of 2016.

LAST MONTH'S ISSUES

A PUBLIC HEARING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 REPLENISHMENT ASSESSMENTS, BASIN EQUITY ASSESSMENT, AND BASIN PRODUCTION PERCENTAGE



The following resolutions were discussed and adopted:

Resolution A – Finding and Determining a Groundwater Basin Overdraft Exists. Resolution passed 9-0.

Resolution B – Levying Replenishment Assessment for Water Produced during Water Year 2016-17. Resolution passed 8-1 (Director Dewane dissented).

Resolution C – Levying Additional Replenishment Assessment and Fixed Charge Replenishment Assessment for Water Produced during Water Year 2016-17. Resolution passed 8-1 (Director Dewane dissented).

Resolution D – Establish the Basin Production Percentage, Production Limitation and Determining the Need and Desirability to Levy Basin Equity Assessments and Amount Thereof. A Basin Pumping Percentage of 75% and a Replenishment Assessment of \$402 passed 8-1 (Director Dewane dissented).

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2016-17 BUDGET

The 2016-17 proposed Budget was approved 7-0 (Director Sheldon and Director Nguyen absent).

MID-BASIN INJECTION PROJECT:

A resolution approving the Mid-Basin Injection Environmental Impact Report was approved with the following actions:

- 1) Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project
- 2) Adopting the Findings of Fact and the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program
- 3) Approve the Project and establish the Project budget of \$33,000,000
- 4) Receive and File Revised Engineer's Report
- 5) Authorize filing of Notice of Determination

Passed 8-0 (Director Sheldon absent).

UPCOMING ISSUES

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

There are no support materials for this item.

REPORTS AND INFORMATION ITEMS:

12. REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER:

REPORTS AND INFORMATION ITEMS:

13. DIRECTORS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS:



*Dedicated to
Satisfying our Community's
Water Needs*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Engineering and Operations Committee
FROM: Stacie Sheek, Customer Services Manager
DATE: May 17, 2016
SUBJECT: Elite Customer Service

RECOMMENDATION

This is an information item only

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal #5: Attract and retain skilled employees.
Goal #6: Provide outstanding customer service.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION/DISCUSSION

None.

BACKGROUND

Mesa Water® is seeking to create an optimal level of customer service. The selected consultant will evaluate the current level of customer service to establish a baseline that is used to identify enhancements in delivering effective customer service standards. Based on that evaluation, appropriate training will be developed and provided to Mesa Water's Customer Services staff members to optimize customer service performance. The Consultant will develop standard customer service monitoring metrics to ensure that the desired level of customer service continues to be provided along with the development of a post audit process to ensure the optimal level of customer service is maintained in the future. The Consultant will also be tasked with conducting a post evaluation of Mesa Water's customer service performance level using the Customer Service Metrics Program.

DISCUSSION

Mesa Water® is requesting proposals from experienced firms to provide professional services for "Elite Customer Service Training". A request for proposals was issued on April 7, 2016. Proposals are scheduled for receipt on May 16, 2016. Results of the selection process and recommendation will be brought to a future Engineering and Operations Committee.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

\$50,000 is budgeted in fiscal year 2017, no funds have been spent to date.

ATTACHMENTS

None.