PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

6:30 P.M. WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 13, 2019

Agenda

6:30  1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

6:35  2. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

6:40  3. CONSENT CALENDAR

   Items appearing on the Consent Calendar are considered routine and will be adopted in one motion, except for any item removed for separate consideration elsewhere on the agenda. The President will ask the Board and the audience for requests to remove these items.

   A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD JANUARY 9, 2019

   B. APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION OF JANUARY 9 2019 DISBURSEMENTS PAID IN FEBRUARY 2019 IN ACCORDANCE WITH RESOLUTION 2013-9 (DISBURSEMENTS SIGNED BY DIRECTOR SOLOMON, PATRICK WALTER, AND RAYLENE COLLINS)

   C. FINANCIAL REPORTS FOR: INCOME AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS JANUARY 2019 REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES, BALANCE SHEETS

   D. APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR STEVE JORDAN TO THE BAY AREA WATER SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION AGENCY

   E. APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR STEVE JORDAN TO THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA REGIONAL WATER SYSTEM FINANCING AUTHORITY

6:45  4. RESOLUTION 2019-01 APPOINTMENT OF KATHLEEN KNOPOFF TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND OATH OF OFFICE

       ACTION

7:00  5. AUTHORIZATION FOR DIRECTOR JORDAN TO ATTEND WATERNOW ALLIANCE SUMMIT MARCH 27-29, 2019 IN AUSTIN, TEXAS

       DISCUSSION/ACTION

7:05  6. RESOLUTION 2019-02 APPRECIATION FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEE GINNY TO

       ACTION

7:10  7. RESOLUTION 2019-03 APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE WATER SUPPLY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WHOLESALE CUSTOMERS IN ALAMEDA COUNTY, SAN MATEO COUNTY, AND SANTA CLARA COUNTY

       DISCUSSION/ACTION

7:20  8. CONSIDER AND ADOPT RESERVE POLICY

       DISCUSSION/ACTION

7:25  9. CONSIDER AND ADOPT DEBT POLICY

       DISCUSSION/ACTION

7:30  10. APPROVE CONTRACT WITH JDH CORROSION CONSULTANTS, INC. FOR AN AMOUNT OF $19,670 FOR CORROSIVITY SOILS TESTING THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT

       DISCUSSION/ACTION
PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 13, 2018

7:40 11. CONSIDER AND APPROVE PAKPOUR CONSULTING FEE INCREASE
DISCUSSION/ACTION

8:00 12. ENGINEER’S REPORT
UPDATE

8:05 13. ATTORNEY’S REPORT
UPDATE

8:10 14. MANAGER’S REPORT
UPDATE/DISCUSSION
A. FIELD REPORT
B. CUSTOMER COMMUNICATIONS

8:30 15. DIRECTORS’ REPORT
UPDATE/DISCUSSION
A. BAWSCA, ACWA/JPIA, SCVWD, AND OTHER AGENCY ISSUES
B. DIRECTORS’ COMMENTS

8:40 16. CONSIDER RESCHEDULING MAY 8, 2019 BOARD MEETING DATE AND TIME
DISCUSSION/ACTION

8:45 17. AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH 13, 2019 BOARD MEETING
DISCUSSION

8:50 18. CLOSED SESSION
Public Employee Performance Evaluation Pursuant to California
Government Code Section 54957(b)(1), Conference with Labor Negotiator
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6
Agency designated representative: Board Chair
Title/Unrepresented Employee: General Manager/Patrick Walter

9:25 19. RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION
ACTION
Public Employee Performance Evaluation
Title: General Manager
Amendment to General Manager’s Employment Agreement

9:30 20. ADJOURNMENT

ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES
In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the
District Secretary at 650-948-1217. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the District to make reasonable arrangements
to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

Copies of all agenda reports and supporting data are available for inspection at the District office, 26375 Fremont Road, Los Altos Hills,
CA. A complete agenda and minutes can also be found on the District’s website: http://www.purissimawater.org.
1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE President Evans called the regular meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the District office.

Directors Present: President Evans, Directors Ernie Solomon, Brian Holtz, and Steve Jordan

Staff Present: Patrick Walter, General Manager; Phil Witt, Assistant General Manager, Joubin Pakpour, Engineer, Pakpour Engineering; Dave Gehrig, Attorney, Hanson Bridgett (teleconference); and Ray Collins, Office Manager/District Secretary

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC Customer and Co-Chair of the Town of Los Altos Hills Emergency Communications Committee (ECC) Dru Anderson, and Town resident Allan Epstein attended.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR It was moved by Director Solomon, seconded by Director Holtz, to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion approved unanimously– voice vote.

4. FOLLOW UP ON RECOMMENDATION TO FILL OPEN BOARD SEAT The District Secretary reported that Supervisor Simitian’s office received the District’s correspondence and his staff will review the Board’s recommendation.

5. CONSIDER APPROVING PURCHASE OF ECHOShore-DX PERMANENT LEAK MONITORING SYSTEM FROM ECHOLEGICS FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $35,000 It was moved by Director Jordan, seconded by Director Holtz, to approve the purchase of Echoshore-DX Permanent Leak Monitoring System for a sum not to exceed $35,000. The District’s Procurement Policy was waived to allow for the award to Echologics, because the product is unique in the marketplace and meets the District’s requirements for high quality acoustic and correlation sensors, is installed above ground in a fire hydrant cap, and uses cellular communications. Motion approved unanimously – voice vote

6. CONSIDER APPROVING PURCHASE OF 2 PAX MIXERS FROM PAX WATER TECHNOLOGIES TO BE INSTALLED AT LA CRESTA T2 AND MCCANN T2 FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $45,000. This item was removed from the agenda. No action taken.

7. JOINT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM WITH LOS ALTOS HILLS COUNTY FIRE DISTRICT (LAHCFD). The Engineer explained that the field flow data was calibrated with the hydraulic model, another hydrant flow analysis will be performed. Draft results should be ready for the Board’s next meeting on February 13, 2019.

8. ENGINEER’S REPORT

   DISTRICT HYDRAULIC MODEL CALIBRATION UPDATE The Engineer explained that an error with a pipe size was corrected in the model. With that correction, both Zone 3 and Zone 4 field flow tests correlated to the model.

9. APPROVAL FOR MOODY RD. MAIN INSTALLATION NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF $150,000 The GM explained that DACO Construction’s bid of $147,108 was the lowest of two bids for replacing 563 feet of 8” main between Old Snakey and Moody Springs. It was moved by Director Jordan, seconded by Director Holtz, to approve DACO Construction to construct the project for an amount not to exceed $150,000. The District’s Procurement Policy requiring a formal bidding process was waived, because of the urgency of the project and because two informal bids were received which resulted in a lower bid.
in sufficient competition under the circumstances. Motion approved unanimously – voice vote.

10. ATTORNEY’S REPORT The Attorney reported that California SB998 Discontinuation of residential water service: Urban and community water systems does not apply the District. However, the District’s current procedures comply with the new law. He also reported on a recent appellate court case expanding the applicability of prevailing wage laws.

11. MANAGER’S REPORT

A. FIELD REPORT
   ➢ Page Mill & Lupine. Four valves are being replaced which do not completely close and a valve will be added to give better redundancy options for the Page Mill/ Lupine area.
   ➢ Southfork. DACO finished the new main installation on Southfork. The main is tied in and finished.
   ➢ Beacons. Seventy Beacons were installed last month. An inventory of 300 will be installed.
   ➢ Main Pump Station Panel. Staff and our electrician met with RESA Power to review quality issues with the starter panel board. The pump 2 panel board is being repaired and should be ready for install at the end of January.

Main Breaks
   ➢ Appaloosa. On Dec. 21st a leak occurred on a 6” cast iron (CI) main. The leak was a full circle crack and was repaired with full circle clamp. There was no public or private property damage.
   ➢ Elena Rd. On Dec. 25th at about 4:00am a leak occurred on an 8” CI main. Given the magnitude of the leak and the holidays, crew was able to postpone the leak repair since the affected customers were out of town. DACO Construction fixed the main 2 days later which saved on overtime expenses. The leak was a split along the pipe nearly full length. It was repaired with a new stick of 8” ductile iron (DI) pipe. The roadway was undermined creating a rough surface and the pathway across the street was washed away. The asphalt repair is expected to be about $80,000. Because of the importance of repairing the asphalt as soon as possible, the Board discussed making the Elena Rd. main replacement a priority and asked the Engineer to begin the survey and design.

B. CUSTOMER COMMUNICATIONS None to Report

12. DIRECTORS’ REPORT

A. BAWSCA, ACWA/JPIA, SCVWD, AND OTHER AGENCY ISSUES None to report.

B. DIRECTORS’ COMMENTS Director Jordan reported on issues concerning the ECC’s proposed radio antenna at La Cresta Tank site. A subcommittee comprised of Directors Solomon and Jordan was formed to discuss the District’s Operating lease.

13. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FEBRUARY 13, 2019 BOARD MEETING
Operating Lease with the Town
SFPUC and BAWSCA Water Service Agreement resolution
Reserve Policy
Debt Policy
Review and Succession planning
Appointment of new Director

14. ADJOURNMENT It was moved by Director Holtz, seconded by Director Jordan, to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 p.m. Motion approved unanimously – voice vote.
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - 01

APPOINTING KATHLEEN L. KNOPOFF
TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT

WHEREAS, there is an open seat on the Board of Directors (Board) due to the expiration of the term of a director and no person filing a declaration of candidacy for that position; and

WHEREAS, Section 10515 of the California Elections Code authorizes the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors (County) to fill by appointment an open seat occurring in the Office of Director; and

WHEREAS, the District notified the County elections officer and posted a notice of open seat on the door of the District's administrative office, NextDoor, and the District's website, and sent the notice in a newsletter to all customers seeking applications from interested and eligible members of the public to fill the Board vacancy; and

WHEREAS, the District received statements of interest from three candidates; and

WHEREAS, the three candidates were interviewed by an advisory committee of the District; and

WHEREAS, the Board has complied with all of the applicable statutory procedures for filling the open seat; and

WHEREAS, after considering all information from the candidates, the advisory committee and the Board concluded that Kathleen L. Knopoff is the best candidate to fill the open seat due to her relevant training and experience in management consulting and organizational behavior, relevant experience with local agencies on climate resiliency efforts, and ability to offer a fresh point of view on District issues; and

WHEREAS, on December 12, 2018, the District recommended that the County appoint Kathleen L. Knopoff to the Board and, on January 14, 2019 the County advised the District that the District Board could appoint Kathleen L. Knopoff directly.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Purissima Hills Water District appoints Kathleen L. Knopoff to the office of Director of the Purissima Hills Water District to fill the open seat.

Passed and adopted this 13th day of February, 2019 by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

President, Board of Directors
Purissima Hills Water District

ATTEST:

Secretary of the District
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-02

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR EMPLOYEE GINNY TO

PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Ms. Ginny To was hired by the Purissima Hills Water District (the District) as a Billing Manager in 1999; and

WHEREAS, Ms. To was instrumental in performing a variety of business functions for the District, including managing billing and customer accounts, answering customer inquiries, preparing and tracking work orders, assisting in audit preparations, and supporting the General Manager; and

WHEREAS, Ms. To established a friendly and approachable presence with customers and staff of the District, and was well regarded in the community; and

WHEREAS, during her 19-year tenure with the District, Ms. To served the District with professionalism, loyalty, and dedication; and

WHEREAS, in view of Ms. To’s retirement on April 30, 2018, the members of this Board of Directors desire to confer special recognition upon her for her contributions to the District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution is included with Minutes of this meeting, and the Board of Directors and the staff of the District shall send a suitable copy of this Resolution to the family of Ginny To with great sympathy for their loss and deep gratitude and appreciation for all she contributed to the Purissima Hills Water District and the community at large.

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Purissima Hills Water District this 13th of February 2019.

__________________________
President of the Board of Directors
Purissima Hills Water District

ATTEST:

__________________________
Secretary of the Board
January 11, 2019

Patrick Walter  
General Manager  
Purissima Hills Water District  
26375 Fremont Road  
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

Subject: Request for Billing Rate Increase

Dear Patrick,

We last adjusted our billing rates with the District close to 1½ years ago on July 1, 2017. Pakpour Consulting Group is looking forward to continuing our relationship with the District. In 2017, the Mid-Peninsula Water District issued a request for qualifications for the design of capital improvement projects, 10 firms provided qualifications, and the average billing rates for the 10 firms is listed for your reference. **Even after the requested adjustment our rates are substantially lower than the industry average for 2017.** We respectfully requested an adjustment to our billing rates effective March 1, 2019 as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Industry Average (2017)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
<td>$190/hour</td>
<td>$230/hour</td>
<td>$220/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>$165/hour</td>
<td>$192/hour</td>
<td>$190/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Engineer (New Position)</td>
<td>$145/hour</td>
<td>$169/hour</td>
<td>$170/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>$145/hour</td>
<td>$169/hour</td>
<td>$150/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer</td>
<td>$130/hour</td>
<td>$145/hour</td>
<td>$135/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$115/hour</td>
<td>$105/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistance</td>
<td>$70/hour</td>
<td>$81/hour</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retainer</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsultant Mark Up</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District will be notified of the job titles of new Pakpour Consulting Group staff within 30 days of hiring. A 5% direct expense fee will be added to the above rates for mileage, telephone, plots, prints, etc. Sub-consultants will be billed at cost plus 10%. We do not bill for travel time during inspection services, only time spent onsite. Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 224-7717.

Very truly yours,

Pakpour Consulting Group, Inc.

[Signature]

Joubin Pakpour, P.E.  
President
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>West Yost Associates</th>
<th>Mott McDonald</th>
<th>NV5</th>
<th>BKF</th>
<th>MNS</th>
<th>Carollo</th>
<th>Freyer &amp; Laureta</th>
<th>Hydro Science</th>
<th>Schaff &amp; Wheeler</th>
<th>Bellecci</th>
<th>Average 10 Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District / Principal Engineer</td>
<td>$229</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$176</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$176</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Consultant Mark Up</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Average 10 Firms</th>
<th>PCG (Current 07/01/17)</th>
<th>PCG (Proposed 03/01/19)</th>
<th>$ Under Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District / Principal Engineer</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>-$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>-$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>-$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Engineer</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>-$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>-$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>-$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Consultant Mark Up</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

This Amendment No. 1 is made as of June 14, 2017, with respect to that certain Professional Services Agreement ("Agreement") by and between the Purissima Hills Water District ("District") and Pakpour Consulting Group ("Pakpour") dated June 30, 2015.

RECATIALS

A. The District and Pakpour entered into the Agreement on June 30, 2015.

B. The District now desires to amend Exhibit A to the Agreement to increase Pakpour’s consulting fees.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of their mutual covenants, the District and Pakpour do hereby agree as follows:

1. Exhibit A of the Agreement is amended as of July 1, 2017, to adopt the fee schedule attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

3. Agreement. Other than the amendment set forth above, no other provision of the Agreement is amended and all other provisions of the Agreement and Amendments thereto, not in conflict, are in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Amendment No. 1 as of the date set forth above.

PURISSIMA HILLS WATER DISTRICT:  PAKPOUR CONSULTING GROUP, INC.:  

Brian Holtz, Board President  

BY: Joubin Pakpour, President

ATTEST:  

General Manager
EXHIBIT A

May 01, 2017

Patrick Walter
General Manager
Purissima Hills Water District
26375 Fremont Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

Subject: Request for Billing Rate Increase

Dear Patrick,

We last adjusted our billing rates with the District close to 2 years ago on July 1, 2015. Pakpour Consulting Group is looking forward to continuing our relationship with the District. The Mid-Peninsula Water District issued a request for qualifications for the design of capital improvement projects, 10 firms provided qualifications, and the average billing rates for the 10 firms is listed for your reference. **Even after the requested adjustment our rates are substantially lower than the industry average.** We respectfully requested an adjustment to our billing rates effective July 1, 2017 as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Engineer</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Industry Average</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joubin Pakpour, P.E.</td>
<td>$155 / hour</td>
<td>$230 / hour</td>
<td>$190 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Ushiro P.E.</td>
<td>$140 / hour</td>
<td>$192 / hour</td>
<td>$165 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Wurzitsch, P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin O'Toole, P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Laurie, P.E.</td>
<td>$125 / hour</td>
<td>$169 / hour</td>
<td>$145 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Fung, E.I.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feraydoo Farsi, E.I.T.</td>
<td>$115 / hour</td>
<td>$145 / hour</td>
<td>$130 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Kwon</td>
<td>$60 / hour</td>
<td>$81 / hour</td>
<td>$70 / hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retainer</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subconsultant Mark Up</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District will be notified of the job titles of new Pakpour Consulting Group staff within 30 days of hiring. A 5% direct expense fee will be added to the above rates for mileage, telephone, plots, prints, etc. Sub-consultants will be billed at cost plus 10%, reduced from 15%. We do not bill for travel time during inspection services, only time spent onsite. Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 224-7717.

Very truly yours,

Pakpour Consulting Group, Inc.

Joubin Pakpour, P.E.
President
November 29, 2018

Pakpour Consulting Group, Inc.
5776 Stoneridge Mall Rd
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Attention: Mr. Joubin Pakpour, P.E.
Principal Engineer

Subject: RFP for Corrosion Engineering Services
System-Wide Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for Purissima Hills Water District
Los Altos Hills, CA

Dear Mr. Pakpour,

Pursuant to your request, we are pleased to provide this scope of services and fee estimate to provide the requested corrosion engineering services for the above referenced project. JDH Corrosion Consultants, Inc. (JDH) has performed these same services for other cities and water agencies; thus, we wish to assure you that we have the experience necessary to perform the services described herein for a project of this size and complexity in a timely and professional manner.

Purpose

The purpose for this corrosivity evaluation is to develop a comprehensive data base related to the corrosion potential resulting from the soils throughout the Purissima Hills Water District (PHWD) to ductile, cast iron, dielectric coated steel, mortar-coated steel and asbestos-cement (AC) water mains. This information will allow JDH better understand the risk of failure for the subject water mains resulting from corrosion.

Our anticipated scope of work will include the following:

Scope of Services

Soil Corrosivity Survey & Report

1. Measure in-situ soil resistivities at 60 select locations within the PHWD service area using the Wenner 4-pin technique. In-situ soil resistivities will be measured to a depth of 15 feet and Barnes Layer calculations will be utilized to determine the variation of resistivity versus soil depth for soil depths of 0 – 2.5’, 2.5’ – 5’, 5’ – 7.5’, 7.5’ – 10’, 10’ – 15’.
2. Review the chemical analysis of soil samples collected as a part of previous pipeline projects, if they are available. These analyses should include pH, chlorides, sulfates, resistivity @ 100% saturation, and Redox potential using ASTM test methods as detailed in the table below. Barnes Layer calculations should have been made to determine the corrosion characteristics of the soils at pipe depth for each pipeline project.

The chemical analysis for the soil samples should be in accordance with the applicable specifications as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical Analysis</th>
<th>ASTM Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chlorides</td>
<td>D4327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>D4972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity</td>
<td>G57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>D4327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redox Potential</td>
<td>D1498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Evaluate the results of the chemical analysis and in-situ soil resistivities and determine the corrosivity classification of the soils throughout PHWD with respect to buried steel, dielectric coated steel, ductile/cast iron, cement mortar coated steel pipelines and AC pipelines.

4. Collect sub-meter GPS coordinates for each in-situ soil resistivity location. This information will be used in the preparation of the corrosivity classification map that will be prepared as a part of the report.

5. Prepare a soil corrosivity report which will include a map of PHWD that contains locations of in-situ soil resistivities, prior soil sampling locations for chemical analysis if they are available, and is color coded to reflect the corrosivity classification of the soils throughout PHWD service areas. This is intended to be a useful document and one that can be added onto in the future as more pipeline construction projects are constructed in the PHWD service area. One of the purposes of this report will be to provide information useful for each district’s asset management program by providing important information related to prioritizing pipeline replacement and/or remediation.

Testing Protocol

We have estimated the number of in-situ soil resistivity measurements for this evaluation (approx. 60) based on our review of the layout of the water district service areas as well as our experience with other cities and water agencies working on similar projects. This degree of scrutiny will provide a broad, strong basis of soil corrosivity information throughout each district which will be useful in determining areas of concern for future pipeline installations as well as for existing water mains. Our goal, if chemical analysis is available, will be to determine not only which areas of PHWD are corrosive, but, why.

For instance, elevated concentrations of water soluble chloride ions and sulfate ions are corrosive to steel, dielectric coated steel, ductile and cast iron pipelines. These aggressive anions in conjunction with a high ground water table and soil types such as clay soils make the soils especially corrosive. If the soils are sandier and dryer, they tend to be more benign from a corrosion standpoint. This type of analysis will be included in our report.
Deliverables

1. Engineering report containing data received from search of previous pipeline projects along with data from the in-situ soil resistivities taken throughout PHWD along with a map showing locations for the resistivity data and chemical analysis data. This report will also contain an analysis of this data.

2. AutoCAD and/or pdf of maps which characterize the soil corrosivity throughout PHWD.


4. Prepare a set of corrosion control guidelines for use and implementation by PHWD as well as engineering consultants and contractors working for PHWD on all future pipeline projects. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide standardization of corrosion control measures to aid in the long-term operation and maintenance of the corrosion monitoring and cathodic protection systems for PHWD water transmission pipelines as well as domestic and fire water distribution pipeline systems.

Information Needed from PHWD

In order for us to perform a complete analysis of the risks related to corrosion to the metallic pipelines throughout PHWD and to develop corrosion control guidelines for various types of pipe we will require the following information for review:

1. Leak repair reports for pipelines throughout PHWD for the past 20 years or more.
2. A detailed inventory of all pipe types and sizes throughout PHWD.
3. The AWWA Specification and year of installation for all pipelines throughout PHWD.
4. All previous corrosion studies and cathodic protection project documents.
5. AutoCAD shape files for PHWD for mapping of results.

Fees, Terms and Conditions

JDH Corrosion Consultants, Inc. will be pleased to provide the above-described corrosion engineering services for the Not-to-Exceed fees* as detailed on the attached manpower spreadsheet:

*These estimated fees include all engineering, laboratory and support services necessary to complete the work. Charges will accrue in accordance with our standard fee schedule attached. Invoices will be submitted for work performed on a monthly basis. All invoices are due and payable within 30 days of receipt.
System-Wide Soil Corrosivity Evaluation
Purissima Hills Water District

We thank you for the opportunity to provide you with this proposal and look forward to the being of service to the Pakpour Consulting Group, Inc. on this project. If you have any questions concerning this proposal or if we can be of any additional assistance, please feel free to contact us at (925) 927-6630.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Darby Howard, Jr.

J. Darby Howard, Jr., P.E.
JDH CORROSION CONSULTANTS, INC.
Principal

Sergio Maciel P.E.
JDH CORROSION CONSULTANTS, INC.
Project Engineer
### Purissima Hills Water District - System Wide In-Situ Resistance Measurements

#### Soil Corrosivity Study

**MANPOWER COST ESTIMATE**

**Rev. 11/29/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Sr. Project Engineer</th>
<th>Design Engineer</th>
<th>Supervising Engineer</th>
<th>Project Engineer</th>
<th>Corrosion Technician</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1 - 4-Pin Testing (60 Locations)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4-Pin Testing and GPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2 - Cathodic Protection Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Input Survey Data, Data Review &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create City Wide Corrosion Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ProjectTotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,670.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corrosion Protection of Ductile Iron Pipe

Current District standards specify the use of ductile iron pipe (DIP) due to its superior performance during seismic events and hydraulic characteristics. Typical design life for DIP is approximately 100 years but can significantly decrease when subject to corrosion. If protected against corrosion DIP will last indefinitely, only needing to be replaced due to capacity increase with a larger diameter pipe. The Districts are interested in investigating the different types of corrosion protection. For the purposes of this memo, we are defining two types of corrosion protection.

Passive: This type of protection includes using thicker walled pipe and / or the addition of zinc coating. This would be the “bury and forget about it” scenario.

Active: This type of protection includes binding the pipes together and installing sacrificial anodes and test station at roughly 1,000 ft increments. It also requires monitoring the test stations every 5 years.

Current District standards call for class 350 DIP with no zinc or cathodic protection.

Thicker Classes of Ductile Iron Pipe – History and Purpose

DIP comes in different pipe thicknesses ranging from class 350 to class 53. The outside diameter is consistent between different classes of pipe, the thickness decreases internal diameter. All classes of DIP are rated to 350 psi. It was verified by speaking with pipe manufactures that the only purpose for the thicker wall is to protect against corrosion, it does not increase pipe performance against seismic events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Wall Thickness (in)</th>
<th>Outside Diameter (in)</th>
<th>Inside Diameter (in) **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Double Cement Lined ** Includes 1/16” cement lining thickness
Zinc Coating – History and Purpose

Zinc coating has been utilized for external corrosion control of metallic pipe for over 50 years. Initially started in Europe this concept has migrated to the United States with manufacturers furnishing the Zinc coated pipe for over 25 years. Most US manufactures of DIP now offer zinc coating as an option. The process consists of adding a layer of 200 g/m² arc-applied or paint-applied, pure zinc coating (ISO 8179), under the standard bituminous (asphalt) coating (AWWA C-151). The zinc coating forms a protective zinc oxide dielectric barrier that cut off corrosion on the surface of the pipe.

Additional Hydraulic Loss Due to Thicker Wall Diameter

Using the Hazen-Williams equation we can calculate the head loss due to friction given a length of pipe.

\[
S_{\text{psi per foot}} = \frac{P_l}{L} = \frac{4.52 \ Q^{1.852}}{C^{1.852} \ d^{4.8704}}
\]

Where “S” friction resistance per foot of pipe, “L” is the length of pipe in feet, “Q” is flow rate in gallons per minute, “C” is pipe roughness coefficient and “d” is inside diameter of the pipe in inches.

In the example below, we used a flow of 200 gpm in an 8-inch DIP for a length of 2,000 ft.

**Class 350 DIP**

| Length “L” | 2,000 lf |
| Flow Rate “Q” | 200 gpm |
| Roughness Coefficient “C” | 140 |
| Inside Diameter “d” | 8.42 inches |
| Calculated Pressure Loss | 0.55 psi |

**Class 53 DIP**

| Length “L” | 2,000 lf |
| Flow Rate “Q” | 200 gpm |
| Roughness Coefficient “C” | 140 |
| Inside Diameter “d” | 8.08 inches |
| Calculated Pressure Loss | 0.67 psi |

In the above example, there is an increase of 21.8% in pressure loss due to use of thicker pipe.
Cost – Passive Cathodic Protection

We contacted R&B Company and received the following prices. They also stated that they only carry class 50 and 53 zinc coated in stock all other pipes have a lead time of minimum 4 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8-inch Ductile Iron Pipe, cost per linear ft based on 2,000 lf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost for 2,000 lf 8-inch Ductile Iron Pipe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Asphalt Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Asphalt Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Asphalt Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Asphalt Coated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost – Active Cathodic Protection

Active cathodic protection requires bonding each section of pipe and installing sacrificial anodes and test station every 1,000 ft. We developed the following cost based on recently received bids plus 20% contingency.

Number of pipe segments (2,000 ft divided by 18 ft) = 112
Cost per bond connection = $50
Cost of bonding for 2,000 lf = $5,600
Cost for three test station / sacrificial anodes = $6,000

Total cost for active cathodic protection for 2,000 lf of 8-inch DIP is $11,600


**Cost – Passive and Active Cathodic Protection Cost Comparison**

PCG completed a cost comparison on an assumed project with 2,000 LF of pipe, 4 tees, 10 bends, 8 gate valves, 4 hydrants, and 20 water services. Installation and Backfill, Gate Valves, FH Assemblies, Service Connections, Mobilization, Traffic Control, and Surface Restoration costs are based on the average unit cost of all bidders’ average of Mezes and Arthur Water Main Improvements Project, dated June 2017. Unit cost for materials, (Pipes, Retrained Gaskets, Megalugs, Tees and Bends) were provided by R&B Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIP – Class 350</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Current District Standard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot; Pipe</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$21.43</td>
<td>$42,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrained Gasket</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$108.32</td>
<td>$12,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation and Back Fill</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$378.97</td>
<td>$757,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ Fittings (Megalugs)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$67.52</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$329.85</td>
<td>$1,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bends</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$179.15</td>
<td>$1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Valve Assembly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,725.00</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH Assemblies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$14,700.00</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8&quot; Service Assembly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization, Traffic Control, Surface Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$36,738.00</td>
<td>$36,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,009,541</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Class Cost Difference in Cost from Current District Standards %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Difference in Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350 Asphalt Coated</td>
<td>$1,009,541</td>
<td>Current Standard</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Asphalt Coated</td>
<td>$1,009,541</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>00.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
<td>$1,017,181</td>
<td>$7,640</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Asphalt Coated</td>
<td>$1,023,161</td>
<td>$13,620</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
<td>$1,030,541</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Asphalt Coated</td>
<td>$1,028,221</td>
<td>$18,680</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Asphalt &amp; Zinc Coated</td>
<td>$1,031,881</td>
<td>$22,340</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded 350 Asphalt Coated with Test Stations</td>
<td>$1,021,141</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Are Other Water Purveyors Doing?

- **City of San Bruno**: Class 350, Non-Zinc coated
- **San Jose Water Company**: Class 50, Zinc Coated
- **Coastside County Water District**: Class 52, Zinc Coated
- **City of San Francisco**: Class 52, Zinc Coated and Active Cathodic Protection
- **EBMUD**: All metal new pipe is installed with Active Cathodic Protection, in addition EBMUD is retrofitting (bonding) each joint of already installed metal pipes over 20-inches and installing cathodic protection.

### Installation of Zinc Coated Pipe

According to the Ductile Iron Pipe Research Association (DIPRA), no special handling or installation procedures are required for zinc coated DIP. Minor scratches in zinc coating do not need to be repaired due to the self-healing nature of zinc coating. Larger area should be repaired by field application of zinc-rich paint, in accordance with ISO 8179.
**Conclusion and Recommendation**

If properly sized and designed to withstand seismic events (with restrained joints), DIP can last virtually forever if protected against corrosion.

Passive corrosion protection, consisting of thicker pipe and/or application of zinc coating does provide adequate corrosion protection, however the **District will not know when the DIP will fail due to corrosion.** It is a “bury and forget” concept which can work well for decades however at some point will fail.

With the additional cost of higher class, zinc coated DIP and degraded hydraulic performance of thicker pipe it is our recommendation to pursue active cathodic protection. The cost of initial installation is comparable to passive protection, however active protection of DIP allows the District to monitor the health of its pipes at all times and adjust the protection (with large size anodes) as needed. There is also an on-going monitoring costs in the range of $10,000 every three ~ five years (for MPWD size district) which will need to be budgeted. **It is our recommendation to add active cathodic protection to the District standards.**

**Purissima Hills Water District** – This memo was discussed with General Manager Patrick Walter and Assistant General Manager Phil Witt on January 28, 2019. They both agreed with the recommendations of this memo and directed the District’s specifications to be modified to include active corrosion protection.

**Westborough Water District** – This memo was discussed with the General Manager, Darryl Barrow, and Field Supervisor Johnny Kennedy on January 25, 2019. They both agreed with the recommendations of this memo and directed the District’s specifications to be modified to include active corrosion protection.

**Mid-Peninsula Water District** – Joubin has spoken to Rene and Tammy okay with concept, need to discuss **with district staff at our next gathering, before or after El Camino review meeting on February 6th**.
Memorandum

TO: Water Management Representatives

FROM: Nicole Sandkulla and Allison Schutte

DATE: December 22, 2018

RE: Approval of Seven Amendments to the Water Supply Agreement and the Amended and Restated Water Supply Agreement with San Francisco.

As previously reported to you and the City/Agency Managers, Legal Counsels, and BAWSCA Board of Directors, on December 11th, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) approved the Amended and Restated Water Supply Agreement (WSA), incorporating the seven amendments negotiated this Fall and including other discrete updates and revisions.

Please find attached the following documents to facilitate the Wholesale Customer approval of the Amended and Restated Water Supply Agreement:

1. Draft resolution "Approving Amendments to the Water Supply Agreement Between the City and County of San Francisco and Wholesale Customers in Alameda County, San Mateo County, and Santa Clara County;"
2. Draft language to insert into your agency's staff report to accompany the resolution;
3. Draft slide presentation summarizing amendment changes;
4. Seven individual amendments, redlined against 2009 WSA;
5. Amended and Restated WSA, redlined against 2009 WSA; and
6. Clean Amended and Restated WSA.

The accompanying resolution and staff report language have been drafted to minimize the amount of editing needed for them to be suitable for your agency. However, you should feel free to modify them so that they are consistent with your agency's preferred format. In particular, the heading at the top of the first page and the layout of the material following the last “Resolved” clause may need to be tailored to match your traditional practice.

Please note, as this resolution approves the amendments and contemplates the execution of an Amended and Restated Agreement, the third resolved clause authorizes execution of the Amended and Restated WSA. This clause refers to both the head of your governing body and the senior executive as being authorized to sign the Agreement. This will need your attention and decision as you must select one of those positions and delete the other. The choice is up to each agency and should reflect your agency's standard practice.

In addition, the resolution refers to the delegation of authority that each agency provided to BAWSCA in Summer 2018 in order to negotiate these amendments. Please insert the corresponding date and resolution number for your agency's action.

Furthermore, in an effort to further facilitate staff presentation of this action item, we have provided some language to be included in a staff report as well as some sample slides describing the
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amendments. In the event you wish to have more information, or would like Nicole Sandkulla, BAWSCA CEO, to assist in presenting this item to your governing body, please do not hesitate to contact her.

BAWSCA has requested that each member agencies’ governing board approve these amendments no later than March 31, 2019. We understand that Cal Water and Stanford have different internal procedures and we will follow up with them separately. Once a majority of Wholesale Customers’ governing boards have approved the amendments, we will prepare and distribute personalized Amended and Restated WSA signature pages for each agency, listing your agency’s authorized signer, attester, and legal counsel. Once each agency, and SFPUC, have executed signature pages, we will circulate final electronic and hard copies of the fully executed Amended and Restated WSA.

Please do not hesitate to contact Nicole Sandkulla with any questions. If your legal counsel has any questions about the draft resolutions, they should feel free to contact Allison Schutte.

Thank you for your assistance.

Nicole Sandkulla, CEO

Allison C. Schutte

nsandkulla@bawsca.org
650-349-3000

aschutte@hansonbridgett.com
415-995-5823

cc: Tom Francis, BAWSCA, Sr. Water Resources Engineer
Nicole Witt, Hanson Bridgett

Attachments:

1. Draft resolution "Approving Amendments to the Water Supply Agreement Between the City and County of San Francisco and Wholesale Customers in Alameda County, San Mateo County, and Santa Clara County;"
2. Draft language to insert into your agency’s staff report to accompany the resolution;
3. Draft slide presentation summarizing amendment changes;
4. Seven individual amendments, redlined against 2009 WSA;
5. Amended and Restated WSA, redlined against 2009 WSA; and
6. Clean Amended and Restated WSA.