



## CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Karen Dean, Chair of the Resources & Infrastructure Committee, hereby calls a Special Meeting pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956. The Special Meeting will be held: **Monday, October 2, 2023, 2:00 PM, 1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428.** The purpose of Special Meeting is to discuss or transact the following business:

### NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

#### CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

**Monday, October 2, 2023**

**2:00 PM**

**1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428**

**In person at:**

**Cambria Veterans' Memorial Hall  
1000 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428**

**AND via Zoom at:**

**Please click the link below to join the webinar:**

**Please click the link below to join the webinar:**

**[https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87606686384?](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87606686384?pwd=ajdUNXpkRnpRREVDOGHNNjZYbDV1dz09)**

**[pwd=ajdUNXpkRnpRREVDOGHNNjZYbDV1dz09](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87606686384?pwd=ajdUNXpkRnpRREVDOGHNNjZYbDV1dz09)**

**Passcode: 624729**

**Or One tap mobile:**

**US: +16694449171,,87606686384# or +16699006833,,87606686384#**

**Or Telephone:**

**Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):**

**US: +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346**

**248 7799 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053**

**or +1 507 473 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 929**

**205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325**

**Webinar ID: 876 0668 6384**

**International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87606686384?pwd=ajdUNXpkRnpRREVDOGHNNjZYbDV1dz09>**

Copies of the staff reports or other documentation relating to each item of business referred to on the agenda are on file in the CCSD Administration Office, available for public inspection during District business hours. The agenda and agenda packets are also available on the CCSD website at <https://www.cambriacsd.org/>. In compliance with the

Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or if you need the agenda or other documents in the agenda packet provided in an alternative format, contact the Confidential Administrative Assistant at 805-927-6223 at least 48 hours before the meeting to ensure that reasonable arrangements can be made. The Confidential Administrative Assistant will answer any questions regarding the agenda.

**1. OPENING**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ESTABLISH QUORUM**

**C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

**D. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

Any Committee Member may make an announcement, report briefly on his or her activities, or ask a question for clarification.

**E. UTILITIES DEPARTMENT MANAGER'S REPORT**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

Members of the public may now address the Board on any item on its agenda today.

**3. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Consideration to Approve the September 11, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

**4. REGULAR BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion Regarding CIP List Review Format
- B. Discussion and Consideration to Choose Dates to Schedule a Joint Finance Committee and Resources & Infrastructure Committee Special Meeting in October 2023
- C. Discussion of Final Ad Hoc Committee Report on Water Supply and Long Term Off Stream Storage and Approve Recommendation to Forward the Water Supply and Long Term Off Stream Storage Ad Hoc Report to the Board

**5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**6. ADJOURN**

**RESOURCES & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE**

REGULAR MEETING  
Monday, September 11, 2023 - 2:00 PM  
1000 Main Street Cambria, CA 93428

**MINUTES****1. OPENING****A. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Dean called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

**B. ESTABLISH QUORUM**

A quorum was established.

Committee members present: Karen Dean, Juli Amodei, James Webb, Mark Meeks and Steve Siebuhr.

Committee members absent: Derrik Williams.

Staff present: General Manager Matthew McElhenie, Utilities Department Manager/District Engineer Ray Dienzo, Program Analyst Tristan Reaper, and Confidential Administrative Assistant Haley Dodson.

**C. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

No report.

**D. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

No reports.

**E. DISTRICT ENGINEER REPORT**

Mr. Dienzo highlighted various items in the Engineers Report.

Mr. Dienzo announced that this was his last R&I Committee meeting, and that James Green will be taking over the position of Utilities Manager, and that Mr. Green and Mr. Reaper will be involved with this committee moving forward.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public Comment:

Chair Dean read written public comment from Aleta Francis and Linda Prentice.

### 3. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Consideration to Approve the August 14, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Webb moved to approve the minutes.

Committee Member Amodei seconded the motion.

The motion was approved: 4-Ayes; 0-Nays; 0-Abstain; 1 Absent (Williams)

### 4. REGULAR BUSINESS

- A. Discussion of Final Ad Hoc Committee Report on Brine Waste Disposal Options and Approve Recommendation to Forward the Brine Waste Disposal Ad Hoc Report to the Board

Committee Member Webb summarized the past brine waste options that had been previously considered, and possible other options such as combining the needs of San Simeon and Cambria, the San Simeon Outfall, deep well injection, and Zero Liquid Discharge.

Public comment was received from Tina Dickason regarding the Flag Lot pipeline.

Committee Member Webb moved to have the AdHoc Committee continue to research options and wait for results of the Zero Liquid Discharge Pilot project.

Committee Member Siebuhr seconded the motion.

The motion was approved: 4-Ayes; 0-Nays; 0-Abstain; 1-Absent (Williams)

- B. Discussion and Consideration of a Recommendation to the CCSD Board of Directors Regarding Approval of an Agreement for Consultant Services with Miller Drilling Company for an Upgrade to San Simeon Well 3 Pump

Program Analyst Tristan Reaper presented the proposed project for the repair of the San Simeon Well 3, he discussed the options of replacing the well pump with a new submersible pump or rebuilding and reinstalling the current pump, as well as video inspecting the well casing. Committee members asked many questions regarding the well casing, if cost to upgrade the motor and electrical was included in the estimate, the brand of pump, age of current pump, life expectancy of the new pump, etc.

It was requested that this item be brought back to a future meeting with more detail.

### 5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chairperson Dean asked for any future agenda items. None suggested.

**6. ADJOURN**

Chairperson Dean adjourned the meeting at 2:53 pm.

DRAFT

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	<b>General Fund CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)</b>								
2	<b>General Fund Projects</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>		<b>Current FY Expenditures</b>	<b>Prior Expenditures</b>		<b>Total Project Expenditures to Date</b>	<b>Project Estimate Remaining</b>
3	<b>Administration Department Projects</b>								
4									
5	Update Sound System - Vets Hall	1	\$ 20,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 20,000
6	Replace District Car	3	\$ 30,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 30,000
7									
8		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>		<b>\$ -</b>				<b>\$ 50,000</b>
9	<b>Facilities &amp; Resources Projects</b>								
10	Skate Park Improvements	1	\$ 1,200,000		\$ 35,000	\$ 20,000		\$ 55,000	\$ 1,145,000
11	East Ranch Restroom	1	\$ 371,480		\$ -	\$ 21,776		\$ 21,776	\$ 349,704
12	EV Charging Station - Vets Hall	1	\$ 24,831						
13	Replace Dump Trailer	2	\$ 15,000		\$ -				\$ 15,000
14	Replace 2012 F-350	2	\$ 45,000		\$ -				\$ 45,000
15	New Office Space and Shop Space	2	\$ 500,000		\$ -				\$ 500,000
16	Replace Wood Chipper	2	\$ 70,000		\$ -				\$ 70,000
17	Electric Vehicle Charging Station (East Village Parking Lot)	3	\$ 17,000		\$ -				\$ 17,000
18	Vets Hall Sewer Line	3	\$ 40,000		\$ -				\$ 40,000
19	Vets Hall Electrical Emergency (Generator & Equipment)	3	\$ 80,000		\$ -				\$ 80,000
20	Vets Hall Water Line	3	\$ 10,000		\$ -				\$ 10,000
21	Re-Roof - Entire Vets Hall Building	3	\$ 55,000		\$ -				\$ 55,000
22	Vets Hall Kitchen Improvements	3	\$ 20,000		\$ -				\$ 20,000
23	Vets Hall Restroom Improvements	3	\$ 17,500		\$ -				\$ 17,500
24		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 869,500</b>		<b>\$ -</b>			<b>\$ 76,776</b>	<b>\$ 792,724</b>
25	<b>Fire Department Projects</b>								
26	Radio System Upgrade Phase 2	1	\$ 79,097		\$ -	\$ 30,000		\$ 38,000	\$ 41,097
27	Fire Station Dry Rot Repair/Rain Gutter Repair/Paint	2	\$ 40,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 40,000
28	Fire Station Turnout Lockers and Storage Room	2	\$ 45,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 45,000
29	Ballistic Vests for Active Shooter Response	2	\$ 15,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 15,000
30	Fire Station Sleeping Quarters Addition	3	\$ 450,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 450,000
31	Fire Department Metal Building (Apparatus Bays/Storage/Gym Relocation)	3	\$ 220,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 220,000
32	Replace Water Tender (21 years old)	3	\$ 600,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 600,000
33	Fire Apparatus Rust Repair and Paint	3	\$ 35,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 35,000
34	Sattelite Phones	3	\$ 6,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 6,000
35	Fire Hose and Nozzles	3	\$ 32,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 32,000
36	Fire Station Bathrooms Remodel x 3	3	\$ 45,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 45,000
37	Fire Training Buiding	3	\$ 475,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 475,000
38	Replace old rescue boat and Rescue ski	3	\$ 21,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 21,000
39	4 Gas Detector	3	\$ 5,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 5,000
40	Fire Station Computers Upgrades	3	\$ 6,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 6,000
41	Fire Department Gate and Fencing	3	\$ 40,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 40,000
42	Fire Station Kitchen Remodel	3	\$ 70,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 70,000

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	<b>General Fund CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)</b>								
2	<b>General Fund Projects</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>	<b>Current FY Expenditures</b>	<b>Prior Expenditures</b>	<b>Total Project Expenditures to Date</b>		<b>Project Estimate Remaining</b>	
43	Fuel Station Computer Replacement	3	\$ 7,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 7,000	
44	CERT Team Respse Vehicle	3	\$ 40,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 40,000	
45	Refurbish Antique Fire Engine	3	\$ 30,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 30,000	
46	Replace Rescue Boat	3	\$ 14,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 14,000	
47	Fire Marshal Vehicle (pending approval for a Fire Marshal Position)	3	\$ 71,000	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 71,000	
48		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 2,275,097</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ 38,000</b>		<b>\$ 2,237,097</b>	
49				\$ -					
50	Priority 1 Total			\$ -					
51	Priority 2 Total			\$ -					
52	Priority 3 Total			\$ -					
53	Priority 4 Total		\$ -	\$ -					
54			\$ -	\$ -					
55	<b>Completed Projects</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>	<b>FY Expenditures</b>		<b>Project to Date Expenditures</b>		<b>FY Budget Amount Remaining</b>	
56	F350 Truck - Replace 1999 F150 Truck	1	\$ 40,000	\$ -		\$ 40,000			
57	Electric Vehicle Charging Station (Vets Hall)	1	\$ 22,272	\$ -		\$ 22,272			
58	Re-Roof - Vets Hall American Legion Kitchen Area	1	\$ 8,446	\$ -		\$ 8,446			
59	Tyler Incode	1	\$ 76,050	\$ -		\$ 76,050			
60	Zoll X Series EKG	1	\$ 40,000	\$ -		\$ 41,776			
61	Utility Truck F-350	1	\$ 79,800	\$ -		\$ 76,964			
62	Extrication Tool	1	\$ 60,000	\$ -		\$ 42,234			
63	Purchase New Fire Truck - Engine Type 3	1	\$ 450,000	\$ -		\$ 446,506			

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	<b>Waste Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)</b>								
2		<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>		<b>Current FY Expenditures</b>	<b>Prior Expenditures</b>		<b>Total Project Expenditures to Date</b>	<b>Project Estimate Remaining</b>
3	<b>Treatment Plant Projects in SST (All SST Cost Estimates Current as of IGA Final Report)</b>								
4	Investment Grade Audit (30% Design for all ECMs)	1	\$ 528,404		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 528,404
5	(ECM 1) Influent Flow Equalization	1	\$ 3,791,224		\$ 466,696			\$ 1,076,702	\$ 2,714,522
6	(ECM 2) Influent Lift Station	1	\$ 46,512		\$ 13,759			\$ 26,224	\$ 6,530
7	(ECM 3) Modified Ludzak-Ettinger Process Upgrade	1	\$ 2,419,093		\$ 322,080			\$ 371,214	\$ 1,725,799
8	(ECM 4) Blower Improvements	1	\$ 603,329		\$ 89,942			\$ 107,143	\$ 406,244
9	(ECM 5) RAS and WAS Pumping Improvements	1	\$ 1,290,972		\$ 153,516			\$ 230,389	\$ 907,067
10	(ECM 7) Electrical Upgrades	1	\$ 554,687		\$ 22,400			\$ 100,139	\$ 432,148
11	(ECM 8) Generator Replacement	1	\$ 925,404		\$ 28,674			\$ 153,675	\$ 743,055
12	(ECM 9) SCADA System	1	\$ 1,148,557		\$ 32,512			\$ 185,587	\$ 930,458
13	(ECM 12) Sewer Lift Stations	1	\$ 1,320,222		\$ -			\$ 54,511	\$ 1,265,711
14	(ECM 10) Secondary Water System (3W) Improvements	2	\$ 318,202		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 318,202
15	(ECM 11) Effluent Pump Station Improvements	2	\$ 374,580		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 374,580
16	Pads for electrical ECMs	2	\$ 313,893		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 313,893
17	Final Design	2	\$ 308,394		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 308,394
18									
19	Tertiary Treatment	4	\$ 889,436		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 889,436
20	Storm Drain	2	\$ 130,521		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 130,521
21	Demolish Old Tanks	2	\$ 567,815		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 567,815
22			<b>\$ 15,531,245</b>		<b>\$ 1,129,578</b>			<b>\$ 2,305,583</b>	
23	<b>Treatment Plant Projects</b>								
24	Security Improvements	1	\$ 15,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 15,000
25	New polymer skid for sludge press	1	\$ 25,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 25,000
26	PFAS Treatment (Design Phase)	2	\$ 50,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 50,000
27	Van Gordon House Demolition (Split with Water)	2	\$ 50,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 50,000
28	Clarifier Improvements								
29	Eastern clarifier - Replace chain drive	2	\$ 40,000		\$ -			\$ 37,552	\$ 2,448
30	Eastern clarifier - Replace drive unit's metallic hubs with non-corrosive hubs	2	\$ 35,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 35,000
31	Eastern clarifier - Replace clarifier wear shoes, skid plates, & sprockets	2	\$ 40,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 40,000
32	Western clarifier - Replace clarifier chain, wear shoes, skid plates, & sprockets	2	\$ 40,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 40,000
33	Cover for Sheltering of Equipment @ Plant ( 50%)	2	\$ 15,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 15,000
34	Secondary Water System	2	\$ 4,100		\$ -			\$ 4,053	\$ 47
35	Blower Replacement	2	\$ 9,200		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 9,200
36	Redundant Blower for Plant	3	\$ 400,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 400,000
37	Repaint the handrails on the digester	3	\$ 30,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 30,000
38	Walkway Grating on Digester Tanks	3	\$ 30,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 30,000
39	Cargo Box for Storage	3	\$ 10,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 10,000
40									
41			<b>\$ 753,300</b>		<b>\$ -</b>			<b>\$ 41,605</b>	<b>\$ 711,695</b>
42	<b>Collection System Projects</b>								
43	Lift Station A (Nottingham & Leighton/Park Hill)								
44	New Submersible Pumps, MCC, Bypass Piping, Control Panel at Grade Elevation	1	\$ 490,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 490,000
45	Lift Station A-1 (Sherwood & Harvey/Marine Terrace)								
46	New Submersible Pumps, Bypass Piping	1	\$ 265,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 265,000
47	Lift Station B - (SR Creek/Behind Park Hill)								
48	New Control Panel, Generator, Wet Well, Submersible Pumps, and Valve Vault	3	\$ 435,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 435,000
49	Lift Station B-1 (Burton Dr at Tin City)								
50	Convert to gravity flow	1	\$ 600,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 600,000



	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	<b>Waste Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)</b>								
2		<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>		<b>Current FY Expenditures</b>	<b>Prior Expenditures</b>		<b>Total Project Expenditures to Date</b>	<b>Project Estimate Remaining</b>
51	Lift Station B-2 (Wood Dr./E. Lodge Hill)								
52		1	\$ 425,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 425,000
53	Lift Station B-3 (Green St./W. Lodge Hill)								
54		1	\$ 250,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 250,000
55		3	\$ 250,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 250,000
56	Lift Station 8								
57		1	\$ 95,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 95,000
58		2	\$ 1,000,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 1,000,000
59		2	\$ 12,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 12,000
60		2	\$ 10,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 10,000
61		1	\$ 20,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 20,000
62		2	\$ 10,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 10,000
63		2	\$ 2,000,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 2,000,000
64			\$ 5,862,000		\$ -			\$ -	\$ 5,862,000
65	<b>Vehicles and Trailer Mounted Equipment</b>								
66	Replacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and Backhoe Tractor	1	\$ 75,000					\$ 69,054	
67	Replace 2005 F250	3	\$ 65,000					\$ 52,982	
68									
69			\$ 22,286,545						
70									
71			\$ -						
72			\$ -						
73			\$ -						
74			\$ -						
75			\$ -						
76									
77		<b>Ranking</b>	<b>10-Yr Cost</b>					<b>FY Project Cost</b>	
78	Replace Tractor	1	\$ 75,000					\$ 69,054	
79	Replace Van - Transport of Sewer Video Camera System	1	\$ 65,000					\$ 52,982	
80	Replace F150	1	\$ 30,000					0	
81	Pearpoint or equal TV inspection camera (removed cost from mid year total to meet reduced funding balance, 11/20/2018.)		\$ 75,000					0	
82	F-350 Service Truck with Crane Body		\$ 57,040					0	
83	Vactor truck - replace with new \$430K truck that meets emssion requirements (7 yr loan @ 4.5%)		\$ 518,000						
84	Replacement Rack Truck (F-150)		\$ 24,193					0	
85	Influent screen, support platform design, & installation		\$ 164,509					0	
86	Lift Station A-1 MCC, SCADA Improvements		\$ 45,000					0	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>Water CIP (FY 23/24 Revised 09/18/2023)</b>								
2		<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Project Estimate</b>		<b>Current FY Expenditures</b>	<b>Prior Expenditures</b>		<b>Total Project Expenditures To Date</b>	<b>Project Estimate Remaining</b>
3	<b>Water Distribution System Projects</b>								
4	Cover for Sheltering of Equipment @ Plant (50%)	1	\$ 15,000		\$ -				\$ 15,000
5	Modular Office Building @ Plant	1	\$ 10,000		\$ -				\$ 10,000
6	Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)	1	\$ 2,220,000		\$ -				\$ 2,220,000
7	Meter install	1	\$ 500,000		\$ -				\$ 500,000
8	Design and Permitting for SSWF Transmission Main and Effluent Line at State Park Wetlands	1	\$ 600,000		\$ -				\$ 600,000
9	Lead and Copper Service Line Regulations	1	\$ 20,000						
10	Source Water Assessment	1	\$ 10,000						
11	Piney Way Erosion Control - Design, Permitting and	1	\$ 10,000		\$ -				\$ 10,000
12	San Simeon Well Field Transmission Main at State Park Wetlands	2	\$ 5,000,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000
13	SR4 Generator	2	\$ 80,000		\$ -				\$ 80,000
14	Well site pump replacements	2	\$ 532,141		\$ -				\$ 532,141
15	Vault upgrades (Rodeo Grounds, Charing, and	2	\$ 60,000		\$ -				\$ 60,000
16	District Metered Areas (Phased - Design and Permitting, Implementation cost TBD)	2	\$ 150,000		\$ -				\$ 150,000
17	Upgrading undersized water mains	3	\$ 130,000		\$ -				\$ 130,000
18	Pine Knolls - Iva Court zone 1 pipeline expansion	4	\$ 165,000		\$ -				\$ 165,000
19	Demo Van Gordon House (Water Portion)	3	\$ 50,000		\$ -				\$ 50,000
20	<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 9,527,141</b>		<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 9,497,141</b>
21	<b>Tank &amp; Booster Pump Station Projects</b>								
22	Stuart Street Tank Rehabilitation	1	\$ 550,000		\$ -	\$ 92,000	\$ 92,000	\$ 92,000	\$ 458,000
23	Santa Rosa Well #4 Replacement	1	\$ 50,000		\$ 48,792				
24	Electrical transfer switch and conduit to well SS-3	1	\$ 25,000		\$ -				
25	SCADA System - Phased Upgrades (Phase III- Alarms, Flow Data, Monitoring Wells)	1	\$ 225,000		\$ -				
26	Rodeo Grounds booster A pump	1	\$ 25,000		\$ -				
27	Rodeo Grounds Pump Station Replacement (aka Zone 2 Booster pump station)	2	\$ 2,200,000		\$ -				
28	Stuart Street and Leimert Booster Pump Replacement	3	\$ 500,000		\$ -				
29	Third Stuart Street Tank Installation	3	\$ 600,000		\$ -				
30	<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 4,175,000</b>		<b>\$ 48,792</b>				
31	<b>Vehicles and Trailer-Mounted Equipment</b>								
32	Replacement 2005 F-150 Truck with F-250 (for towing Ditch Witch)	1	\$ 55,000		\$ -				
33	Truck Replacement Program (annual cost to build reserves)	3	\$ 55,000		\$ -				
34	Replacement of 1999 John Deere Loader and Backhoe Tractor	3	\$ 75,000		\$ -				
35	Dump trailer for storing and hauling spoils from road repairs	3	\$ 15,000		\$ -				
36	<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 200,000</b>		<b>\$ -</b>				
37	<b>Programs and Plans</b>								
38	Hydraulic System Model Update	3	\$ 75,000		\$ -				
39	Asset Management Plan	2	\$ 25,000		\$ -				
40	Water Master Plan Amendment	3	\$ 35,000		\$ -				
41	Database for water conservation program/tracking with parcel links & APN file conversion	3	\$ 10,000		\$ -				
42	<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 145,000</b>		<b>\$ -</b>				
43									
44			<b>\$ 14,047,141</b>		<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>				
45									
46			\$ 9,100,000		Priority 1 Total				

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
47			\$ 2,625,000		Priority 2 Total				
48			\$ 2,002,141		Priority 3 Total				
49			\$ 165,000		Priority 4 Total				
50									
51	<b>Completed Projects</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>10-Yr Cost</b>		<b>FY Project Cost</b>				
52	replacement @ SR Creek pedestrian bridge	1	\$ 215,527		\$ -				
53	SR4 submersible pump replacement		\$ 50,338						
54	SS2 Electrical Panel Upgrade		\$ 25,000						
55	SCADA System - Phase I and II Upgrades		\$ 99,371						
56	Replacement Dump Truck		\$ 74,871		\$ -				
57	Trailer-Mounted Air Compressor		\$ 22,557		\$ -				
58	Trailer-Mounted Vacuum Extractor		\$ 46,169		\$ -				
59	San Simeon well field generator replacement		\$ 50,449		\$ -				
60									



CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

TO: Resources & Infrastructure Committee

AGENDA NO. **4.B.**

FROM: Matthew McElhenie, General Manager  
Denise Fritz, Administrative Department Manager

---

Meeting Date: October 2, 2023

Subject: Discussion and Consideration to  
Choose Dates to Schedule a Joint  
Finance Committee and Resources &  
Infrastructure Committee Special  
Meeting in October 2023

---

**DISCUSSION:**

The Finance Subcommittee and Resources & Infrastructure Committee would like to hold a special meeting to discuss the ranking system for the CIP list and approve the new formatting.

The suggested dates are October 10, 11, 17, and 18.

## LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY AND STORAGE ALTERNATIVES

---

**DATE:** September 23, 2023

**TO:** Cambria Community Services District Resources and Infrastructure Committee

**FROM:** Jim Webb  
Derrick Williams

**SUBJECT:** Cambria Community Services Long-Term Water Supply and Storage Options Update

---

### INTRODUCTION

The Long-Term Water Supply and Storage Ad-Hoc Committee is tasked with summarizing water supply and water storage alternatives. This memorandum summarizes options included in previous studies, as well as options that have been proposed but not studied by the Cambria Community Services District (CCSD). This memorandum summarizes all options, without any intent to make recommendations. This memorandum does not assess the reliability or ability of CCSD's current supplies to meet demands. Such determinations are beyond the scope of this effort and have been previously included in the CCSD's Urban Water Management Plan.

### OPTIONS IN PREVIOUS STUDIES

The *Assessment of Long-Term Water Supply Alternatives* (Kennedy/Jenks, 2004) identified eight potential water supply alternatives including:

- Seawater desalination
- Surface water from Lake Nacimiento
- Surface water from Whale Rock Reservoir
- Expanding the Santa Rosa Creek wellfield
- An Arroyo De La Cruz wellfield
- Hard rock wells
- Additional use of recycled water
- Demand management

These alternatives were further developed and refined in the *Cambria Water Supply Alternatives Engineering Technical Memorandum* (CDM/Smith, 2013). This memorandum reviewed 28

water supply options. The 28 options were screened, resulting in eight water supply alternatives. Each alternative is presented below, with an assessment of the pros and cons for each. The alternatives are grouped by type for ease of comparison.

## **IMPLEMENTED ALTERNATIVES**

### **1. San Simeon Creek Road Brackish Water Desalting (CDM Smith Alternative 5)**

This alternative is a version of CCSD's existing Water Reclamation Facility (WRF). Because this alternative has effectively been implemented, it is no longer a source of new water or storage.

## **DESALINATION ALTERNATIVES**

### **2. Desalinating Seawater from Shamel Park (CDM Smith Alternative 1)**

This alternative entails installing two horizontal wells: one to serve as a subsurface seawater intake and one to serve as a subsurface brine line. The two horizontal wells would originate from the Shamel Park parking lot. Seawater would be treated to drinking water standards at a reverse osmosis plant located at the existing CCSD wastewater treatment plant.

Pros: - Provides a drought proof source of water.  
- No long piping is needed, compared to other alternatives.

Cons: - A previous proposal for the Shamel Park Desalination Plant project was rejected by the California Coastal Commission. It is unlikely that the Coastal Commission will reverse itself and approve this project.  
- Relatively high costs.

### **3. Partner with Morro Bay's Seawater Desalination Plant (CDM Smith Alternative 3)**

This alternative envisions partnering with the city of Morro Bay to convert its existing desalination plant into a plant that can supply water to CCSD as well as Morro Bay. The Morro Bay desalination plant has been idle since 2000, and its permits have lapsed. Therefore, this alternative has greater difficulties than outlined in the 2013 memorandum.

Pros: - Infrastructure for a desalination plant already exist in Morro Bay.

Cons: - The Morro Bay desalination plant permits have lapsed, and it is unclear if the plant's operation can be permitted again.  
- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.  
- Relatively high costs.

- Morro Bay likely has no reason to reactivate its desalination plant in partnership with CCSD because Morro Bay has invested in a Water Reclamation Facility as its supplemental water supply.

#### **4. Estero Bay Marine Terminal Desalination Plant (CDM Smith Alternative 4)**

This alternative is similar to the Shamel Park desalination plant alternative, but much of the infrastructure is located near the intersection of Highway 1 and Toro Creek Road, south of Cayucos. This alternative entails installing a horizontal well in Estero Bay to serve as a subsurface seawater intake. A desalination plant would be built on Toro Creek Road, and the brine would be piped to the Morro Bay outfall through a new pipeline.

Pros: - Provides a drought-proof supply of water.

- Siting the desalination plant on Toro Creek Road, inland of the coastal zone, could potentially lessen some Coastal Commission permitting requirements.

Cons: - Permitting a desalination plant may be extremely difficult and time consuming.

- CCSD does not own the land on which the desalination plant would be built.

- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.

- Relatively high costs.

- A previous proposal for the Shamel Park Desalination Plant project was rejected by the California Coastal Commission. The Coastal Commission appears to be hesitant to approve new desalination plants.

### **INCREASED STORAGE ALTERNATIVES**

#### **5. San Simeon Creek Off-Stream Storage (CDM Smith Alternative 2)**

This alternative entails developing off-stream reservoirs in the San Simeon Creek watershed. The CDM Smith memorandum identified three potential reservoir locations. A fourth location, known as the Warren Reservoir, was not included in the memorandum, and is discussed separately, below. Water from CCSD's existing wellfield would be pumped into the off-stream reservoirs for storage and later use. The three reservoirs were sized to cumulatively store approximately 1,200 acre feet of water, and supply approximately 250 acre-feet of water annually.

Pros: - The alternative uses existing CCSD wells as a water source.

- The proposed reservoirs are located relatively close to existing CCSD pipes and wells.

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the San Simeon wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits,



potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.

- Stored water would need to be treated as surface water, requiring a full-time surface water treatment plant.
- CCSD would be required to build, manage, monitor, and maintain new reservoirs.
- Reservoir permitting can be relatively long and difficult.
- CCSD does not own the land proposed for the new reservoirs.
- High construction costs.
- The State has expressed concerns about the impact of the San Simeon wellfield on San Simeon Creek. Although the additional wellfield pumping that supplies the reservoirs would occur during the winter when there are higher stream flows, the additional pumping may amplify the State's concerns about stream impacts.

#### **6. Hard Rock Water Storage and Recovery (CDM Smith Alternative 6)**

This alternative entails pumping additional water from the Santa Rosa #4 well during the winter and piping the water to an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) wellfield. The water would be injected through ASR wells in the wet season and recovered in the dry season. The ASR wells would store water in fractured bedrock.

Pros: - Uses existing wells as a water source  
 - Proposed piping is not in Caltrans right of way, potentially simplifying permitting.

Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the Santa Rosa wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.  
 - Hard rock fractures generally have very little storage capacity, and the amount of water that can be stored is uncertain.  
 - Requires up to 42 new ASR wells.  
 - CCSD does not own the land where the ASR wells would be located.

#### **7. Seasonally Store Water in Whale Rock Reservoir (CDM Smith Alternative 7)**

This alternative entails pumping additional water from CCSD's existing wells during the wet season, piping the water to Whale Rock Reservoir, and seasonally storing the water in the reservoir. Stored water could be piped from the reservoir to Cambria during the dry season.

Pros: - Uses an existing reservoir for storage.  
 - Relatively simple technology.

- Cons: - CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the Santa Rosa wellfield or San Simeon wellfield to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.
- A relatively long pipeline must be built in Caltrans right-of-way along Highway 1.
  - It is unclear if the City and County of SLO will permit seasonal storage in Whale Rock Reservoir.

## WASTEWATER ALTERNATIVES

### 8. Use San Simeon's Treated Wastewater to Offset Cambria's Potable Water Demands (CDM Smith Alternative 8)

This alternative entails treating raw wastewater from San Simeon at an upgraded CCSD wastewater treatment plant.

Pros: - Uses known technologies.

- Cons: - The limited demand for non-potable water (for business and irrigation) will likely not produce adequate potable water demand savings. The amount of new potable water is likely negligible.
- Discussions with San Simeon CSD regarding regional water and wastewater management have not been fruitful.
  - The future status of the San Simeon wastewater treatment facility is unclear.

## OPTIONS DEVELOPED AFTER PREVIOUS STUDIES

Four water supply and storage alternatives have been proposed or developed since the 2013 *Cambria Water Supply Alternatives, Engineering Technical Memorandum*.

### 9. Warren Reservoir

This alternative entails building a seasonal storage reservoir on private land near CCSD's existing WRF. This alternative is similar to the San Simeon Creek Off-Stream Storage alternative proposed in the memorandum. Water from CCSD's existing wellfield would be pumped into the Warren reservoir for storage and later use. The reservoir is sized to hold approximately 700 acre-feet of water, seasonally. It is unclear how much of the 700 acre feet would be available for annual supply.

- Pros: - Uses existing CCSD wells as a water source
- The proposed reservoir is located very close to existing CCSD pipes and wells

- Cons:
- CCSD's current permits do not allow water pumped by the San Simeon wells to be stored. This alternative would likely require CCSD to reopen its permits, potentially subjecting them to additional regulatory constraints and limitations.
  - Stored water would need to be treated as surface water, requiring a full-time surface water treatment plant.
- CCSD would be required to build, manage, monitor, and maintain a new reservoir.
- Reservoir permitting can be relatively long and difficult.
  - CCSD does not own the land proposed for the new reservoirs. The land owner appears open to the project, but the cost and details of building the reservoir must still be developed.
  - High construction costs.
  - The State has expressed concerns about the impact of the San Simeon wellfield on San Simeon Creek. Although the additional wellfield pumping that supplies the reservoirs would occur during the winter when there are higher stream flows, the additional pumping may amplify the State's concerns about stream impacts.

## **10. Regional Desalination Plant**

The County of San Luis Obispo has initiated a five-phase planning process for potentially developing and constructing a regional desalination plant. CCSD has expressed interest in being a participant in the planning process.

- Pros:
- Provides a reliable, drought-proof source of water.
  - Costs could be shared with other regional partners, making this alternative potentially less expensive than a smaller desalination plant.

- Cons:
- Likely long timeline before a desalination plant is built. The County's current timeline shows the desalination plant potentially being built in 2045.
  - The desalination plant's location is unknown. Piping water from the plant to CCSD may involve extensive and expensive piping.
  - Cost of the plant and cost of the produced water is unknown.

## **11. Direct Potable Reuse**

The state of California recently released its proposed Direct Potable Reuse (DPR) regulations for public review. Although not a new source of water, DPR may provide the District an option for more efficient operation of the WRF. The WRF currently employs Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR). Indirect potable reuse requires that WRF product water be injected and stored underground for an established period before the water can be pumped into the distribution system. Direct potable reuse would allow WRF product water to be directly placed into the District's distribution system.

Direct potable reuse would require improvements and upgrades to the existing WRF. Additionally, it is likely the state of California will proceed cautiously with its initial DPR permits. Therefore, although DPR provides the District increased efficiency in its use of WRF product water, this option may not be available for many years.

Pros: - More efficient use of existing wastewater.  
 - Could leverage the existing WRF infrastructure. The WRF infrastructure provides some of the required treatment for DPR.

Cons: - Would require a change to the WRF project description.  
 - Likely a long timeline for the state of California to adopt DPR regulations, tests DPR in highly monitored systems, then allow wider adoption of DPR.  
 - Requires some additional treatment be added to the WRF.  
 - May require additional monitoring and oversight of the WRF.

## **12. Reduce Water Loss**

There is a discrepancy between the amount of water pumped into the District's distribution system and the amount of water billed to customers. This is referred to as water loss and is endemic to all municipal water systems. The District's water loss ranges between 10% and 17%. Water loss can result from leaks, pipe failures, meter errors, measurement inaccuracies, or water theft. Some of the losses due to leaks or pipe failures could be reduced by identifying and repairing leaks in the existing distribution system. This would effectively provide the District additional water to provide customers.

Pros: - Relatively low cost to implement.  
 - No new wells or pipelines needed.

Cons: - The water savings may be minimal if the water loss is due to meter error or measurement inaccuracy  
 - Requires ongoing monitoring and maintenance to avoid future water loss.

## **13. Add San Simeon Wastewater to the WRF Input Stream**

Increasing the amount of wastewater treated by the WRF could effectively increase the amount of water percolated into the aquifer supplying the San Simeon wellfield. This

could result in additional water supplies for the San Simeon Wellfield, and possibly fewer stream impacts.

- Pros:
- Leverages CCSD's existing infrastructure.
  - Relatively little infrastructure needs.
  - The additional water stored in the aquifer may result in reduced stream impacts.
- Cons:
- Running the San Simeon wastewater through the WRF every year would require a change to the WRF project description.
  - Discussions with San Simeon CSD regarding regional water and wastewater management have not been fruitful.
  - The future status of the San Simeon wastewater treatment facility is unclear.

## REFERENCES

CDM Smith, 2013. Cambria Water Supply Alternatives, Engineering Technical Memorandum, prepared for the Army Corp of Engineers and the Cambria Community Services District, 236 pp.

Kennedy/Jenks, 2004. Assessment of Long-Term Water Supply Alternatives, prepared for Cambria Community Services District, 118 pp.