

## July Board Questions – D’Ambrosio

1. Page 46 of Daryl’s report - on manholes - total inspected thus far (1,195) what #/% have need for repairs?

Rating	#
Unsafe	2
Poor	178
Fair	857
Good	153
Excellent	5

2. Reading Marks report on safety in general and all our efforts protecting staff, it seems like momentum is building for both private and public sectors to require shots for all employees unless medically excused by a physician. What are we considering if things become worse due to this new variant let alone if any new even more contagious strains arise?

In April 2021 we were advised by legal counsel to perform Interactive Process interviews with all “non-vaccinated” employees. This was completed and documented in their personnel file. We are keeping a close eye on the news and trends of public agencies in California. While I suspect most of us (CAWD management staff) would like to see a vaccine mandate at CAWD, right now we are waiting for a firm legal opinion.

NOTE: on July 26, 2021 the Justice Department lawyers determined that federal law does not prohibit agencies and private business from requiring COVID-19 vaccines – even if the vaccines have only emergency use authorization.

[Whether Section 564 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act Prohibits Entities from Requiring the Use of a Vaccine Subject to an Emergency Use Authorization \(cnn.com\)](#)

We are checking with legal counsel to see if there is anything in California law we need to be careful of. The evening of 7/26/21 counsel emailed that he had not seen anything other than article in Politico that reported how California state employees would have to be tested weekly if they refused to vaccinate.

If we are able to mandate, I would recommend that CAWD require all employees to be vaccinated – it would be safer, and more efficient for the District.

3. Page 67 - Eucalyptus trees - what is the status of tree replacement selections and timelines to plant replacements?

Progress has been gradual. Hall Landscape provided a list of potential tree species for new exterior screening in March of this year. The tree height needed to screen the WWTP has been determined based on the LiDAR survey site-line analysis developed in-house.

I need to get State Parks feedback on this project and potential tree options before getting back to Hall and asking him to develop some layout drawings. My plan is to get the eucalyptus pruning work done and then shift the time I've been spending on that project towards pushing the new tree replacement plan.

Hall Landscape has also been working for CAWD on two other endeavors. The first is a landscaping plan for the interior of the WWTP, preliminary drawings have been developed and several onsite meetings occurred. Also, recently Hall Landscape was engaged to conduct a drone flyover for the CAWD Bridge Trail planning. The drone work was conducted in May of this year and I am awaiting some photos and videos from that work to create a project webpage.

Hall Landscape has only submitted two invoices for a total of about \$2k for these three projects over the last year and a half. Ongoing follow up is needed on all these efforts to keep them moving forward.

4. Page 103 - Project 18-01 - Electrical Rehab and Sludge Tank Replacement Project - describe what changes will occur on the site where the replacement sludge tank is now.

The Sludge Holding Tank area will look much different than it does now after the project which involves removal of three large dilapidated concrete tanks and adjoining storage structures, and construction of a new glass coated steel sludge tank on a new concrete pile supported foundation. The visual character of the 7,000 square foot area (which is adjacent to the existing office trailers near the front of the facility) will be much improved aesthetically as well as functionally with the removal of the old dilapidated concrete tanks.

The other parts of the project tackle remaining process areas that were not improved during the Phase 1 WWTP Rehab Project. There will be major process improvements involving mostly in-kind equipment replacements at the Influent Building, Headworks, Chlorination Building, and Effluent Building. These process areas will maintain their existing visual character and function, but will have mostly brand new mechanical and electrical equipment that replaces the 30- to 50-year-old equipment currently in service in these locations.

5. Page 105 - project management contract - will there be a construction committee appointed for this project as was the case with Phase I ?

Yes, I have already spoken with Ken White and we will be forming a committee just like we did with Phase I.

6. Page 146 -Tier 3 fee - why \$1,700 vs actual of \$1,875 as rounded to the closest \$5 increment.

Because since 2019 we have not had any plan reviews that have exceeded (or even come close) to \$1,700. Should that happen, we can return to the customer and ask for additional funds.

7. Page 156 - I'm confused, the report mentions \$10,965 throughout the report but the Resolution 2021-06 has \$18,820? Did I miss something?

I can see how this might be a bit confusing, my apologies. The current request is for \$10,965. There was a prior Resolution #2021-06 in January 2021 for \$18,820. The \$18,820 added to the \$10,965 totals \$29,785.

If you look at the "Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved...." Section of the current Resolution #2021-45 the request is to approve \$10,965 for a total not to exceed of \$29,785. Additionally, Resolution #2021-45 refers to the \$18,820 in the past tense in the second "Whereas" paragraph (i.e., the District approved).

This item is before the Board because we look at the entire project when making the call to place it on the agenda or not. The engineering alone is within my signing limit, but engineering, construction and project management *combined* exceed my signing limit.

8. Page 167 - top bullet - curious what the Forest Lake Action Plan focus is?

Assuming that you are referring to the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet "Forest Lake Reservoir Emergency Action Plan"?

The California Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) recently published a number of new standards specifically requiring dam owners to update/develop reservoir inundation maps and update associated reservoir Emergency Action Plan (EAP) per California Office of Emergency Services. These requirements are a condition of the permit to operate Forest Lake Reservoir.

DSOD approved the reservoir inundation maps submitted last year. The EAP now needs to be updated. The EAP will identify potential emergency conditions and specify actions to be followed to minimize loss of life and property damage.