

### **METRO TAC AGENDA**

(Technical Advisory Committee to Metro JPA)

**TO:** MetroTAC Representatives and Metro Commissioners

**DATE:** Wednesday, February 17, 2010

**TIME:** 11:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

LOCATION: MWWD, 9192 Topaz Way (MOCII Auditorium) - Lunch will be provided

# \*PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THIS NOTICE TO METRO COMMISSIONERS AND METROTAC REPRESENTATIVES.\*

1. Review and Approve MetroTAC Action Minutes for the Meeting of January 20, 2009 (Attachment)

- 2. METRO Commission/JPA Board Meeting Recap (Standing Item)
- 3. Financial Update (Karyn Keese)
- 4. New Contract for Sodium Hypochlorite (Chris McKinney)
- 5. Metro Wastewater Update (Rod Greek)
- 6. Public Utilities Proposed FY 11 CIP Budgets (Lee Ann Jones-Santos)
- 7. Discussion item Cross Connections (Rod Greek)
- 8. Update on Pt. Loma Waiver Process (Alan Langworthy)
- 9. Operating Reserve & Debt Financing (Standing Item)
- 10. Transportation Agreement (Standing Item)
- 11. Review of Items to be Brought Forward to the Metro Commission/Metro JPA Meeting of March 4, 2010
- 12. Other Business of Metro TAC
- 13. Adjournment (To the next Regular Meeting, March 17, 2010)

Metro TAC 2010 Meeting Schedule							
January 20	May 19	September 15					
February 17	June 16	October 20					
March 17	July 21	November 17					
April 21	August 18	December 15					

# AGENDA ITEM 1 Attachment



### **Metro TAC**

(Technical Advisory Committee to Metro JPA)

### **ACTION MINUTES**

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 20, 2010

TIME: 11 AM

**LOCATION:** MWWD, MOC II, Auditorium

#### **MEETING ATTENDANCE:**

Roberto Yano, Chula Vista Iracsema Quilantan, Chula Vista Scott Huth, Chair, Coronado Dan Brogadir, County of San Diego

David Scherer, Del Mar

Dennis Davies, El Cajon

Greg Humora, Vice Chair, La Mesa

Erin Bullers, La Mesa Joe Smith, National City

Manny Magaña, Otay Water District Augie Caires, Padre Dam MWD

Augie Scalzitti, Padre Dam MWD Neal Brown, Padre Dam MWD

Doug Wilson, Padre Dam MWD

Tom Howard, Poway

David Bryant, City of San Diego Amy Dorman, City of San Diego Edgar Patino, City of San Diego Rod Greek, City of San Diego Guann Hwang, City of San Diego Martin Kane, City of San Diego Peggy Merino, City of San Diego Tom Alspaugh, City of San Diego Stuart Seymour, City of San Diego

Jamie Richards, City of San Diego Bill Kennedy, Brown & Caldwell

Karyn Keese, PBS&J Dean Gipson, PBS&J

Lori Weiss, ADS Environmental Services

Dawn Guendert, Carollo Engineers

1. Review and Approve Metro TAC Action Minutes for the Meeting of December 16, 2009

The Minutes were approved.

2. Metro Commission/JPA Board Meeting Recap

Reported on January 7, 2010 Commission meeting; no new action items for MetroTAC.

- 3. Financial Update (Karyn Keese)
  - Handed out 2011 Estimate (Table C) of load characteristics; City of San Diego will provide an update (FYI)
  - Handed out draft capacity allocations that the City of San Diego is finalizing (FYI)
  - Handed out current results of Leadership Development Program Survey; please provide responses to Karyn Keese by 2/5/10
    - City of San Diego wants to use only San Diego staff to work out kinks
    - 2<sup>nd</sup> year would start in FY2012
    - Estimated cost is \$1,950 per person

## 4. Regional Recycled Water Survey/Status (Karyn Keese)

- Handed out draft summary of survey to date
- Soliciting input on format/data for final presentation
- Group suggested adding other efforts happening in the region, such as the ground water recharge project by PDMWD
- Final table will include the City of San Diego data that is currently in Technical Memorandum #2

## ACTION: PBS&J to finalize survey and present at next Metro JPA meeting

### 5. 2007 Refund (Karyn Keese)

- Handed out letter from Scott Huth to Rod Greek (dated January 14, 2010) requesting a refund for 2007 overpayment
- The City of San Diego indicated it is okay with the refund, considering that the method used to calculate the operating reserve and debt financing levels (addressed in Item 12 below) are acceptable

## 6. Metro CIP (David Bryant)

- Handed out draft spreadsheet
- Clarification on the purpose of the CIP list: use as much information as possible
  and generate little new information; use existing project descriptions and add a
  summary of Metro CIP (annual); this is to be a quick reference document to aid
  MetroTAC when reviewing projects that the City of San Diego brings to the group
  for action
- David Bryant will continue to work on this list which will include a 5 year look ahead and then the following 5 years lumped together; should try to mirror the COSD's rate case
- South Bay and North City WRP annual allocations should be separate

### ACTION: City of San Diego to update CIP list and present at next MetroTAC meeting

### 7. Metro Wastewater Update (Rod Greek)

- Introduced Edgar Patino who will be taking over certain duties from Martin Kane
- Wastewater financing meetings are underway for next bond financing effort
- Internal FY11 budget process is underway; release planned for mid-April
- Rain update: PLWWTP peaked at 330 mgd, with a max flow of 175 mgd

# 8. Grit Processing Improvement Project at Point Loma Treatment Plant (Stuart Seymour)

- City presented the bid and award phase of this project
- Construction start anticipated for August 2010
- Construction cost estimated at \$28.8M

- Total budget cost estimated at \$38.5M
- MetroTAC approved to recommend to Metro JPA

# 9. Amendment to MM and NEO San Diego Contracts (Miramar LFG Power Plant Expansion) (Tom Alspaugh)

- City presented project to add landfill gas wells on the new part of the landfill and expand COGEN facilities at NCWRP and MBC
- This is a partnership with the US Marines, Fortistar, and the City of San Diego
- Estimated savings for the City is about \$3M per year
- MetroTAC approved to recommend to Metro JPA

# 10. Review and Approval of Six Month Financial Statements for Period Ending December 31, 2009 (Doug Wilson)

- Treasurer presented the six month budget analysis
- Generally budget is on track
- Noted that PBS&J expenditures, if remaining constant, will exceed budget; additional efforts by PBS&J due to support on recycled water issues, additional meetings with City of San Diego staff, and update of the Metro Capacity Valuation Model
- MetroTAC approved to recommend to Metro JPA

### 11. Update on the Pt. Loma Waiver Process

• Final approval by the California Coastal Commission is set for the meeting to be held February 10-12, 2010 in Oceanside, CA.

### 12. Operating Reserve & Debt Financing (Standing Item)

- Handed out proposed operating reserve and debt finance refund concept
- After much discussion, the group approved the method presented

# ACTION: City of San Diego to input FY08 data to spreadsheet and transmit it to Karyn Keese for review

## 13. Transportation Agreement (Standing Item)

City continues to meet with PAs

# 14. Review and Comments on the Metro Commission/JPA Draft Agenda for the Meeting

- Six Month Budget Update
- Recycled Water Use in San Diego County Survey Results
- Grit Processing Improvement Project at Point Loma Treatment Plant
- Amendment to MM and NEO San Diego Contracts (Miramar LFG Power Plant Expansion)
- Operating Reserve & Debt Financing options

## 15. Other Business of Metro TAC

 City of San Diego needs a volunteer to participate in the MBC Water System Improvements Design Build (Dennis Davies to participate)

# 16. Adjournment

**TABLE C** 

## CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT SYSTEM WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS - FISCAL YEAR 2008 SYSTEM STRENGTH LOADINGS INCLUDED

			THE AND THE PERSON NAMED IN THE
	2008	2011	OVER/
AGENCY	AUDITED	PROJECTED	
	FLOW - mgd (a)	FLOW (b)	(B-A)
CHULA VISTA	16.765	16.543	-0.222
CORONADO	2.004	2.500	0.496
DEL MAR	0.614	0.694	0.080
EAST OTAY MESA	0.000	0.294	0.294
EL CAJON	9.116	8.800	-0.316
IMPERIAL BEACH	2.180	2.250	0.070
LA MESA	5.278	5.210	-0.068
LAKESIDE/ALPINE	3.198	3.250	0.052
LEMON GROVE	2.156	2.296	0.140
NATIONAL CITY	4.521	4.571	0.050
OTAY	0.274	0.303	0.029
PADRE DAM	3.103	3.070	-0.033
POWAY	3.444	3.469	0.025
SPRING VALLEY	6.159	7.230	1.071
WINTERGARDENS	0.885	0.960	0.075
SUBTOTAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	59.697	61.440	1.743

# DRAFT

Agencies	Original capacity	Additional capacity	New capacity	Transferred capacity	Total capacity	% of total
Chula Vista	19.843	1.021	0.000	0.000	20.864	8.182%
Coronado	3.078	0.172	0.000		3.250	1.275%
Del Mar	0.821	0.055	0.000		0.876	0.344%
East Otay Mesa	0.000	0.000	0.000		1.000	0.392%
El Cajon	10.260	0.655	0.000		10.915	4.280%
Imperial Beach	3.591	0.164	0.000		3.755	1.473%
La Mesa	6.464	0.359	0.000	0.170	6.993	2.742%
Lakeside/Alpine	4.586	0.255	0.000	0.000	4.841	1.898%
Lemon Grove	2.873	0.154	0.000	0.000	3.027	1.187%
National City	7.141	0.346	0.000	0.000	7.487	2.936%
Otay	1.231	0.056	0.000	0.000	1.287	0.505%
Padre Dam	6.382	0.343	0.000	-0.500	6.225	2.441%
Poway	5.130	0.264	0.000	0.500	5.894	2.312%
Spring Valley	10.978	0.545	0.000	-1.170	10.353	4.060%
Wintergardens	<u>1.241</u>	0.068	0.000	0.000	1.309	0.513%
Subtotal	83.619	4.459	0.000	0.000	88.078	34.540%
San Diego	<u>156.381</u>	10.541	0.000	0.000	166.922	65.460%
Total	240.000	15.000	0.000	0.000	255.000	100.000%

AGENDA Uzolo ITEM #3(c)

## Keese, Karyn

From:

Keese, Karyn

Sent:

Tuesday, December 29, 2009 11:14 AM

To:

Gipson, Dean J

Subject:

Leadership Development Program Survey -- Please send to Metro TAC members

At the December 16, 2009, Metro TAC meeting John Gavares of the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department staff presented an overview of the City's new Leadership Development Program. This program is for their utilities management and field staff. There are two separate academies:

- Management Academy is intended for second line supervisors and above
- Field Academy is intended for crew leaders and first-line crew supervisors

A copy of the PowerPoint presentation give by the City to Metro TAC is attached to this email for your review. The first academy is expected to occur in Fall 2010. Academies are intended for those who have not attended other, similar academies such as the regional management academy.

Although the program is intended for City of San Diego staff, it could be open to PAs and others. The City has requested that we survey all Metro TAC members to determine the number of staff and at what levels that you might be interested in attending one or the other of the two academies on 2010 and 2011.

Please reply to this email by January 11, 2010 with the following information:

Potential number of attendees 2010:
Management Academy Field Academy
Potential number of attendees 2011:
Management Academy Field Academy
Comments:

Happy New Year,

Dean & Karyn

Karyn L. Keese Manager, Financial Consulting Services PBS&J 9275 Sky Park Court, Suite 200 San Diego, CA 92123-4386 858.874.1810 Direct: 858.514.1008

Fax: 858.514.1001 Cell: 619.733.8876 kkeese@pbsj.com www.pbsj.com

Please think twice before printing this e-mail

# Survey of Participating Agencies Potential Participation in San Diego's Leadership Development Program

Agency	2010		2011		
	Management	Field	Management	Field	
,					
Chula Vista					
Coronado	2	2	2	1	
Del Mar				-	
County of San Diego					
El Cajon					
Imperial Beach	0	0	0	0	
La Mesa	1	1	2	2	
Lemon Grove					
National City					
Otay					
Padre Dam					
Poway					

Water Recycling Project										
Purveyor	Supply Source	Cost from Supplier	No. of Wholesale Customers	How Many Charg Wholesale Whol AFY Acre	sale Retail	Charge per Retail Acre Foot	Miles of Recycled Pipeline	Current Reuse (AFY)	Year 2035 Reuse (AFY)	Type of Reuse
Carlsbad M.W.D.	Carlsbad W.R.P. Gafner W.R.F. (Leucadia)  Meadowlark W.R.F. (Vallecitos)	NA \$900/AF Based on actual cost, around \$300/AF			575 meters as of September many customers have more than one meter	The state of the s	90 - 100 miles	1260 (old) 4500 (new)	5000 (old) will be achieve by end or calendar year. 8y 2035, they may be up to 8-9000 AF if they expand.	
Del Mar (City of)	San Elijo W.R.F.	Pass through to Fairgrounds, no mark-up, \$805.86/AF with a take-or-pay agreement for 150 AFY.	1 - 22nd DAA for Fairgrounds				1/4 mile max	85 AFY	150 is what's paid for but the fairgrounds only currently uses 85. No plans to expand since parks are the only place where water would be used and they are too far away to justify cost.	
Escondido (City of)	Hale Avenue R.R.F.							0	4,200	Landscape, agriculture, industrial
Fallbrook P.U.D.	Fallbrook Plant #1	NA - Owned by P.U.D.	0	Washing to Sa	About 12	\$2.20 per thousand gallons	No sure but less than 10 miles	431 (old) closer to S50 (new)	850 (old) 650-700 (new)	Landscape, agriculture
Oceanside (City of)	San Luis Rey W.W.T.P.	NA - Owned by City	0		1 - Oceanside Municipal Gol Course	f \$1.75 per HCF	Unsure but very little infrastructure which is why there is only one client		2700 - Still accurant	Landscape, environmental
Olivenhain M.W.D.	4-S Ranch W.W.T.P. Santa Fe Valley W.R.F. Whispering Palms W.P.C.F.							271	3,800	Landscape, environmental, pasture irrigation
Otay W.D.	R.W. Chapman W.R.F.  South Bay W.R.P Don't ask about this one	NA \$350/ AF	0		Less than 670 connections: some customers have more than one meter.	Charged at %85 of potable rate so depending on the customer and which tier they are using, the rate will be different. Irrigation customers vs homes, etc.	Арргох. 700	971 (old) for clanedar year 08 (4727) (new)	7800 (old) 10,000 (new) at buildout which will be later than 2035	Landscape, environmental
Padre Dam M.W.D.	Santee Basin W.R.P.	NA	0		201 meters	%90 of potable water - 2nd tier price only. Amounts to \$3.6162 per HCF	30	900	900 (old) looking into plant expansion and top possibility is 2700 AFY with infrastructure development, estimates 1500 in 2035	Landscape, environmental
Pendleton U.S.M.C.	Camp Pendleton W.W.T.P.							3,915	800	Landscape, environmental
Ramona M.W.D.	Santa Maria W.P.C.F.	NA	0	edward oxid	3 customers: 1 for Santa Maria is Mt. Woodson Golf Course, 2 for San Vicente are S.V. Golf Course and Spangle Peak Ranch (avacado and citrus orchards)		3 miles for SV and 8 for SM	902 (old) 250 AF to Mt. Woodson, 400 to Spangler, and 240 to S.V. Golf Course: Total = 890	1300 (old) still current	Landscape, environmental, agriculture
Rincon Del Diablo M.W.D.	San Vicente W.P.C.F.	NA								Landscape, agriculture, industrial
	Hale Avenue R.R.F.	SDG&E's cooling tower water is 100% rate pass-through (\$1.30/1000 gallons) For others they pay \$540/AF	0		58 meters in 2007-2008 + SDG&E	\$2.75/1000 gallons	4.5 miles	Annual for last FY was 3291.1 AF	Doesn't have a set amount, is limited by HARRF's output, will be expanding, looking into other options.	
ian Dieguito W.D.	San Elijo W.R.F.	Pay a JPA for %85 of their commercial rate (which equals \$2.12 /HCF after 85%)	0		62+ meters, some customers have multiple meters	Charge %85 of the commercial rate for most, but landscaping companies by \$2.58/HCF - all goes to San Elijo JPA	JPA owned, contact is Mike	405 (old) last year around 700 AF, estimate reduction due to conservation around 600	700 (old) 800 (new) guestimate	Landscape, agriculture, industrial
anta Fe I.D.	Fairbanks Ranch W.R.F. Rancho Santa Fe W.R.F. San Eiljo W.R.F. (JPA)	No water No water Base on 85% of potable water rate (which equals over \$1080/AF)	0		47 connections, 19 cusomters	\$2.89 per HCF	No pipelines, they are owned by San Elijo, unsure of # of miles	863 (old) 500 AFY current	1090 (old) still accurate, probably looking more like 1200	Landscape, environmental
alley Center M.W.D.	Lower Moosa Canyon W.R.F. Skyline Ranch Country Club Woods Valley Ranch T. P. (proposed)	No	0		1 - Wodds Valley Golf Course	\$2.1828 per HCF	3 miles or so to holding ponds at golf course	304 (old) Current is 44 AFY	1620 (old) Moosa may be producing 900 AF/Y by then, and 400/500 AF/Y within the next two years	Landscape, environmental
/ista I.D.	Shadowridge W.R.P. (is this in commission? Any plans for using recycled water?	Plant owned by City of Vista, Shadowridge feasibility study being done by Mark Elliott right nowno conclusions yet.	looking at who	used to be used by placed by placed to City Carlsbad.					300	Landscape

# METRO WASTEWATER JPA



Agenda 1/20/10 ITOM#5

276 Fourth Avenue Chula Vista, CA 91950 619-476-2557

Ernest Ewin, Chairman

January 14, 2010

Mr. Rod Greek Metropolitan Wastewater Department 9192 Topaz Way San Diego, California 92123

Subject:

Refund of 2007 year-end adjustments to the Participating Agencies

Dear Mr. Greek:

This letter is a follow up from our phone conversation earlier today wherein I indicated that the PA's would like to have San Diego move forward and refund the Participating Agencies' 2007 year-end adjustment.

Since our last meeting to discuss the participating agencies potential participation in the Metro operations reserve and debt service coverage the 2008 Exhibit E audit has been finalized. Draft numbers show an even larger refund than the 2007 year-end adjustment that was finalized in August 2009. With the projections of continued refunds in the \$6.5 million range for 2009 and 2010 we feel that the City has sufficient money to fund our potential participation in both the debt service coverage and operations reserve.

The Metro TAC subcommittee has discussed this and has come to a conclusion that since 2008 shows a surplus of \$6.6 million that the 2007 year-end adjustment should be made with the February 2010 billing thus releasing the \$5.8 million held by the City for that year. This will serve as our formal request for you to include the 2007 year-end adjustment in the February 2010 billing. We have attached the schedule that was provided to us at the close of the 2007 Exhibit E audit showing the adjustments required per participating agency.

We appreciate your facilitation of this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact Karen Keese or I if you have any questions.

Singerely.

Scott Huth

MetroTAC Chairman

Attachment A

CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT

# DISTRIBUTION OF SYSTEM WASTEWATER COSTS - FISCAL YEAR 2007 FUNCTIONAL-DESIGN BASED ALLOCATION METHOD

TABLE B

ALLOCCATION OF COSTS BY FLOW, SUSPENDED SOLIDS AND CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND								
AGENCY	FLOW (a)	SS (a)	COD (a)	TOTAL FLOW, SS & COD	TOTAL PAID FOR FY 2007	DIFFERENCE	% INC/DEC	Money Held By SD for
CHULA VISTA	\$6,935,611	\$3,621,468	\$3,418,703	\$13,975,802	\$15,812,812	(\$1,837,010)	-11.62%	Cashflow (\$1,837,010)
CORONADO	\$913,690	\$348,864	\$351,300	\$1,613,854	\$1,803,764	(\$169,910)	-10.53%	(\$189,910)
DEL MAR	\$263,826	\$163,243	\$122,946	\$550,015	\$637,800	(\$87,785)	-13.76%	(\$87,785)
EL CAJON	<b>\$</b> 3,519,478	\$1,499,392	\$1,425,945	<b>\$6,444,</b> 815	\$6,735,184	(\$290,369)	-4.31%	(\$290,369)
IMPERIAL BEACH	\$893,187	\$418,187	\$378,150	\$1,689,524	\$1,821,824	(\$132,300)	-7.26%	(\$132,300)
LA MESA	\$2,097,523	\$905,657	\$796,191	<b>\$3,799,37</b> 1	\$3,899,164	(\$99,793)	-2.56%	(\$99,793)
LAKESIDE/ALPINE	\$1,289,432	\$586,725	\$474,326	\$2,350,483	\$2,643,796	(\$293,313)	-11.09%	(\$289,313)
LEMON GROVE	\$905,745	\$402,078	<b>\$376,</b> 151	\$1,683,974	\$1,831,008	(\$147,034)	-8.03%	(\$147,034)
NATIONAL CITY	\$1,962,011	\$941,824	\$954,730	\$3,858,565	\$4,495,944	(\$637,379)	-14.18%	(\$637,579)
OTAY	\$114,567	\$430,704	\$190,669	\$735,940	\$612.148	\$123,792	20.22%	\$0
PADRE DAM	\$1,153,906	\$1,642,305	\$1,141,237	\$3,937,448	<b>\$</b> 4,727,424	(\$789,976)	-16.71%	(\$789,976)
POWAY	\$1,319,615	<b>\$551,405</b>	<b>\$467,813</b>	\$2,336,833	\$3,022,084	(\$683,251)	-22.61%	
SPRING VALLEY	\$2,637,006	\$1,045,996	<b>\$978,89</b> 3	\$4,661,895	\$5,272,988	(\$611,093)	-11.59%	(\$643,251)
WINTERGARDENS	\$368,916	\$134,014	<b>\$</b> 116,742	\$619,672	\$691,656	(\$71,984)	Peda coo sa	(\$611,093)
SUBTOTAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	\$24,374,513	\$12,691,882	\$11,193,796	\$48,260,191	\$54,007,596	(\$5,747,405)	-10.41%	(\$71.984)
SAN DIEGO	<b>\$45,438,510</b>	\$25,637,066	\$23,349,041	\$94,424,617	4-1-01	(604,141,00)	-10.64%	(\$5,871,197)
TOTAL	\$69,813,022	\$38,328,947	\$34,542,837	\$142,684,803				

<sup>(</sup>a) Allocations based on estimated annual flows and strength loadings - See Table C

---



## THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO





January 14, 2010

AGENDA 1/20/10 ITEM# 5

Scott Huth Director of Public Services City of Coronado Department of Public Service Coronado, CA 92118-1510

Dear Mr. Huth:

Subject: FY 2011 Estimated Billing

Enclosed is the FY 2011 Estimated Billing for the Participating Agencies and the Ten-Year Capital Improvement Plan. The O&M portion of the estimate is based on a review of actual expenditures for several prior years, current year budget, and anticipated expenditure changes as discussed with our budget staff. The CIP is based on 80% bond financing of the projected FY 2011 Metro CIP budget. The debt service portion is based on anticipated expenditures for previous year's bond financing, and SRF expenditures.

We are in the process of providing at least one more year of estimates as some Participating Agencies have asked. We hope to provide that sometime in February.

If you have any questions regarding the formulation of these estimates, please contact Peggy Merino at 858 292-6322 or pmerino@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,

Rod Greek

Deputy Director, Finance & Information Technology

RG:pm

Enclosures:

10-19ciplist

Table A – Estimated Unit Costs FY 2011

Table B – Projected Distribution of Wastewater System Costs FY 2011

Table C - System Wastewater Characteristics FY 2011 Table D - Allocation of Estimated Budget FY 2011

cc:

File



## METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT

### CIP PROJECTS FY 2010 - FY 2019

CIP PROJE	CTS - FUND 41508	10 YEAR TOTAL
CIP#	TITLE	TOTAL
45-943.0	POINT LOMA - GRIT PROCESSING IMPROVEMENTS	\$33,859,482
	TOTAL 41508	\$33,859,482

CTS - FUND 41509	
	10 YEAR
	TOTAL
TITLE	
ANNUAL ALLOCATION-METRO BIOSOLIDS CENTER	\$19,742,975
ANNUAL ALLOCATION - METRO OPERATIONS CENTER	\$1,246,840
ANNUAL ALLOCATION - METROPOLITAN SYSTEM PUMP STATIONS	\$5,370,654
ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING & TECH. SERVICES LAB BOAT DOCK	\$2,304,000
MBC BIOSOLIDS STORAGE SILOS	\$7,600,000
MBC DEWATERING CENTRIFUGES REPLACEMENT	\$8,777,842
MBC ODOR CONTROL FACILITY UPGRADES	\$3,739,720
NCWRP - SLUDGE PUMP STATION UPGRADE	\$469,976
NCWRP -EDR UPGRADE	\$565,000
NCWRP - EDR ENCLOSURE	\$500,000
PUMP STATION 2 ONSITE STANDBY POWER	\$9,983,800
SOUTH BAY PUMP STATION AND CONVEYANCE SYSTEM PHASE 1	\$9,100,000
SOUTH BAY WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PHASE 1	\$9,100,000
SBWRP DEMINERALIZATION PHASE 1 & 2	\$16,926,823
SOUTH METRO SEWER REHABILITATION PHASE IIIB	\$9,500,000
WET WEATHER STORAGE FACILITY	\$115,514,020
MBC CHEMICAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE II	\$3,100,000
METRO FACILITIES CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE	\$10,200,000
TOTAL 41509	\$233,741,650
	ANNUAL ALLOCATION-METRO BIOSOLIDS CENTER ANNUAL ALLOCATION - METRO OPERATIONS CENTER ANNUAL ALLOCATION - METROPOLITAN SYSTEM PUMP STATIONS ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING & TECH. SERVICES LAB BOAT DOCK MBC BIOSOLIDS STORAGE SILOS MBC DEWATERING CENTRIFUGES REPLACEMENT MBC ODOR CONTROL FACILITY UPGRADES NCWRP - SLUDGE PUMP STATION UPGRADE NCWRP - EDR UPGRADE NCWRP - EDR ENCLOSURE PUMP STATION 2 ONSITE STANDBY POWER SOUTH BAY PUMP STATION AND CONVEYANCE SYSTEM PHASE 1 SOUTH BAY WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PHASE 1 SBWRP DEMINERALIZATION PHASE 1 & 2 SOUTH METRO SEWER REHABILITATION PHASE IIIB WET WEATHER STORAGE FACILITY MBC CHEMICAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE II METRO FACILITIES CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE

## CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT FISCAL YEAR 2011 ESTIMATED UNIT COSTS FUNCTIONAL-DESIGN COST ALLOCATION METHOD

FY 2011 BUDGET	UNITS	COST PER UNIT
, ,	(-)	\$1,405.08 /per Million Gallons \$341.89 /per Thousand Pounds \$150.58 /per Thousand Pounds
)	BUDGET  OUNT % 4,365,156 49.6%  0,539,847 26.6% 5,342,333 23.8%	BUDGET UNITS  OUNT % 4,365,156 49.6% 67,160 (a)  0,539,847 26.6% 147,825 (b)  5,342,333 23.8% 301,125 (c)

<sup>(</sup>a) Units of Flow - Million Gallons Per Year

<sup>(</sup>b) Units of SS - Thousands of Pounds per Year

<sup>(</sup>c) Units of COD - Thousands of Pounds per Year

TABLE B

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT PROJECTED DISTRIBUTION OF SYSTEM WASTEWATER COSTS - FISCAL YEAR 2011 FUNCTIONAL-DESIGN BASED ALLOCATION METHOD

_		expre	expressed in percents:				
AGENCY	FLOW (a)	SS (a)	CAL OXYGEN DEMAND  COD (a)	TOTAL FLOW, SS & COD	SUS FLOW	PENDED SOLIDS	OXYGEN DEMAND
CHULA VISTA	\$9,000,744	\$4,648,859	\$4,402,206	\$18,051,809	9.54%	9.20%	9.71%
CORONADO	1,360,198	497,005	516,625	2,373,828	1.44%	0.98%	1.14%
DEL MAR	377,591	246,986	174,478	799,055	0.40%	0.49%	0.38%
EAST OTAY MESA	159,959	79,492	67,933	307,384	0.17%	0.16%	0.15%
EL CAJON	4,787,898	1,946,012	1,835,259	8,569,169	5.07%	3.85%	4.05%
IMPERIAL BEACH	1,224,178	620,473	505,714	2,350,365	1.30%	1.23%	1.12%
LA MESA	2,834,653	1,197,163	1,054,367	5,086,183	3.00%	2.37%	2.33%
LAKESIDE/ALPINE	1,768,258	773,266	649,067	3,190,591	1.87%	1.53%	1.43%
LEMON GROVE	1,249,206	545,016	522,258	2,316,480	1.32%	1.08%	1.15%
NATIONAL CITY	2,486,987	1,153,747	1,165,379	4,806,113	2.64%	2.28%	2,57%
OTAY	164,856	223,624	98,866	487,346	0.17%	0.44%	0.22%
PADRE DAM	1,670,323	2,328,495	1,188,872	5,187,690	1.77%	4.61%	2.62%
POWAY	1,887,411	883,834	703,844	3,475,089	2.00%	1.75%	1.55%
SPRING VALLEY	3,933,693	2,003,754	1,594,891	7,532,338	4.17%	3.96%	3.52%
WINTERGARDENS	522,316	194,134	186,722	903,172	0.55%	0.38%	0.41%
SUBTOTAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	\$33,428,271	\$17,341,860	\$14,666,481	\$65,436,612	35.42%	34.31%	32.35%
SAN DIEGO	\$60,936,883	\$33,197,988	\$30,675,850	\$124,810,721	64.58%	65.69%	67.65%
TOTAL	\$94,365,154	\$50,539,848	\$45,342,331	\$190,247,333	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

<sup>(</sup>a) Allocations based on estimated annual flows and strength loadings - See Table C

#### CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT SYSTEM WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS - FISCAL YEAR 2011 SYSTEM STRENGTH LOADINGS INCLUDED

2)	WASTEWATER CHARACTERISTICS			UNAL	UNADJUSTED ANNUAL USE			ADJUSTED ANNUAL USE		
AGENCY	AVERAGE FLOW - mgd (a)	SS COD mg/l (b) mg/l (b)		2011 FLOWS million gallons	SS thousand pounds	COD thousand pounds	2011 FLOWS million gallons	SS thousand pounds	COD thousand	
CHULA VISTA	16.543	207	623	6,038.222	10,409	31,390	6,405.860	13,598	pounds 29,236	
CORONADO	2.500	146	484	912.500	1,113	3,684	968.058	1,454	3,431	
DEL MAR	0.694	262	589	253.310	553	1,244	268.733	722	1,159	
EAST OTAY MESA	0.294	199	541	107.310	178	484	113.844	233	451	
EL CAJON	8.800	163	488	3,212.000	4,357	13,086	3,407,563	5,692	12,188	
IMPERIAL BEACH	2,250	203	526	821.250	1,389	3,606	871.252	1,815	3,359	
LA MESA	5.210	169	474	1,901.650	2,681	7,518	2,017.432	3,502	7,002	
LAKESIDE/ALPINE	3.250	175	468	1,186.250	1,731	4,628	1,258.475	2,262	4,311	
LEMON GROVE	2.296	175	533	838.040	1,220	3,724	889.064	1,594	3,468	
NATIONAL CITY	4.571	186	597	1,668.415	2,583	8,310	1,769.997	3,375	7,739	
ОТАУ	0,303	543	764	110,595	501	705	117.329	654	657	
PADRE DAM	3,070	558	907	1,120.550	5,214	8,477	1,188.775	6,811	7,895	
POWAY	3,469	187	475	1,266.185	1,979	5,019	1,343.277	2,585	4,674	
SPRING VALLEY	7.230	204	516	2,638.950	4,487	11,372	2,799.623	5,861	10,592	
WINTERGARDENS	0.960	149	455	350.400	435	1,331	371.734	568	1,240	
SUBTOTAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	61.440	207	559	22,425.627	38,830	104,579	23,791.015	50,724	97,402	
SAN DIEGO	112.000	218	641	40,880.000	74,333	218,733	43,368.985	97,101	203,723	
REGIONAL SLUDGE RETURNS	10.560	1,078	(690)	3,854.373	34,663	(22,187)				
TOTAL	184.000	264	537	67,160.000	147,825	301,125	67,160.000	147,825	301,125	

<sup>(</sup>a) Estimated flows based on sewage Flow projections provided by Participating Agencies November/December 2009.

Mass Balance provided by the MWWD Engineering & Program Management division dated December 9, 2009

<sup>(</sup>b) SS and COD characteristics based on standard deviation cumulative samples taken by MWWD's Environmental Monitoring and Technical Services Division up to 06-30-09.



### CITY OF SAN DIEGO - METROPOLITAN WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT ALLOCATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2011 ESTIMATED BUDGET FUNCTIONAL-DESIGN BASED ALLOCATION METHOD

4	FY 2011				ALLOCATION OF CO	OSTS			
DESCRIPTION	BUDGET	FLOW	FLOW	SS	SS	COD	COD	TOTAL	
	COSTS	%	COSTS	%	COSTS	%	COSTS	COSTS	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE :									
TRANSMISSION AND SYSTEM MAINTENANCE	\$10,000,000	100.0%	\$10,000,000	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$10,000,000	
OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE	48,000,000	36.9%	17,697,097	33.9%	16,287,488	29.2%	14,015,415	48,000,000	
TECHNICAL SERVICES	9,000,000	30.0%	2,700,000	40.0%	3,600,000	30.0%	2,700,000	9,000,000	
COGENERATION	500,000	0.0%	0	60.0%	300,000	40.0%	200,000	500,000	
METRO ADMIN & GENERAL EXPENSES - 41508	19,000,000	45.0%	8,556,885	30.0%	5,695,360	25.0%	4,747,756	19,000,000	
METRO ADMIN & GENERAL EXPENSES - 41509	23,000,000	45.0%	10,358,334	30.0%	6,894,383	25.0%	5,747,283	23,000,000	
TOTAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	\$109,500,000	45.03%	\$49,312,316	29,93%	\$32,777,230	25.03%	\$27,410,454	\$109,500,000	
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM :									
PAY-AS-YOU-GO METRO 41508	2,171,896	55.8%	1,211,806	22.0%	477,769	22.2%	482,322	2,171,897	
PAY-AS-YOU-GO METRO 41509	3,438,314	55.8%	1,918,401	22.0%	756,352	22.2%	763,560	3,438,313	
DEBT SERVICE	75,137,126	55.8%	41,922,633	22.0%	16,528,496	22.2%	16,685,997	75,137,126	
TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	\$80,747,336	55.8%	\$45,052,840	22.0%	\$17,762,617	22.2%	\$17,931,879	\$80,747,336	
TOTAL O&M & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	\$190,247,336	49.6%	\$94,365,156	26.6%	\$50,539,847	23.8%	\$45,342,333	\$190,247,336	

AGENDA 1/20/2010 ITEM#6
DRAFT

# PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT FY 2010 Annual & FY 2011 Proposed Budget- Metro CIP Projects

FUNDING									N V/488/484	
OURCE	Fund No.	CIP NUMBER	WBS#	PROJECT TITLE	Prior Year Costs (FY09 and before)	FY 2010 Budget	FY 2011 Budget	Est. Total Project Cost	Est 2010-2019 Budget	Notes
METRO	41509	42-913.0		TREATMENT PLANTS ANNUAL ALLOCATION- METRO TREATMENT PLANTS This project provides for improvements and modifications to the existing Metro facilities to implement operating efficiencies, optimization of existing facilities and compliance with revised regulatory and operation plan requirements.		\$3,742,975.00	\$4,000,000.00		\$19,472,975	
			B-00527	NCWRP EDR #6	\$55,121.94	1,242,975		\$2,600,000.00		Total project cost includes estimated Carryover funds prior year of \$1.3 million.
			new	Point Loma Twelve Sedimentation Basins Equip Refurbishment  MBC Plant Water Systems Improvements		****	\$3,000,000.00	4.,200,000.00		
	27.72	45-966.0	Hew	METRO FACILITIES CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE	4070 400 07	\$200,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$1,000,000.00		
				This project provides for the upgrading of the existing Distributed Control System to the current (Emerson) system at the Metro Biosolids Center (MBC).	\$679,163.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,200,000.00		Total project cost includes estimated Carryover funds prior year of \$4 million.
METRO	41509	41-942.0		NORTH CITY WATER RECLAMATION PLANT (NCWRP) - SLUDGE PUMP STATION UPGRADE This project will entail a study to determine the source of the vibration and to implement a remediation plan to eliminate the vibration and thus reduce maintenance, and increase equipment life.	\$438.09	\$150,000.00	\$319,976.00	\$470,414.00	\$469,876.00	
ETRO	41509	45-983.0	S-00339	METRO BIOSOLIDS CENTER DEWATERING CENTRIFUGES REPLACEMENT The project will replace 4 of the 8 existing centrifuges with 4 new larger capacity centrifuge units.	\$934.41	\$277,842.00	\$2,000,000.00	\$8,778,776.41	\$8,777,842.00	
ETRO	41509	45-989.0	S-00323	METRO BIOSOLIDS CENTER ODOR CONTROL FACILITY UPGRADES This project will upgrade the existing Odor Control System.	\$8,045.11	\$582,400.00	\$1,606,493.00	\$5,600,000.00	\$3,739,720.00	
ETRO	41509	45-993.0	S-00340	NORTH CITY WATER RECLAMATION PLANT - ELECTRODIALYSIS REVERSAL ENCLOSURE This project is to install an enclosure to protect the EDR equipment.	\$0.00	\$240,000.00	\$260,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	
ETRO	41509	45-992.0		NORTH CITY WATER RECLAMATION PLANT - ELECTRODIALYSIS REVERSAL UPGRADE This project is to remove and upgrade all EDR equipment	\$0.00	\$230,000.00	\$335,000.00	\$1,100,000.00	\$565,000.00	
ETRO	41509	45-984.0		MBC Biosolids Storage Slios This project will add two more storage silos and will also evaluate alternatives for additional truck loadout stations.	\$120,319.71	\$0.00	\$1,600,000.00	\$9,200,000.00	\$7,600,000.00	
ETRO	41509	45-943.0		Point Loma - Grit Processing Improvements The Grit Processing Improvements project will include reconstruction of the old south grit tanks and their adjacent pump gallery, replacement of the headworks building that was constructed in 1962 with a new drive-through facility, expansion of an existing odor removal system and replacement of auxiliary equipment.	\$4,727,066.88	\$0.00	\$10,859,482.00	\$38,586,549.00	\$33,859,482.00	
				SUBTOTAL	\$5,535,967.9	\$5,223,217.0	\$20,980,951.0	\$71,435,739,4	\$74,984,995.0	
	I				40,000,007.00	70,000,011.0	7201000100100	VI 17-00/100/A	<b>₩</b> , ¬,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	

FUNDING	tho		***		2340 444 M	3	2.50			
OURCE	Fund No.	CIP NUMBER	WBS#	PROJECT TITLE	Prior Year Costs (FY09 and before)	FY 2010 Budge	FY 2011 Budge	t Est. Total Project Cost	Est 2010-2019 Budget	Notes
METRO	41509	41-926.0	A-BP.00002	LARGE PUMP STATIONS  ANNUAL ALLOCATION - METROPOLITAN SYSTEM PUMP STATIONS  This project provides for comprehensive upgrades, design modifications, major/minor renovations or replacement of major equipment such as: pumps, valves, tanks, controls, odd control system, etc. These improvements will allow the pump stations to be run more efficiently plus increase the reliability of the Metropolitan Wastewater System.		\$337,459.00	\$337,459.00		\$5,370,654.00	
IETRO	41509	45-915.0	new S-00312	Stairway Project at Point Loma Hydroelectric Bidg  PUMP STATION 2 ONSITE STANDBY POWER  This project will replace the Engine drives for pumps 4 & 5 with electric motors and provide two generators for electrical power to the pumps at the station. This will provide the required surge protection against an electrical utility outage.	\$0.00	\$300,000.00 \$748,800.00	\$0.00	\$10,200,000.00	\$9,983,800.00	
-				SUBTOTAL	\$0.0	\$1,086,259.0	\$337,459.0	\$10,200,000,0	\$15,354,454.0	
METRO	41509	46-502.0	A-BR.00004	OTHER PROJECTS POOLED CONTINGENCY This is a pooled contingency fund for Metro projects.		\$94,663.00	\$0.00	Marie de Santo	\$0.00	
ETRO	41509	45-940.0	S-00314	WET WEATHER STORAGE FACILITY This project includes the implementation of the Live Stream Discharge of reclaimed water from the North City Water Reclamation Plant during heavy rain events to reduce the capact demand on the downstream sewer system and facilities. This project also includes constructing a seven-million gallon (7-MG) Underground Storage Tank at the Liberty Station (vacated Naval Training Center) to provide hydraulic relief to the Pump Station 2, the South and North Metro Interceptors, and the major trunk sewers.	1	\$280,766.00	\$432,640.00	\$117,367,236.04	\$115,514,020.00	
ETRO	41509	45-961.0	S-00317	South Metro Sewer Rehabilitation, Phase 3B This project will rehabilitate the remaining 5000' of the 108" pipeline from Winship Lane to Pump Station 2.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500,000.00	\$9,500,000.00	\$9,500,000.00	
ETRO	41509	n/a	new	MBC Chemical System Improvements PH II This project is to improve the operation and maintenance and address the safety problems the MBC Chemical Building.	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00	\$3,100,000.00	\$3,100,000.00	
ETRO	41509	n/a	new	Metro Facilities Control System Upgrade PH II This project provides for the upgrading of the existing Distributed Control System to the current (Emerson) system at the wastewater treatment plants (Point Loma & NCWRP).	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,200,000.00	\$10,200,000.00	\$10,200,000.00	
				SUBTOTA	\$1,853,216.0	\$375,429.0	\$6,732,640.0	\$140,167,236,0	\$138,314,020.0	
		18011	1000000	TOTAL PROJECTS	\$7,389,184	\$6,684,905	\$28,051,050	\$221,802,978	\$228,653,469	N



AGENDA 1/20/10 ITEM # 10

SUPPLEMENTAL TO

BUDGET ANALYSIS

January 18, 2010

Mr. Doug Wilson Treasurer, Metro Wastewater Commission/JPA c/o Padre Dam Municipal Water District P.O. Box 719003 Santee, CA 92072

SUBJECT: Metro Wastewater Commission Mid-Year Budget Overruns

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Earlier this week I provided you with PBS&J's November and December billings for Financial and Engineering Services in support of the Metro Wastewater Commission/JPA/MetroTAC. I noted to you that, while we are currently at mid-year (50% of the fiscal year remaining), we have only 31% of our FYE 2010 budget remaining. The purpose of this letter is to provide you and the Metro member agencies with an explanation for this.

### The Issue

The following table summarizes where we stand in each one of our contract's tasks.

Took	Total to 12/31/08	Budget	Remaining	% Romaining
TASK: 1001-Attend MetroTAC	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 8,400.00	\$ 4,200.00	50%
TASK: 1002-Attend Metro Commission	\$ 2,117.00	\$ 8,400.00	\$ 6,283.00	75%
TASK: 1003-Support Metro AdHoc Finance Committee	\$ 3,325.00	\$ 9,219.00	\$ 5,894.00	64%
TASK: 1004-Participate in Metro Strategic Planning Workshop	\$ -	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 2,800.00	100%
TASK: 2000-Exhibit E Audit	\$ 13,737.50	\$ 21,700.00	\$ 7,962.50	37%
TASK: 3000 Budget Review	\$ 3,407.50	\$ 10,150.00	\$ 6,742.50	66%
TASK: 4001-Metro TAC Staff Support	\$ 12,860.00	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 3,940.00	23%
TASK: 4002-Update Cap Fee Model	\$ 5,865.00	\$ 2,800.00	\$ (3,065.00)	-109%
TASK: 4003-Reclaimed Water Issues	\$ 19,228.00	\$ 8,400.00	\$ (10,828.00)	-129%
TASK: 4004-All Other Special Projects	\$ 7,720.00	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 9,080.00	54%
TASK: 9000-Direct Expenses	\$ 137.67	\$ 126.00	\$ (11.67)	-9%
Total Ali Tasks	72,597.67	105,595.00	32,997.33	31%

As you will note, the majority of the tasks have adequate remaining budget for the rest of the fiscal year. The only other tasks where a potential overrun might occur relate to our work on the Exhibit E audit and our MetroTAC support. The money we have expended year-to-date has accomplished the closure of the 2007 and 2008 audits. The current audit schedule shows that,

Doug Wilson
January 18, 2010
Metro WW Commission Budget
Page 2 of 3

potentially, we could have the 2009 audit closed by fiscal year end as well. Technically we only budgeted to complete one audit, but with the San Diego staffs' additional preparation of documentation for us, we have achieved economies of scale which bode well for the future. MetroTAC Staff Support (Task 4001) is for on-call technical support to MetroTAC and is based on issues that arise which need our assistance. Recent items included facilitating the PAs' review and comment of Brown & Caldwell Technical Memorandums 1 and 2 and compiling PAs' responses, and preparing background material for City staff to standardize the Metro CIP format for review by the PAs.

The overruns fall into three tasks:

- 1. Resolution of Reclaimed Water Issue,
- 2. Update of the Metro Capacity Valuation Model, and
- 3. Direct Expenses.

### Task 4003 – Resolution of Reclaimed Water Issue

The overrun in Task 4003 is the most substantial. The total expenditures for this task to date consist of the following:

Meetings w/City Staff	\$1,050.00
Reconciliation of Reclaimed Revenues & Expenses	\$13,803.00
Review & response to Recycled Water Pricing Study	\$4,375.00
Total Expenditures to Date	\$19,228.00

The first is the resolution of the reclaimed water issue. Essentially our budget was for 48 hours to meet with the City and the MetroTAC subcommittee and do some minor analysis of a resolution proposal prepared by City staff. However, this has not been the case. After two meetings with staff, it was determined that the subcommittee was going to have to make a proposal to them. Therefore, as directed by the subcommittee, we answered the questions of what is the financial responsibility of the PAs per the Regional Wastewater Disposal Agreement (Agreement), how much reclaimed revenue has been collected from both the North City and the South Bay subsystems, and what additional expenses the Metro System has incurred for both the required capital facilities and the annual operating expenses to produce the reclaimed water from inception.

PSB&J requested the information from the City and they were unable to provide it. Thus we had to reconstruct not only what the current debt service is for the Optimized System that the PAs are required to repay per the Agreement (the original debt had been refunded several times and the City could not clearly demonstrate what the PAs' current responsibility was for the debt service), but also what revenues and expenses have been since the completion of both water reclamation plants and the beginnings of reclaimed water sales. Water sales had to be reconstructed from wholesale customers' records as the City could not provide us with the information. The CIP had to be reconstructed by going through past CIP records from the audits



Doug Wilson January 18, 2010 Metro WW Commission Budget Page 3 of 3

of each fiscal year. We prepared an economic model containing this information that can be updated each year to provide a record of revenue and expenses for the system and project when the Metro system will no longer have the repayment responsibility for the Optimized System debt. We have provided a copy of the model to the subcommittee for their use in continued negotiations with the City.

In addition, earlier this year the City provided us with a draft of their Recycled Water Pricing Study. PBS&J was tasked with reviewing the study and coordinating comments from MetroTAC members. We prepared a summary of the issues and a response letter to the City requesting further input once the next version of the study is complete. This task was not envisioned during the preparation of the scope for this year.

# Task 4002 - Update of Metro Capacity Valuation Model

In February 2008, Raftelis Consulting completed a study which provided multiple valuation methodologies for the Metro System. As part of that study, they were to provide an economic model that could be updated to keep the system value current. Many agencies use the valuation as a basis for the Metro portion of their capacity fees. During planning for this year's support contract, it was decided that, since the valuation was almost three years out-of-date, the model should be updated. We requested the model from Raftelis but what we received was just a few spreadsheets of asset values. Thus we had to construct the required model before we could update the values. We had not anticipated constructing the model in our scope; rather, we anticipated only updating it with current numbers.

### Task 9000 - Direct Expenses

The slight overrun in the direct expenses is due to the fact that we did not budget for providing breakfast or lunch for the Finance AdHoc Committee. This can easily be mitigated by moving money as needed from the Finance Committee budget to cover this expense.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this letter is to provide an explanation of the three tasks where there are cost overruns at mid-year. It is quite possible that, if there are cost savings in other areas, such as the budget review, we will end the year within our contract budget. Still, we wanted you to be aware in advance of the current overruns and their cause.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Karyn Keese

Manager, Client Financial Services



**Draft**Schedule of Participating Agency Debt Coverage for FY 2007-2011
Prepared on: August 31, 2009

Transfer (to)/from Rate Stablization Fund         (2,037,339)         52,334         (360,892)         611         156,484         77         19         (66)           Undesignated Fund Balance Interest         (1)         306,913         357,427         297,883         229,489         206,978         202,900           Operating Reserve Interest         (2)         153,036         154,566         156,112         157,673         159,250         160,842           Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607			FY0	7	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Return to PAs (1,985,005) (1,430,875) (3,048,156) (4,085,000) (5,775,000) (5,225,000) (4,800,000) (4,525,000) (7,775,000) (7,7	(Contributions over/(un	der) \$65M										
Transfer (to)/from Operating Reserve         (3,982,722)         (597,420)         597,420         -         (39,827)         (40,225)         (40,628)         (41,034)         (41,444)           Transfer (to)/from Rate Stabilization Fund         (2,037,339)         52,334         (360,892)         611         156,484         77         19         (66)           Undesignated Fund Balance Interest         (1)         306,913         357,427         297,883         229,489         206,978         202,900           Operating Reserve Interest         (2)         153,036         154,566         156,112         157,673         159,250         160,842           Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	PA System Revenue		\$5	4,007,596	\$63,231,038	\$57,249,960	\$64,487,408	\$65,000,000	\$65,000,000	\$65,000,000		\$65,000,000
Transfer (to)/from Rate Stablization Fund         (2,037,339)         52,334         (360,892)         611         156,484         77         19         (66)           Undesignated Fund Balance Interest         (1)         306,913         357,427         297,883         229,489         206,978         202,900           Operating Reserve Interest         (2)         153,036         154,566         156,112         157,673         159,250         160,842           Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	Return to PAs				(1,985,005)	(1,430,875)	(3,048,156)	(4,085,000)	(5,775,000)	(5,225,000)	(4,800,000)	(4,525,000)
Undesignated Fund Balance Interest         (1)         306,913         357,427         297,883         229,489         206,978         202,900           Operating Reserve Interest         (2)         153,036         154,566         156,112         157,673         159,250         160,842           Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	Transfer (to)/from Operating Reserve		(3	3,982,722)	(59 <b>7</b> ,420)	597,420	-	(39,827)	(40,225)	(40,628)	(41,034)	(41,444)
Operating Reserve interest         (2)         153,036         154,566         156,112         157,673         159,250         160,842           Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	Transfer (to)/from Rate Stablization Fur	nd	(2	2,037,339)	52,334		(360,892)	611	156,484	77	19	(66)
Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	Undesignated Fund Balance Interest	(1)					306,913	357,427	297,883	229,489	206,978	202,900
Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest         (3)         92,412         92,389         86,376         86,373         86,372         86,375           Gross PA System Revenue         \$47,987,535         \$60,700,947         \$56,416,505         \$61,630,721         \$61,480,166         \$59,881,629         \$60,207,985         \$60,611,585         \$60,883,607	Operating Reserve Interest	(2)					153,036	154,566	156,112	157,673	159,250	160,842
Gross PA System Revenue \$47,987,535 \$60,700,947 \$56,416,505 \$61,630,721 \$61,480,166 \$59,881,629 \$60,207,985 \$60,611,585 \$60,883,607	Rate Stabilization Reserve Interest						92,412	92,389	86,376	86,373	86,372	86,3 <b>7</b> 5
	Gross PA System Revenue		\$4	7,987,535	\$60,700,947	\$56,416,505	\$61,630, <b>7</b> 21	\$61,480,166	\$59,881,629	\$60,207,985	\$60,611,585	\$60,883,607
	Less:	(4)	40	2 224 222	607.450.043	¢22.204.200	622 204 200	Ć22 C27 244	622.0F2.64.4	622 202 4F4	622 C4E 002	622.052.442
PA Estimated Total Operating Expenses (4) \$32,304,298 \$37,150,042 \$32,304,298 \$32,304,298 \$32,627,341 \$32,953,614 \$33,283,151 \$33,615,982 \$33,952,142	PA Estimated Total Operating Expenses	(4)	\$3	2,304,298	\$37,150,042	\$32,304,298	\$32,304,298	\$32,627,341	\$32,953,614	\$33,283,151	\$33,615,982	\$33,952,142
Net PA System Revenue \$15,683,237 \$23,550,905 \$24,112,207 \$29,326,423 \$28,852,825 \$26,928,015 \$26,924,834 \$26,995,603 \$26,931,465	Net PA System Revenue		\$1	5.683.237	\$23,550,905	\$24.112.207	\$29,326,423	\$28.852.825	\$26,928,015	\$26.924.834	\$26,995,603	\$26,931,465
					<del></del>	<b>V</b> - ///	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,-,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	<del></del>
PA CIP Debt Service Payment \$20,373,393 \$19,850,051 \$20,441,069 \$24,049,989 \$24,043,880 \$22,479,039 \$22,478,266 \$22,478,075 \$22,478,730	PA CIP Debt Service Payment		\$2	0.373.393	\$19.850.051	\$20,441,069	\$24.049.989	\$24.043.880	\$22,479,039	\$22,478,266	\$22.478.075	\$22,478,730
CIP Pay Go (5) (4,417,502) (512,512) - 1,318,048 5,610,210 7,369,218 5,800,940 4,570,129 4,655,009		(5)	•	*		-						
Total CIP and Debt Service 15,955,891 19,337,539 20,441,069 25,368,037 29,654,090 29,848,257 28,279,206 27,048,204 27,133,739	•	(-)				20.441.069		<del></del>				
				.,,								,,
Net Income after CIP and Debt Service (\$272,654) \$4,213,366 \$3,671,138 \$3,958,387 (\$801,266) (\$2,920,242) (\$1,354,372) (\$52,601) (\$202,274)	Net Income after CIP and Debt Service		(	\$272,654)	\$4,213,366	\$3,671,138	\$3,958,387	(\$801,266)	(\$2,920,242)	(\$1,354,372)	(\$52,601)	(\$202,274)
PA Undesignated Fund Balance (\$272,654) \$3,940,712 \$7,611,851 \$11,570,237 \$10,768,971 \$7,848,729 \$6,494,358 \$6,441,756 \$6,239,482	PA Undesignated Fund Balance		(	\$272,654)	\$3,940, <b>7</b> 12	\$7,611,851	\$11,570,237	\$10,768,97 <b>1</b>	\$ <b>7</b> ,848,729	\$6,494,358	\$6,441, <b>7</b> 56	\$6,239,482
Calculated Debt Service Ratio (min req 1.2 times) 0.77 1.19 1.18 1.22 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20	Calculated Debt Service Ratio (min req :	1.2 times)		0.77	1.19	1.18	1.22	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
Operating Reserve (45 days) \$3,982,722 \$4,580,142 \$3,982,722 \$3,982,722 \$4,022,549 \$4,062,774 \$4,103,402 \$4,144,436 \$4,185,881	Operating Reserve (45 days)		\$	3,982,722	\$4,580,142	\$3,982,722	\$3,982,722	\$4,022,549	\$4,062,774	\$4,103,402	\$4,144,436	\$4,185,881
Rate Stabilization Balance (10% of ann debt service) \$ 2,037,339 \$ 1,985,005 \$ 2,044,107 \$ 2,404,999 \$ 2,404,388 \$ 2,247,904 \$ 2,247,827 \$ 2,247,808 \$ 2,247,873	Date Stabilization Palence /109/ of our	daht camical	ė -	0.027.220 <b>€</b>	4 095 005   \$	2 044 107	2 404 000 É	2 AOA 200 É	2 247 004   ¢	2 247 027 . 6	2 247 909 . 6	2 247 972
Rate Stabilization balance (10% of ann debt Service) \$ 2,057,555 \$ 1,565,005 \$ 2,447,675 \$ 2,447,675	Rate Stabilization balance (10% of ann c	debt service)	7 4	.,U37,339 \$	1,365,005 \$	2,044,107 \$	2,404,333 \$	2,404,366 \$	2,247,304 \$	2,247,027 \$	2,247,606 \$	2,247,073
(1) average of current year end bal + prior year end bal times 3.2% \$ 12,490,864 Calculated Savings for FY08 and FY07	(1) average of current year end i	bal + prior year end bal t	imes 3.2%		\$	12,490,864 Calcu	lated Savings for FYO8 a	ind FY07				
(2) ave monthly bal times LAIF rate (first year calculated at half year interest)6,026,829 Amount estimated in reserves at end of FY09	(2) ave monthly bal times LAIF ra	ate (first year calculated	at half year int	erest)		6,026,829 Amou	unt estimated in reserve	s at end of FY09				
(3) ave monthly bal times LAIF rate (first year calculated at half year interest) \$ 6,464,036 Return in FY10 to PA's for FY07 and FY08	(3) ave monthly bal times LAiF ra	ate (first year calculated	at half year int	erest)	\$	6,464,036 Retur	n in FY10 to PA's for FY	07 and FY08			a	
(4) FY10 base then 1% inflation 1,985,005 Return in FY08 to PA's for FY07 and FY08	(4) FY10 base then 1% inflation					1,985,005 Retur	n in FY08 to PA's for FY	07 and FY08				
(5) 20% of projected Metro CIP 1,430,875 Return in FY09 to PA's for FY07 and FY08	(5) 20% of projected Metro CIP					1,430,875 Retur	n in FY09 to PA's for FY	07 and FY08				
3,048,156 Return in FY10 to PA's for FY07 and FY08						3,048,156 Retur	n in FY10 to PA's for FY	07 and FY08				
Savings distribution (0) Diff	Savings distribution					(0) Diff						
Operating Reserve \$ 3,982,722 \$ 597,420 \$ (597,420)	Operating Reserve		\$ 3	3,982, <b>7</b> 22 \$	597,420 \$	(597,420)						
Rate Stabilization 2,037,339 (52,334) 59,102	Rate Stabilization		7	2,037,339	(52,334)	59,102						
Fund Balance (272,654) 4,213,366 3,671,138	Fund Balance			(272,654)		3,671,138						
Return to Agencies 0 1,985,005 1,430,875	Return to Agencies											
Total Savings \$ 5,747,407 \$ 6,743,457 \$ 1,430,875	•		\$ 5	5,747,407 \$					4			
Audited Savings Per Peggy \$ 5,747,405 \$ 6,743,458		ed Savings Per Peggy	-			• •						
diff = interest \$ 2 \$ (1)												

# MetroTAC Participating Agencies Selection Panel Rotation

Agency	Representative	Selection Panel	Date
	•		Assigned
Padre Dam	Neal Brown	IRWMP – Props 50 & 84 Funds	2006
El Cajon	Dennis Davies	Old Rose Canyon Trunk Sewer Relocation	9/12/2007
La Mesa	Greg Humora	As-Needed Piping and Mechanical	11/2007
National City	Joe Smith	MBC Additional Storage Silos	02/2008
Otay Water District	Rod Posada	As-needed biological services 2009-2011	02/2008
Poway	Tom Howard	Feasibility study for bond offerings	02/2008
County of San Diego	Dan Brogadir	Strategic business plan updates	02/2008
Coronado	Scott Huth	Strategic business plan updates	09/2008
Coronado	Scott Huth	As-needed financial, HR, training	09/2008
PBS&J	Karyn Keese	As-needed financial, Alternate HR, training	09/2008
Otay Water District	Rod Posada	Interviews for Bulkhead Project at the PLWTP	01/2009
Del Mar	David Scherer	Biosolids project	2009
Padre Dam	Neal Brown	Regional Advisory Committee	On-going
County of San Diego	Dan Brogadir	Large Diameter Pipeline Inspection/Assessment	10/2009
Chula Vista	Roberto Yano	Sewer Flow Monitoring renewal contract	12/2009
La Mesa	Greg Humora	Sewer Flow Monitoring renewal contract	12/2009
Poway	Tom Howard	Fire Alarm Panels contract	12/2009
El Cajon	Dennis Davies	MBC Water System Improvements Design/Build	1/2010
Lemon Grove	Patrick Lund		
National City	Joe Smith		
Coronado	Scott Huth		
Otay Water District	Rod Posada		
Del Mar	David Scherer		
Padre Dam	Neal Brown		
County of San Diego	Dan Brogadir		
Chula Vista	Roberto Yano		
La Mesa	Greg Humora		
Poway	Tom Howard		

Updated 1/2010