



5. SEATING OF ALTERNATES
6. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA (Government Code §54954.2)
7. PUBLIC COMMENT RELATING TO ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (Limit 3 Minutes)
- \*8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  - A. August 4, 2021
9. ENGINEERING AND CIP PROGRAM MANAGER COMMENTS
10. OPERATIONS MANAGER COMMENTS
11. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS
12. BOARD ACTION UPDATES
13. WATER SERVICE UPGRADE PROJECT (WSUP) (OPERATIONS)
14. HELI-HYDRANT PROJECT UPDATE (OPERATIONS)
15. NORTH RIVER ROAD CONSTRUCTION UPDATE (OPERATIONS)
- \*16. EFI SOLE SOURCE UPDATE (ENGINEERING)
17. RAINBOW HEIGHTS PUMP STATION CONSTRUCTION UPDATE (ENGINEERING)
- \*18. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SELECTION FOR THOROUGHbred LIFT STATION #1 AND PROJECT STATUS UPDATE (ENGINEERING)
19. RICE CANYON CIP BUDGET UPDATE (ENGINEERING)
- \*20. AS-NEEDED SERVICES EXPENDITURES SUMMARY
21. LIST OF SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
22. ADJOURNMENT

**ATTEST TO POSTING:**

*Pam Moss*  
Pam Moss  
Secretary of the Board

9-30-21 @ 4:30 p.m.  
Date and Time of Posting  
Outside Display Cases

**MINUTES OF THE ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING  
OF THE RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT  
AUGUST 4, 2021**

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The Engineering and Operations Committee Meeting of the Rainbow Municipal Water District on August 4, 2021, was called to order by Chairperson Nelson at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the District, 3707 Old Highway 395, Fallbrook, CA 92028. *(All meetings are being held with in person attendance following County and State COVID guidelines as well as virtually.)* Chairperson Nelson, presiding.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Member Brazier *(via teleconference)*, Member Marnett, Member Nelson, Alternate Largent *(via video conference)*, Member Gasca, *(arrived at 3:42 p.m. via video conference)*.

**Also Present:** General Manager Kennedy, Executive Assistant Washburn, Operations Manager Gutierrez, Information Systems Specialist Espino.

**Also Present Via Video Conference or Teleconference:**

Engineering and CIP Program Manager Williams, Construction and Maintenance Supervisor Lagunas, Project Manager Tamimi.

One member of the public was present via teleconference or video teleconference.

4. **INSTRUCTIONS TO ALLOW PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS FROM THOSE ATTENDING THIS MEETING VIA TELECONFERENCE OR VIDEO CONFERENCE**

Mr. Nelson read aloud the instructions for those attending the meeting via teleconference or video conference.

5. **SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Ms. Largent was seated as an alternate.

6. **ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA (Government Code §54954.2)**

There were no amendments to the agenda.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT RELATING TO ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (Limit 3 Minutes)**

There were no comments.

**\*8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. July 7, 2021**

***Motion:***

***To approve the minutes of July 7, 2021.***

***Action: Approve, Moved by Member Brazier, Seconded by Member Marnett.***

***Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Ayes = 4).***

***Ayes: Member Brazier, Member Marnett, Member Nelson, Alternate Largent.***

***Absent: Member Gasca.***

**9. GENERAL MANAGER COMMENTS**

Mr. Kennedy reported the recent Town Hall meeting was a great event and how another will be scheduled in the Fall. He also pointed out due to the CDC and County guidelines, all RMWD public meetings will continue to be conducted with everyone wearing masks again until such time the guidelines are revised.

**10. ENGINEERING AND CIP PROGRAM MANAGER COMMENTS**

Mr. Williams mentioned a Notice of Completion for the paving work completed on Dentro de Lomas will be taken to the Board in August. He also announced RMWD hired a new project manager, Amanda Parra. He mentioned Ms. Parra was previously employed with the County of San Diego as the lead on parks and public works matters within the RMWD boundaries; therefore, she was very familiar with all RMWD's projects currently ongoing with the County.

**11. OPERATIONS MANAGER COMMENTS**

Mr. Gutierrez reported the Rainbow Heights Pump Station is currently in a SDG&E power shutoff for the purpose of switching over to the new electrical infrastructure which is anticipated to be complete by August 5<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Kennedy pointed out this was unplanned to be done during the month of August.

Mr. Gutierrez reported there was a mainline break on Highway 76 east of I-15 which spread along all the eastbound lanes of Highway 76. He noted staff was able to isolate the break and will be using an existing permit with Caltrans to work in their right-of-way beginning on August 10<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Kennedy added this break was disappointing in that the pipe was under ten years old and may be related to only having 18" of cover as opposed to the required 48". Mr. Nelson inquired as to the effect on service. Mr. Gutierrez stated Horse Ranch Creek area is the only community served by this line, but no customers further east and no customers are out of water as a result of this break.

Mr. Gutierrez announced staff was wrapping up lead and copper testing which was going well with results showing all non-lead detection.

*Discussion returned to Item #12.*

**12. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS**

Mr. Marnett thanked Ms. Largent for completing the backflow investigation including the distribution of letters.

Discussion returned to Item #11.

Discussion returned from Item #12.

**Member Gasca joined the meeting at 3:42 p.m.**

Mr. Gasca thanked staff for installing the Heli-Hydrant tank as well as noted he appreciated seeing the displayed signs related to the WSUP project.

Mr. Nelson mentioned when driving to golf courses located on North River Road, there is a sign on the westbound side of the road announcing the WSUP project is completing in April 2021 which may cause some confusion for some constituents. Mr. Gutierrez explained the company responsible for updating the signs was sold to another company to whom he will contact to get this updated since the manhole work was still occurring.

Mr. Nelson commented on the new development, Citro (aka Meadowood), stating it looks as though there is a great deal of terracing happening which could result in a loss of land.

**13. BOARD ACTION UPDATES**

Mr. Williams reported the North River Road Notice of Completion and Bonsall Oaks Construction and Sewer Agreements were approved by the Board of Directors in July.

**14. MORRO RESERVOIR MIXERS UPDATE (OPERATIONS)**

Mr. Gutierrez reported all the mixers are up and running. He noted tests performed over two weeks for ammonia and chlorine went very well; however, they were not able to bring up the residual but since they were more interested in validating the all the components to ensure it was operating properly, this was not too concerning. He explained staff will now turn off the system, eject chlorine on the outflow, drain the tank to as low a level as possible, and once notified the Rainbow Heights work is complete, they will fire up the system with 9'-10' of water and see if residual can be picked up. Discussion followed.

**15. HELI-HYDRANT PROJECT UPDATE (OPERATIONS)**

Mr. Gutierrez reported the project was moving along very quickly. He mentioned recent photographs have been uploaded to RMWD's website. He also noted the CalFire hand crews have been at the site cutting back brush and North County Fire contributing to spreading of rock. He noted a test run was conducted with Channel 10 News present and how test runs will be conducted having different elevations in the tank. He said electronics were expected to be received next week so the pilot can remotely turn on the tank to start filling it and how an anticipated dry run would be conducted to assist pilots in their familiarity. He stated once everything has been confirmed to be working fine, a date will be scheduled for ribbon cutting for multiple individuals to attend. Discussion ensued.

***DRAFT***

***DRAFT***

***DRAFT***

Mr. Gasca asked for the total costs associated with building out this project. Mr. Kennedy stated the contract was for \$150,000; however, there was another company who approached RMWD regarding a cheaper alternative but it does not have quite the capacity or a capable fill system as the Heli-Hydrant tank.

Mr. Nelson stated he went to visit the site; however, it was not visible from the road. Mr. Gutierrez recommended traveling on Wilt Road where there are two signs with arrows pointing to the location of the tank.

**16. RAINBOW HEIGHTS WATERLINE PROJECT UPDATE (OPERATIONS)**

Mr. Gutierrez reported staff attempted to come up with a narrative on what was found and how initially there was a 5-1 ratio; however, per Mr. Kennedy's recommendation, it was kicked back to the manager and others prior to presenting it to the Board and committee. He explained after researching the costs better, it was realized the complete overhead and hourly rates were not included which resulted lowering the ratio to 3-1 ratio, which is still really good. He mentioned some additional projects staff has decided to include to find out if the numbers are still validated.

Mr. Kennedy confirmed this was a ROI (Return on Investment) project. He noted this project was showing great progress as well as promise; however, more data needs to be collected.

Mr. Nelson inquired as to how many feet of pipe are involved with the projects to be added. Mr. Tamimi stated 2,500 for Olive Hill and 665 linear feet for Via Ararat. Discussion ensued.

**17. WATER SERVICE PROJECT UPGRADE (WSUP) UPDATE (OPERATIONS)**

Mr. Gutierrez reported the project was approximately 65% complete and was still on track to be at 95% complete in the December timeframe. Mr. Kennedy added while the full water audit calculation has not yet been made, the raw numbers show the total water loss being reduced to 4.3%.

Ms. Largent mentioned the preliminary spend rate was at approximately \$7.4 million as of year end and how if this spend rate continues, there will be approximately \$2.5 million remaining in the funding source which was on track with the planning. Discussion ensued.

**\*18. EASEMENT VACATION FOR RICE CANYON/TRI-POINTE HOMES (ENGINEERING)**

Mr. Williams explained due to some unanticipated construction changes, the developer has asked RMWD if it would be available for the District to vacate existing easements for realigning District-owned facilities back to the developer. He mentioned Legal Counsel has confirmed any agreement regarding this matter requires Board approval. He noted RMWD will have easements where needed; however, should it be determined some are not needed when the project is complete, those will be vacated at that time.

Mr. Nelson inquired about abandoning the wider easement being in the best interest of the District and recommended ensuring the easement is wide enough to conduct work at and maintain District-owned facilities. He also recommended the legend provided in the handout match the drawing presented due to the fact the visual presentation does not match the numeric presentation. Mr. Williams agreed to work with staff and the developer on correcting this information.

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

Mr. Marnett asked why the builder would construct homes over the easement. Mr. Kennedy explained this was an old access easement RMWD held with the understanding it would eventually be vacated; however, since it involves real property, Board approval is required. He pointed out the developer expects everything to be done as soon as possible.

Ms. Brazier asked whether there was any means of avoiding this type of scenario in the future or would developers continue to be developers and receive what they want no matter what. Mr. Williams ensured her staff does whatever is necessary to check all the boxes regardless of how quickly a developer wants to receive something from the District. Ms. Brazier inquired as to whether any teeth could be put in the District's procedures to avoid a reoccurrence. Mr. Gasca asked if there was any means of incentivize the developers to get it done. Mr. Kennedy explained there is not much RMWD can do to compel developers to act in a certain way, but can enforce District policies and procedures. Ms. Brazier stated she understands staff's limitations, but it is frustrating developers can waste staff time and efforts on an ongoing basis. Mr. Kennedy pointed out all staff time spent on a development is charged to the developer.

***Motion:***

***For this committee to recommend that the Board move forward with the easements revisions as cleaned up by Mr. Williams and staff.***

***Action: Approve, Moved by Member Marnett, Seconded by Member Gasca.***

***Vote: Motion passed (summary: Ayes = 4, Abstain = 1).***

***Ayes: Member Marnett, Member Nelson, Member Gasca, Alternate Largent.***

***Abstain: Member Brazier.***

**\*19. MASTERCRAFT CHANGE ORDER (CO-03) (ENGINEERING)**

Mr. Kennedy noted as part of the process of going through the Headquarters Development Study, staff requested an additional work to be done as well as a set of documents capable of being presented to the County as indicated in the handouts provided to the committee. He stated this Change Order will be the last for this project. He mentioned since he had already issued \$25,000 in Change Orders already, this would need to go to the Board for consideration.

Mr. Marnett asked for verification part of this was to get additional land declared usable. Mr. Kennedy confirmed this was true and how part of this will also cover the costs to for Mastercraft to produce a packet suitable to present to the County as part of their preapproval process. Mr. Marnett inquired as to whether this could reveal some of the potential acreage increase. Mr. Kennedy explained although the increase in acreage; however, the drawings were not at the level needed to submit to the County for preapplication, but this will help RMWD achieve the goal of getting this to before the Board of Supervisors for possible approval.

Mr. Nelson asked if the work conducted by Helix was very successful; however, he had inquiries about the process related to Tasks Nos. 12 and 13 and how Mastercraft was being tasked to conduct work the ad-hoc committee had not yet had an opportunity to review. He said he wanted to ensure the ad-hoc committee was on the front end as opposed to the back end. Mr. Kennedy confirmed work would not start until after the August 24, 2021 Board meeting; therefore, the ad-hoc committee will have an opportunity to weigh in at their meeting scheduled for August 18<sup>th</sup>.

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

Mr. Nelson said he was a bit put off by the \$8,000 project management fee which is 28% for a small engagement of \$28,000 which seemed very high to him based on his experience. Mr. Williams explained he looked at the original Task 7 versus this, it did not appear high to him, but he would look into that again. He recalled the original scope included eight tasks and was now at thirteen with the additional tasks being District-driven. Mr. Kennedy proposed going back to Mastercraft to see if something different could be done.

Mr. Gasca said he would like to see some type of breakout before making a recommendation for approval. Mr. Kennedy directed Mr. Williams to work with Mastercraft on a breakout of what the \$8,000 entails including more details as well as possible revising the Board recommendation for their consideration.

**Motion:**

**To recommend the Board approve this Change Order subject to additional meetings of the ad-hoc committee meeting.**

Mr. Gasca offered an amendment to the original motion. Mr. Marnett accepted the amended motion.

**Motion:**

**To forward this to the ad-hoc committee for final disposition.**

**Action: Approve, Moved by Member Marnett, Seconded by Member Nelson.**

**Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Ayes = 4).**

**Ayes: Member Brazier, Member Marnett, Member Nelson, Member Gasca, Alternate Largent.**

**20. DISTRICT HEADQUARTERS DEVELOPMENT STUDY UPDATE (ENGINEERING)**

This item was addressed under Item #19.

**\*21. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) REVIEW PROCESS (ENGINEERING)**

Mr. Williams described the draft RFP templates included in the agenda packet for committee input noting pending committee approval, staff has several RFP's they would like to solicit.

Mr. Nelson stated he found the examples provided to be a tremendous improvement; however, he had some inquiries in terms of warranties, performance bonds, retention, as well as termination for convenience. He asked whether there was an agreement to be attached for the committee to review. He also referenced Page 13 of 55, Section 52 asking whether there was a reason for telegraphing such with blank lines for dollars.

Mr. Williams clarified the one example for design services was a draft template from another local water agency provided in the event the committee did not like staff's proposed blank template. Mr. Nelson clarified there was still a comment about an estimated budget; therefore, he still wanted staff to consider the reason for wanting to telegraph this number. Mr. Williams explained the first question asked by most developers is related to the District's budget and/or the Engineer's estimate. Mr. Kennedy agreed with Mr. Nelson that this sentence being removed from the RFP's.



***DRAFT***

***DRAFT***

***DRAFT***

Mr. Nelson clarified he only questions specifying the amount budgeted for the particular scope of work being sought being necessary. Mr. Williams explained the intent was the overall budget, but not the budget for the work; therefore, he agreed it should be moved and reworded.

Ms. Brazier agreed with Mr. Nelson's comments.

***Member Brazier excused herself from the meeting at 5:06 p.m.***

Mr. Gasca suggested adding a list of definitions. He also provided examples of what would be included to build a full rack called the program amount. He then explained the Engineer's estimate would then be the effort to perform tasked identified as well as incidentals. He cautioned staff to be careful with the terminology utilized in the different paragraphs to which are being written.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out this was the first step taken in working through this process with many more discussions and reviews to follow. He recommended committee members provide Mr. Williams with feedback. Mr. Williams encouraged the committee members to review the handout titled "Request for Proposal for Construction Management Services" and send staff any comments and edits, staff will present a final draft including an Exhibit A which would accompany it.

Mr. Nelson suggested it may be more efficient to have those involved with the design work review all design questions as opposed to a Construction Manager. Mr. Kennedy explained the benefit of having the Construction Manager resolve any issues while working at the jobsite and then contact the RFI issues with those involved with the design work if necessary. Mr. Gasca added there were many things that could be resolved in the field to keep the project moving.

Mr. Nelson referenced Page 32 of 55 as he recommended approach to work remain at 30% and personnel and experience be set equally at 35% due to it being just as important.

Mr. Nelson inquired about Section 5.2 being stricken through and whether this was included in the Administrative Code. Mr. Williams agreed to review this section with staff and return to the committee with clarification or with this section unstricken.

Mr. Nelson said he will read Construction Management in greater detail and provide Mr. Williams with any additional comments.

Mr. Nelson referenced Page 3.3 inquiring as to whether the word "may" should be utilized or should some of this be fatal compared to giving staff some discretion for allowing a proposer to cure. Mr. Williams provided examples where using the word "may" has been beneficial to the District.

Mr. Nelson asked about the information provided on Page 51 of 55. Mr. Williams clarified this was from the Administrative Code for committee members to reference.

Mr. Nelson acknowledged and complemented staff in preparing these templates and making modifications to modernize them. He stated the comments being made are not meant to diminish the effort and quality staff put into this process. He conveyed his personal thanks for the efforts put into this matter.

Mr. Williams proposed staff providing the committee with one complete document from which the committee can provide input before the committee reconvenes in September. Mr. Gasca noted this would be helpful. Mr. Kennedy explained there would also be a need for multiple templates for different types of work for which the committee members may want to provide input as well.

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

**DRAFT**

Mr. Gasca pointed out in the area of inspections, there was no listing for environmental. He proposed there be language stating either they have responsibilities in certain areas or a responsibility to contact RMWD in the event any environmental issues are discovered. Mr. Kennedy agreed.

**\*22. AS-NEEDED SERVICES EXPENDITURES SUMMARY (ENGINEERING)**

Mr. Nelson inquired about the highlighted task provided in the summary. Mr. Kennedy explained this was task was related to Fire Station 4. Mr. Williams reported staff just received the quitclaim. Mr. Kennedy stated unless the committee members reject, this matter will be taken to the Board for consideration in August.

**23. LIST OF SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING**

It was noted an update on the Heli-Hydrant, Rainbow Heights Waterline Project (including methods of analysis), and WSUP as well as the RFP review should be on the next committee agenda.

**24. ADJOURNMENT**

*The meeting was adjourned by Member Nelson.*

The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

---

**Flint Nelson, Committee Chairperson**

---

**Dawn M. Washburn, Board Secretary**

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

October 26, 2021

---

### SUBJECT

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION FOR SOLE SOURCE PURCHASE OF PRE-MANUFACTURED PUMP STATIONS FROM ENGINEERED FLUID SOLUTIONS, INC (EFI), CENTRALIA, IL (ALL DIVISIONS)

### BACKGROUND

Topography within the Rainbow Municipal Water District (District) creates situations of both high and low pressure issues throughout its water system which require the use of booster pump stations or pressure reducing stations to manage. Over the past several years, the District has been purchasing and installing pre-manufactured pressure reducing (PR) stations manufactured by Engineered Fluid Solutions, Inc. (EFI). These PR stations have proven to be of a high quality, cost effective, and provide a standardization for maintenance by the District's Operations Department.

EFI also provides design and manufacturing of potable water and recycled water pump stations. Fabrication of the pump stations is performed in a controlled factory environment which results in a customized station at a pre-fabricated cost. Each station is designed and fabricated "in-house" to the customer's specifications and delivered as a ready to assemble skid mounted unit. Other companies also provide skid mounted or pre-fabricated pump stations but do not offer the level of customization, ability to meet the customer's specifications, or quality control offered by EFI.

### DESCRIPTION

The District has recent experience with an EFI designed/fabricated pump station at the Rainbow Heights Pump Station. The District is also currently working with EFI for the design and fabrication of the Hutton and Turner potable water pump stations which will provide the District with the ability to pump water from the Metropolitan Water District into the District's system. This is currently achieved through the use of temporary pump stations which are rented as needed on a case by case basis.

EFI is one of the few manufacturers who provides pre-fabricated skid mounted pump station systems. Within the Southern California region, dozens of agencies have utilized them to provide cost-effective and well-designed stations. These agencies include Fallbrook PUD, City of Oceanside, Olivenhain Municipal Water District, Padre Dam Municipal Water District, Vallecitos Water District and many others. The benefits of pre-manufactured stations are numerous. They are less costly than site-built stations – frequently 25%-40% less. The shop welded and coated pipe is of much higher quality. Installation is simplified through design considerations that include skid mounted systems which can be connected to supply and discharge headers for simplified construction. In addition, by standardizing on a common design for the stations, ongoing maintenance costs are reduced as District staff do not need to train on multiple designs and have a common set of spare parts (valves, fittings, etc). For this reason, EFI has been identified by staff as the preferred sole-source vendor for pump stations.

**POLICY/STRATEGIC PLAN KEY FOCUS AREA**

---

Strategic Focus Area Two: Asset Management. This purchase will help with District-wide pressure management as well as standardization of facilities.

Strategic Focus Area Four: Fiscal Responsibility. Pre-fabrication will save the District time, effort, and money during both design and construction.

**ENVIRONMENTAL**

---

In accordance with CEQA guidelines Section 15378, the action before the Board does not constitute a “project” as defined by CEQA and further environmental review is not required at this time. When a project goes out to bid for the installation of these PR stations, an appropriate CEQA statement will be included in the Board Action Item at that time.

**BOARD OPTIONS/FISCAL IMPACTS**

---

The District’s CIP Budget includes \$XXX,000 for the Hutton Pump Station and \$XXX,000 for the Turner Pump Station.

The following options exist for the Board’s consideration.

- 1) Authorize the selection of EFI for the sole source procurement of pump stations within the District in order to capitalize on timing, quality, and cost savings for current and future pump station projects.
- 2) Authorize the General Manager to enter into agreements with EFI for the Hutton and Turner Pump Stations once final design configurations have been determined.
- 3) Provide other direction to staff.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

---

Staff Recommends Option 1.

---

Chad Williams  
Engineering and CIP Program  
Manager

10/26/2021

**LS-1 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT & INSPECTION SERVICES EVALUATIONS**

<b>CHAD WILLIAMS</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	26	28	20	29	N/A
PM & Team Qualifications	35	28	30	28	32	N/A
Project Experience	35	32	35	32	35	N/A
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>96</b>	
<b>MALIK TAMIMI</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	26	24	20	28	20
PM & Team Qualifications	35	28	28	25	28	25
Project Experience	35	27	30	25	30	32
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>ROBERT GUTIERREZ</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	25	25	20	28	20
PM & Team Qualifications	35	30	32	30	30	30
Project Experience	35	20	25	20	30	20
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>MICHAEL POWERS</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	25	23	20	30	23
PM & Team Qualifications	35	25	28	25	33	27
Project Experience	35	27	30	25	33	28
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>AMANDA PARRA</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	24	25	26	28	28
PM & Team Qualifications	35	28	29	25	32	29
Project Experience	35	31	31	25	32	31
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>ROBERT MARNETT</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>HOCH</b>	<b>IEC</b>	<b>TKE</b>	<b>VCM</b>	<b>W&amp;A</b>
Approach to Work	30	26	27	27	30	27
PM & Team Qualifications	35	33	34	34	33	35
Project Experience	35	32	34	33	33	34
<b>SUM</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>

**LS-1 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT & INSPECTION SERVICES EVALUATIONS**

<b>Evaluator's Scores</b>						
CHAD		86	93	80	96	N/A
MALIK		81	82	70	86	77
ROBERT		75	82	70	88	70
MICHAEL		77	81	70	96	78
AMANDA		83	85	76	92	88
ROBERT M.		91	95	94	96	96
<b>RESULTS / RANKING</b>						
<b>Total Evaluator's Scores</b>		493	518	460	554	409
<b>Average Total Scores</b>		82	86	77	92	82
		HOCH	IEC	TKE	VCM	W&A
<b>Total Score</b>		82	86	77	92	82

# Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021  
 1444101\*02  
 Page 1



## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

**Description:** This table presents scoring and cost estimation of five construction methods for the Bonsall Creek and Ostrich Farm Creek crossings. Scoring is from 0 to 5 based on the Scoring Criteria Table.

### Scoring Criteria

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Construction Feasibility	Infeasible	-	-	Feasible pending additional data	-	Feasible
Risk of Method Failure	Infeasible	Very High Probability of Failure Based on Known Conditions	High Probability of Failure Based on Known Conditions	Moderate Probability of Failure Based on Known Conditions	Low Probability of Failure Based on Known Conditions	Very Low Probability of Failure Based on Known Conditions
Caltrans/Environmental Permitting Impact	Extensive Caltrans and Environmental Permitting	Extensive Caltrans and Moderate Environmental Permitting	Moderate Caltrans and Environmental Permitting	Minimal Caltrans and Environmental Permitting	Minimal Caltrans Permitting Only	No Additional Permitting
Schedule Impacts	17+-Month Delay	13 to 16-Month Delay	9 to 12-Month Delay	5 to 8-Month Delay	1 to 4-Month Delay	No Delay
Life of Installed Pipeline	Projected 2-year Life Cycle	Projected 10-year Life Cycle	Projected 20-year Life Cycle	Projected 30-year Life Cycle	Projected 40-year Life Cycle	Projected 50-year Life Cycle

**Bonsall Creek Crossing (8-inch)**

Method	Construction Feasibility	Risk of Method Failure	Caltrans/ Environmental Permitting Impact	Schedule Impacts		Life of Installed Pipeline	Total Score	Assumed Successful Construction Cost per LF	Additional Engineering/ Permitting Cost	Total Estimated Cost Impact	Notes
				Score	Duration (months)						
Microtunnel	5	4	5	5	0	5	<b>24</b>	\$ 8,850.00	\$ -	\$ 849,600.00	Recommended alternative as it is suitable in groundwater and soils with high blow counts (>50 blows per foot, which indicate hard soils); is suitable for cobbles up to ~9"; requires minimum 28"-30" casing size; and requires no additional permitting or schedule delays with this method.
Jack and Bore*	3	1	1	1	13	5	<b>11</b>	\$ 5,800.00	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 671,800.00	This alternative is not suitable in groundwater; is suitable for cobbles up to ~9"; requires lowering groundwater table to install pipe; and access to channel for dewatering triggers environmental permitting. The feasibility and volume of dewatering along the alignment requires pump testing to assess the feasibility of this alternative.
Open Shield Pipe Jacking*	3	1	1	1	13	5	<b>11</b>	\$ 6,200.00	\$ 210,000.00	\$ 805,200.00	This alternative requires deepening of pipe due to larger casing (minimum casing is ~48"-54"), which will also increase LS depth; is suitable for cobbles up to ~14"; is not suitable in groundwater; requires lowering groundwater table to install pipe; and access to channel for dewatering triggers environmental permitting. The feasibility and volume of dewatering along the alignment requires pump testing to assess the feasibility of this alternative.
Pilot Tube Microtunnel*	3	2	2	1	13	5	<b>13</b>	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 115,000.00	\$ 537,400.00	This alternative is not suitable in groundwater or soils with high blow counts; is unsuitable for cobbles >~1"; requires lowering groundwater table to install pipe; and access to channel for dewatering triggers environmental permitting. The feasibility and volume of dewatering along the alignment requires pump testing to assess the feasibility of this alternative.
Trenching	5	4	0	1	15	5	<b>15</b>	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 430,000.00	\$ 775,600.00	This alternative involves significant Caltrans involvement due to proximity to Bonsall Creek Bridge headwall; significant structural design impact; significant environmental permitting; and requires modification to the CEQA documents. Engineering cost includes additional structural design and construction of channel headwall and modification of CEQA documents.

**Evaluation Definitions**

- Construction Feasibility: Physical probability of constructability using method.
  - *\*Feasibility is contingent on dewatering pump tests. This evaluation assumes dewatering is feasible.*
- Risk of Method Failure: Likelihood of successful construction using method (no change order, collapses, ruptures, lost parts, etc).
  - *\*Risk is contingent on dewatering pump tests. This evaluation assumes dewatering is feasible.*
- Caltrans/Environmental Permitting Impact: Extent of additional permitting required
- Schedule Impacts: Delay in project schedule due to additional design/permitting.
- Life of Installed Pipeline: Variation of expected pipeline longevity
- Construction Cost per LF: Approximate cost per linear foot based on recent projects assuming no change orders/method failures during construction
- Additional Engineering/Permitting Costs: Costs associated with permitting coordination, permitting fees, mitigation credits, and re-design costs as applicable
  - Additional construction cost for items such as deepening the Lift Station and concrete headwall demolition/reconstruction are included here as applicable
- Total Estimated Cost Impact: Combined cost per linear foot for extent of crossing and additional engineering/permitting costs
  - Does not account for costs associated with any changed conditions or method failures during construction should they occur



### Ostrich Farm Creek Crossing (18-inch)

Method	Construction Feasibility	Risk of Method Failure	Caltrans/ Environmental Permitting Impact	Schedule Impacts		Life of Installed Pipeline	Total Score	Assumed Successful Construction Cost per LF	Additional Engineering/ Permitting Cost	Total Estimated Cost Impact	Notes
				Score	Duration (months)						
Microtunnel	5	4	5	5	0	5	24	\$ 8,850.00	\$ -	\$ 1,486,800.00	Recommended alternatives as it is suitable in groundwater and soils with high blow counts (>50 blows per foot, which indicate hard soils); is suitable for cobbles up to ~9"; requires minimum 28"-30" casing size; and requires no additional permitting or schedule delays with this method.
Jack and Bore*	3	2	1	1	13	5	12	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 845,600.00	This alternative is not suitable in groundwater; is suitable for cobbles up to ~9"; requires lowering groundwater table to install pipe; and access to channel for dewatering triggers environmental permitting. The feasibility and volume of dewatering along the alignment requires pump testing to assess the feasibility of this alternative.
Open Shield Pipe Jacking*	3	2	1	1	13	5	12	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 879,200.00	This alternative requires deepening of pipe due to larger casing (minimum casing is ~48"-54"), which will also increase LS depth; is suitable for cobbles up to ~14"; is not suitable in groundwater; requires lowering groundwater table to install pipe; and access to channel for dewatering triggers environmental permitting. The feasibility and volume of dewatering along the alignment requires pump testing to assess the feasibility of this alternative.
Pilot Tube Microtunnel*	Infeasible										Infeasible due to soil conditions. Pilot tubes cannot be driven in soils with blow counts above 50 per foot (i.e. hard soils).
Trenching	5	5	0	0	18	5	15	\$ 3,400.00	\$ 335,000.00	\$ 906,200.00	This alternative requires significant Caltrans involvement; requires significant environmental permitting; and requires modification to the CEQA documents. Permitting cost includes purchase of mitigation credits and modification of CEQA documents.

**Evaluation Definitions**

- Construction Feasibility: Physical probability of constructability using method.
  - *\*Feasibility is contingent on dewatering pump tests. This evaluation assumes dewatering is feasible.*
- Risk of Method Failure: Likelihood of successful construction using method (no change order, collapses, ruptures, lost parts, etc).
  - *\*Risk is contingent on dewatering pump tests. This evaluation assumes dewatering is feasible.*
- Caltrans/Environmental Permitting Impact: Extent of additional permitting required
- Schedule Impacts: Delay in project schedule due to additional design/permitting.
- Life of Installed Pipeline: Variation of expected pipeline longevity
- Construction Cost per LF: Approximate cost per linear foot based on recent projects assuming no change orders/method failures during construction
- Additional Engineering/Permitting Costs: Costs associated with permitting coordination, permitting fees, mitigation credits, and re-design costs as applicable
  - Additional construction cost for items such as deepening the Lift Station and concrete headwall demolition/reconstruction are included here as applicable
- Total Estimated Cost Impact: Combined cost per linear foot for extent of crossing and additional engineering/permitting costs
  - Does not account for costs associated with any changed conditions or method failures during construction should they occur



## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021

1444101\*02

Page 4

### Limitations:

Information on the depth to groundwater is currently being obtained via two installed piezometers. The data collected indicates that the pipelines at both crossing will be installed below the measured groundwater elevations.

No information currently exists on the transmissivity of the soil at the shaft locations or along the bore alignment, which is the rate at which groundwater moves through the soil. If the transmissivity is low and the groundwater moves slowly enough, it may allow water entering the shafts and bore to be removed by a single pump in the jacking and receiving shafts. If the transmissivity is high, investigation regarding how high is required. If it is reasonable, the groundwater table at the shaft sites and along the bore alignment may be able to be dewatered by installing well points at strategic locations or sumps at an appropriate spacing. This evaluation assumes transmissivity is high enough to require dewatering along the alignment but reasonable enough to remain feasible.

Since continuous soil information along the entire length of either bore is not currently available without further investigation, a risk that the San Louis Rey River is connected to the soil along the bore path should be considered. Should this be the case, the dewatering may work during the boring operations until a seam of water making the connection between the River and the Bore path is encountered. If large, a connection of this sort could overtax the pumping capability of the dewatering system, requiring abandonment of the drive. If this were to occur, the cost differential between microtunneling and pilot tube microtunneling would be minor by comparison.

In short, one of the open pipe methods that allow groundwater to enter the shafts and bore as it proceeds (jack-and-bore, open shield pipe jacking, and pilot tube microtunnel) may be feasible, but the risk of failure is significantly higher. If monetized, the lower risk of microtunneling may well be less costly in the long run than an open casing solution presented here, which has lower initial cost but risk of much greater final cost.

Kennedy Jenks' conclusions, opinions, and recommendations are based on a limited number of observations and data. It is possible that conditions could vary between or beyond the data evaluated.

Kennedy Jenks makes no guarantee or warranty, express or implied, regarding the services, communication (oral or written), report, opinion, or instrument of service provided. Any statement involving estimates or matters of opinion, whether or not so specifically designated, are intended as such, and not as representations of fact. KJ's devoted effort is consistent with (i) that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the same profession currently practicing under same or similar circumstances and (ii) the time and budget available for its work in its efforts to endeavor to provide that the information contained herein is reasonably accurate as of the date of its preparation.

## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021

1444101\*02

Page 5

This evaluation was based on information provided by and consultations with Rainbow staff, information, estimates, assumptions developed by KJ from its research effort, geotechnical investigation performed by Leighton Consulting, Inc., and general knowledge of the industry. This report is subject to and qualified in its entirety by, the foregoing and should be considered in light of, these limitations, conditions, and considerations.

### **Basis of Method Scoring:**

- Microtunnel
  - Microtunnel machines are available starting at a minimum 28 to 30-inches in size
  - Microtunnel machines are designed for work in groundwater conditions
  - Microtunnel has potential for subsidence or surface rupture due to the low depth of cover over the bore
  - An appropriately sized microtunneling machine should be able to excavate or grind and remove rock, cobbles and boulders up to 30% of the diameter of the bore.
  - Microtunneling will require a rescue shaft if the machine becomes stuck on an obstruction
  - Microtunnel costs based on estimate provided by a Contractor
  - No impact on permitting, as it has been approved by Caltrans, and dewatering is minimized
  - No impact on schedule, as all permitting is complete and a redesign is not required.
  
- Jack and Bore/Auger Bore
  - Jack and Bore machines available in sizes down to 18-inches in size
  - Jack and Bore cannot be done in groundwater, dewatering will be required along the alignment (within the channel and creek)
  - Jack and Bore would require dewatering permitting
  - Jack and bore has potential for subsidence or surface rupture due to the low depth of cover over the bore
  - Jack and Bore can typically remove cobbles and boulders up to 30% the diameter of the bore
  - Jack and Bore may, in a worst case, require a rescue shaft if the machine becomes stuck on an obstruction
  - Jack and Bore costs based on latest estimate we did for a similar project for Eastern Municipal Water District (Well 206 - 209) pipeline
  - Jack and Bore costs include a cost for a rescue shaft and required dewatering
  - Would have an impact on testing and design schedule, minimum 1 month for dewatering testing, then 1 month to redesign and include in specifications
  - Would have an impact on schedule and Caltrans Permit, as access to Ostrich Farm Creek would require Caltrans environmental review, at least 2-month

## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021

1444101\*02

Page 6

- review period and probably longer since it would directly impact Caltrans property during dewatering.
    - Would have an impact on schedule for permitting, since Bonsall and Ostrich Farm Creek are considered Blue Ribbon Streams next to San Luis Rey River, need Army Corps of Engineers and Fish & Wildlife permits, 12-month duration
- Open Shield Pipe Jacking
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking Machines are available starting at a minimum 48-inches, but most contractor machines begin at 54" diameter.
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking has significant potential for subsidence or surface rupture due to the low depth of cover over the bore and large size of the machine.
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking would require deepening of Bonsall Creek Channel Crossing, which would deepen the Lift Station.
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking cannot be done in groundwater, dewatering will be required along the alignment (within the channel and creek)
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking would require dewatering permitting
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking can typically remove cobbles and boulders up to 30% the diameter of the bore
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking will not require a rescue shaft due to the large bore size and expected size of cobbles that will be encountered
  - Open Shield Pipe Jacking costs are based on latest estimate we did for a similar project for Eastern Municipal Water District (Well 206 - 209) pipeline with a larger diameter casing based on RS Means values
  - Would have an impact on testing and design schedule, minimum 1 month for dewatering testing, then 1 month to redesign and include in specifications
  - Would have an impact on schedule and Caltrans Permit, as access to Ostrich Farm Creek would require Caltrans environmental review, at least 2-month review period and probably longer since it would directly impact Caltrans property during dewatering.
  - Would have an impact on schedule for permitting, since Bonsall and Ostrich Farm Creek are considered Blue Ribbon Streams next to San Luis Rey River, need Army Corps of Engineers and Fish & Wildlife permits, 12-month duration

## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021

1444101\*02

Page 7

- Pilot Tube Microtunnel
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel Machines can insert casings as small as 12-inches in diameter
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel will minimize the potential for subsidence or surface rupture from shallow depth of ground cover
  - Pilot Tube Microtunneling can be done in groundwater if the amount of groundwater entering the shafts and bore is minimal, or if dewatering along the alignment (within the channel and creek) can be attained to a depth below the bore.
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel would require dewatering permitting if dewatering is required
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel cannot push through soils that have a blow count of 50 or higher per the Geotechnical Report. This alternative is not feasible for Ostrich Farm Creek crossing.
  - Pilot Tube Microtunneling may require abandonment of the pilot bore if obstructions are encountered. During enlargement of the pilot bore the casing can become stuck on an obstruction requiring a rescue shaft or abandonment.
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel normally has significantly smaller jacking and receiving pits than conventional jack and bores, microtunneling, or open shield pipe jacking
  - Pilot Tube Microtunnel costs are based on the Naomi Sewer Study for Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation from 2017, with numbers updated to 2021 costs
  - Would have an impact on testing and design schedule, minimum 1 month for dewatering testing, then 1 month to redesign and include in specifications
  - Would have an impact on schedule and Caltrans Permit, as access to Ostrich Farm Creek would require Caltrans environmental review, at least 2-month review period and probably longer since it would directly impact Caltrans property during dewatering.
  - Would have an impact on schedule for permitting, since Bonsall and Ostrich Farm Creek are considered Blue Ribbon Streams next to San Luis Rey River, need Army Corps of Engineers and Fish & Wildlife permits, 12-month duration

## Trenchless Method Evaluation Matrix

23 September, 2021

1444101\*02

Page 8

- Open Cut Trenching
  - Open Cut Trenching has no limit on pipe or casing size, and so the casing can be installed open trench to protect the pipe that will be installed inside
  - Open Cut Trenching will minimize the potential for subsidence or surface rupture
  - Open Cut Trenching will require dewatering to install the casing and pipe in the trench
  - Open Cut Trenching would require dewatering permits
  - Open Cut Trenching would require the concrete sides and floor of Flood Control Channel to be removed and replaced
  - Open Cut Trenching would require mitigation credits for disturbing/damaging Ostrich Farm Creek vegetation
  - Would have an impact on schedule for significant redesign time to evaluate area of influence of Bonsall Creek culvert headwall and structural design pending the extent the headwall is impacted, 3 months anticipated. Specialty shoring requirements would need to be added to the design specifications.
  - Would have an impact on schedule and Caltrans Permit, as the change to trenching would require Caltrans review, at least 12-month review period for Bonsall Creek due to proximity to Bonsall Creek Bridge and 18-month review and coordination period for Ostrich Farm Creek due to mitigation requirements.
  - Would have an impact on schedule for permitting, since Bonsall and Ostrich Farm Creek are considered Blue Ribbon Streams next to San Luis Rey River, need Army Corps of Engineers and Fish & Wildlife permits, 12-month duration
  - Would have an impact on ISMND for addition of an addendum, 3-month duration





**AS-NEEDED CONTRACT EXPENDITURES REPORT**

**AUGUST 2021**

CONTRACT INFO	FUND SOURCE	ASSIGN. NO.	STATUS	DATED	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZED AMOUNT	NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT	INVOICED TO DATE	CURRENT BALANCE
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Land Surveying Services <b>Firm:</b> Johnson-Frank & Assoc. <b>Expires:</b> 8/29/2022* (C#18-16) *One year extension.	NON-CIP	2019-01	Closed	5/14/2019	Topography - Dentre De Lomas Road repair.		\$ 5,115.40	\$ 5,115.40	
	NON-CIP	2019-02	Closed	8/6/2019	Easement review - McDowell / Mead.		\$ 4,100.00	\$ 1,404.25	
	NON-CIP	2020-03	Closed	9/19/2020	Survey & Reset Monument on Los Alisos Lane.		\$ 6,079.00	\$ 4,297.76	
	CIP	2021-04	Open	5/3/2021	Prepare Plat Map - Thoroughbred Lift Station		\$ 11,592.00	\$ -	
						\$ 50,000.00	\$ 26,886.40	\$ 10,817.41	\$ 39,182.59
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Land Surveying Services <b>Firm:</b> KDM Meridian, Inc. <b>Expires:</b> 8/29/2022* (C#18-14) *One year extension.	NON-CIP	2018-01	Closed	9/11/2018	Stake easement on Morro Hills due to 20" watermain failure.		\$ 7,280.00	\$ 7,278.75	
	CIP	2019-02	Closed	1/9/2019	RMWD "Base Map" to perform in-house design of proposed water facilities on Via Ararat.		\$ 5,800.00	\$ 5,800.00	
	CIP	2019-03	Cancelled	---	Assignment Cancelled - 4 PTR Plottable Easements.		\$ -	\$ -	
	CIP	2019-04	Closed	4/24/2019	Stake easement on Gird Road for construction project.		\$ 5,400.00	\$ 5,400.00	
	CIP	2019-05	Closed	6/18/2019	Legal and Plat for Campbell - Via Ararat.		\$ 1,195.00	\$ 1,195.00	
	NON-CIP	2019-06	Closed	10/24/2019	Stake easement on Via Oeste Drive and Laketree Drive.		\$ 10,900.00	\$ 7,725.00	
	CIP	2019-07	Closed	11/8/2019	Easements for new PS on W. Lilac/Via Ararat.		\$ 4,100.00	\$ 1,100.00	
	NON-CIP	2020-08	Closed	4/6/2020	Linda Vista Drive - Mainline Break.		\$ 5,563.00	\$ 5,562.50	
	CIP	2020-09	Closed	4/6/2020	Gird Road - Winery easement anlysis and exhibit.		\$ 7,680.00	\$ 6,900.00	
	CIP	2020-10	Closed	9/1/2020	Additional Gird Road - Winery easement analysis and new exhibit.		\$ 5,320.00	\$ 5,320.00	
	CIP	2020-11	Closed	11/6/2020	Easement for Hialeah PRS - Via De La Reina.		\$ 3,990.00	\$ 2,545.00	
	NON-CIP	2020-12	Closed	12/3/2020	Stake easement - Winterhaven Court		\$ 4,490.00	\$ 3,527.50	
	NON-CIP	2020-13	Closed	12/16/2020	Legal and Plat for Gird Road - Winery.		\$ 5,460.00	\$ 5,460.00	
	CIP	2021-14	Open	1/29/2021	Survey & staking of easements - Rancho Amigos. Auth \$815 over. (Staff evaluating if more work may be needed.)		\$ 7,530.00	\$ 8,345.00	
	CIP	2021-15	Open	5/27/2021	Survey & staking of easement - Turner Pump Station. (Staff evaluating if more work may be needed.)		\$ 5,665.00	\$ 5,665.00	
	NON-CIP	2021-16	Open	7/22/2021	Prepare documentation to file a quit claim for Rainbow easement at Fire Station 4.		\$ 1,500.00	\$ -	
NON-CIP	2021-17	Open	7/29/2021	Pepare documentation for new easement and quit claim documentation for existing easement.		\$ 7,240.00	\$ -		
					CO-01 for \$50K BoD 5/26/20, CO-02 for \$50K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 89,113.00	\$ 71,823.75	\$ 78,176.25
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Land Surveying Services <b>Firm:</b> Right-of-Way Eng. <b>Expires:</b> 8/29/2022* (C#18-15) *One year extension.	NON-CIP	2019-00A	Closed	5/15/2019	Title Reports, Legals & Plats - Los Sicomoros.		\$ 7,705.00	\$ 7,705.00	
	NON-CIP	2019-00B	Closed	6/18/2019	Adams Property Easement - Ranger Road.		\$ 1,885.00	\$ 1,885.00	
	CIP	2019-00C	Closed	6/30/2019	Pardee Easement - North River.		\$ 2,875.00	\$ 2,875.00	
	NON-CIP	2019-01	Closed	6/19/2019	Easement Survey - Grove View Road.		\$ 4,220.00	\$ 3,285.00	
	CIP	2019-02	Closed	10/3/2019	Easement Survey - Pala Mesa/Tecalote/Fire Rd/Pala Lake.		\$ 15,640.00	\$ 15,451.30	
	CIP	2019-03	Closed	11/6/2019	Easement Survey - Moosa Creek Pump Station. Restake and reconfigure easement authorized additional \$525.		\$ 5,675.20	\$ 5,675.20	
CIP	2020-04	Closed	2/19/2020	Lemonwood Easement Location.		\$ 5,370.00	\$ 4,390.00		
CIP	2020-05	Closed	6/9/2020	Easement Survey - Hutton Pump Station.		\$ 5,687.50	\$ 4,577.50		

**AS-NEEDED CONTRACT EXPENDITURES REPORT  
AUGUST 2021**

CONTRACT INFO	FUND SOURCE	ASSIGN. NO.	STATUS	DATED	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZED AMOUNT	NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT	INVOICED TO DATE	CURRENT BALANCE
	CIP	2020-06	Closed	7/30/2020	Easement Survey - Rainbow Heights Rd - Calfire Camp Site .		\$ 5,756.00	\$ 4,177.60	
	CIP	2020-07	Open	8/26/2020	Easement Survey - RHR - Calfire Camp Site Additional Services.		\$ 2,276.00	\$ -	
	CIP	2020-08	Closed	10/19/2020	Easement Survey - OHE Rancho Del Caballo.		\$ 1,620.00	\$ 1,445.00	
	CIP	2020-09	Closed	11/3/2020	Easement Survey - Rainbow Heights Rd. Westside - Calfire Camp Site.		\$ 11,521.00	\$ 8,449.20	
	CIP	2021-10	Closed	1/11/2021	Topographic Survey - Rainbow Heights Road		\$ 8,820.00	\$ 8,525.00	
	CIP	2021-11	Open	1/19/2021	Easement Survey - Skycrest Drive.		\$ 7,710.00	\$ 4,162.60	
	CIP	2021-12	Open	2/4/2021	Easement Survey, Legal Desc./Plat Map - Camino Del Cielo. (Staff evaluating if more work may be needed.)		\$ 5,490.00	\$ 5,467.50	
	CIP	2021-13	Open	2/23/2021	Easement Survey/County ROW Marking, Topo Map - Camino Del Cielo. (Staff evaluating if more work may be needed.)		\$ 2,320.00	\$ 2,320.00	
	CIP	2021-14	Open	2/23/2021	Easement Survey - Skycrest Drive.		\$ 4,720.00	\$ 795.00	
					CO-01 for \$50K BoD 5/26/20, CO-02 for \$50K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 99,290.70	\$ 81,185.90	\$ 68,814.10
<b>Title: As-Needed Civil Engineering Services</b>	Both	2019-01	Closed	12/18/2019	PRS and other Schematic Design/Drafting Services.		\$ 10,000.00	\$ 7,527.50	
<b>Firm: Dudek</b>	CIP	2020-02	Closed	8/5/2020	Design of Hutton Pump Station Site - Assignment Cancelled.		\$ 1,787.50	\$ 1,787.50	
<b>Expires: 6/25/2022 (C# 19-16)</b>									
					CO-01 for (\$100K) BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 11,787.50	\$ 9,315.00	\$ 40,685.00
<b>Title: As-Needed Civil Engineering Services</b>	NON-CIP	2019-01	Closed	7/16/2019	PS&E Pavement Repair - Dentro De Lomas.		\$ 8,890.00	\$ 8,890.00	
<b>Firm: Omnis Consulting, Inc.</b>	CIP	2019-02	Closed	8/1/2019	Olive Hill Estates Transmission Water Main.		\$ 73,700.00	\$ 73,700.00	
<b>Expires: 7/01/2022 (C#19-17)</b>	CIP	2019-03	Closed	10/14/2019	Vista Valley Retaining Wall Design.		\$ 23,495.00	\$ 23,040.67	
	CIP	2019-04	Closed	12/3/2019	Sarah Ann to Gird Road Force Main Replacement.		\$ 22,790.00	\$ 22,790.00	
	CIP	2020-05	Closed	3/24/2020	Gird Road Water Main Upsize.		\$ 21,120.00	\$ 21,120.00	
	CIP	2020-06	Closed	8/5/2020	Caltrans Encroachment Permit Renewal.		\$ 6,410.00	\$ 3,670.00	
	NON-CIP	2020-07	Open	10/14/2020	Standard Drawing - CAD Updates.		\$ 4,400.00	\$ 2,200.00	
	NON-CIP	2020-08	Closed	10/29/2020	PEIR Pipe Alignment Analysis.		\$ 19,920.00	\$ 19,920.00	
	CIP	2021-09	Open	4/19/2021	Sarah Ann Waterline Replacement.		\$ 6,800.00	\$ 5,265.00	
	CIP	2021-10	Open	4/19/2021	Rainbow Water Quality Improvement Relocation Design.		\$ 13,900.00	\$ 8,560.00	
	CIP	2021-11	Open	6/9/2021	Wilt Road Water Pipeline Design.		\$ 45,905.00	\$ -	
					CO-01 for \$150K BoD 6/23/20.	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 247,330.00	\$ 189,155.67	\$ 110,844.33
<b>Title: As-Needed Civil Engineering Services</b>	CIP	2019-01	Open	12/18/2019	Live Oak Park Road Bridge Crossing.		\$ 42,020.00	\$ 30,685.00	
<b>Firm: HydroScience Eng., Inc.</b>									
<b>Expires: 6/25/2022 (C#19-18)</b>									
					CO-01 for (\$40K) BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 42,020.00	\$ 30,685.00	\$ 79,315.00

**AS-NEEDED CONTRACT EXPENDITURES REPORT  
AUGUST 2021**

CONTRACT INFO	FUND SOURCE	ASSIGN. NO.	STATUS	DATED	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZED AMOUNT	NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT	INVOICED TO DATE	CURRENT BALANCE
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Real Estate Appraisal Services <b>Firm:</b> Anderson & Brabant, Inc. <b>Expires:</b> 6/25/2022 (C# 19-19)	CIP	2019-01	Closed	9/19/2019	North River Rd Easement Appraisal.		\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,500.00	
	CIP	2020-02	Closed	2/19/2020	PRS Fire Road Appraisal.		\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00	
	CIP	2021-03	Open	4/28/2021	Hutton Pump Station Site Appraisal. (Staff evaluating if more work may be needed.)		\$ 7,500.00	\$ 7,500.00	
	CIP	2021-04	Open	8/11/2021	Thoroughbred Lift Station Appraisal. (Four Reports)		\$ 17,500.00		
					CO-01 for \$20K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 18,500.00	\$ 21,500.00
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Real Estate Appraisal Services <b>Firm:</b> ARENS Group, Inc. <b>Expires:</b> 6/11/22 (C# 19-20)	NON-CIP	2019-01	Closed	7/15/2019	Bonsall Reservoir Appraisal (to include rent value).		\$ 3,050.00	\$ 3,050.00	
	CIP	2020-02	Closed	1/7/2020	Moosa Creek Pump Station Easement Appraisal.		\$ 5,350.00	\$ 6,542.50	
	CIP	2020-03	Closed	1/7/2020	Hutton Pump Station Easement Appraisal.		\$ 3,400.00	\$ 3,400.00	
					CO-01 for \$20K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 11,800.00	\$ 12,992.50	\$ 27,007.50
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Geotechnical Services <b>Firm:</b> Leighton Consulting, Inc. <b>Expires:</b> 11/13/2022 (C# 19-39)	CIP	2020-01	Closed	6/25/2020	Rainbow Heights Pump Station geotechnical exploration.		\$ 8,630.00	\$ 8,484.20	
	CIP	2021-02	Open	4/15/2021	Turner Pump Station geotechnical exploration.		\$ 14,300.00	\$ 14,286.63	
	CIP	2021-03	Open	5/15/2021	Hutton Pump Station geotechnical exploration.		\$ 8,450.00	\$ 249.80	
						\$ 100,000.00	\$ 31,380.00	\$ 23,020.63	\$ 76,979.37
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Geotechnical Services <b>Firm:</b> Ninyo & Moore G.E.S. <b>Expires:</b> 11/1/2022 (C# 19-40)	NON-CIP	2020-01	Closed	3/26/2020	Dentro De Lomas - Geotech observation & material testing. Proj. #2		\$ 6,518.00	\$ 1,369.00	
		2020-02	Closed	8/6/2020	Vista Valley Villas PRS geotech observation & material testing.		\$ 10,235.00	\$ 7,136.00	
		2021-03	Open	5/6/2021	Dentro De Lomas - Geotech observation & material testing. Proj. #1		\$ 6,097.00	\$ -	
						\$ 100,000.00	\$ 22,850.00	\$ 8,505.00	\$ 91,495.00
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Geotechnical Services <b>Firm:</b> ATLAS (SCST, LLC) <b>Expires:</b> 11/20/2022 (C# 19-41)	CIP	2020-01	Closed	7/7/2020	Olive Hills Estates Trans. Main geotech observation/field test.		\$ 36,619.00	\$ 17,563.00	
						\$ 100,000.00	\$ 36,619.00	\$ 17,563.00	\$ 82,437.00
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Construction Management & Insp. Services <b>Firm:</b> Harris & Associates <b>Expires:</b> 1/28/2023 (C# 20-01)	CIP	2020-01	Closed	3/13/2020	CM Support Services for the WSUP.		\$ 100,000.00	\$ 99,972.50	
	CIP	2020-02	Closed	4/7/2020	Constructability design review of PUP-1.		\$ 6,270.00	\$ 5,280.00	
	NON-CIP	2020-03	Open	4/21/2020	Sewer North River Road - Emergency Repair.		\$ 11,000.00	\$ 4,389.33	
	CIP	2020-04	Open	9/21/2020	District Wide Inspection Services.		\$ 20,000.00	\$ 11,566.73	
					CO-01 for \$20K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 170,000.00	\$ 137,270.00	\$ 121,208.56	\$ 48,791.44
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Construction Management & Insp. Services <b>Firm:</b> Reilly Construction Mnmnt. <b>Expires:</b> 1/28/23 (C# 20-02)							\$ -	\$ -	
							\$ -	\$ -	
					CO-01 for (\$100K) BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00

**AS-NEEDED CONTRACT EXPENDITURES REPORT  
AUGUST 2021**

CONTRACT INFO	FUND SOURCE	ASSIGN. NO.	STATUS	DATED	DESCRIPTION	AUTHORIZED AMOUNT	NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT	INVOICED TO DATE	CURRENT BALANCE
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Environmental Services <b>Firm:</b> Helix Environmental <b>Expires:</b> 2/25/2023 (C# 20-03)	CIP	2020-01	Closed	5/13/2020	Pipeline Upgrade Project - Disney Lane - Cultural/ Biological Evals.		\$ 9,148.00	\$ 5,804.56	
	CIP	2020-02	Closed	5/13/2020	Pipeline Upgrade Project - Via Vera - Cultural/Biological Evals.		\$ 9,155.00	\$ 4,446.37	
	CIP	2020-03	Closed	5/14/2020	Pipeline Upgrade Project - Hutton Pump Station - Cultural/Biological Evals.		\$ 13,209.00	\$ 6,793.54	
	CIP	2020-04	Closed	5/14/2020	Pipeline Upgrade Project - Turner Pump Station - Cultural/Biological Evals.		\$ 13,209.00	\$ 7,683.26	
	CIP	2020-05	Closed	7/16/2020	North River Road Sewer Points Repair - Biological Survey.		\$ 3,900.00	\$ 3,136.05	
	CIP	2020-06	Closed	9/10/2020	Gopher Canyon Water Pipeline Impv. Project - CEQA ISMND.		\$ 34,695.00	\$ 31,363.46	
	CIP	2021-07	Closed	3/25/2021	Rainbow Heights Pipe Installation - Bird Survey.		\$ 5,000.00	\$ 808.80	
	CIP	2021-08	Open	5/21/2021	RMWD HQ - Biological Survey & Buffer Mapping.		\$ 11,684.00	\$ 5,672.50	
					CO-01 for \$110K BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 210,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 65,708.54	\$ 144,291.46
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Environmental Services <b>Firm:</b> Rincon Consultants <b>Expires:</b> 2/25/2023 (C# 20-04)	CIP	20-01	Closed	11/6/2020	Rainbow Heights Road Transmission Main Biological Survey.		\$ 3,240.00	\$ 3,234.75	
							\$ -	\$ -	
					CO-01 for (\$15K) BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 85,000.00	\$ 3,240.00	\$ 3,234.75	\$ 81,765.25
<b>Title:</b> As-Needed Environmental Services <b>Firm:</b> Michael Baker International <b>Expires:</b> 3/24/2023 (C# 20-05)							\$ -	\$ -	
							\$ -	\$ -	
					CO-01 for (\$15K) BoD 6/22/21.	\$ 85,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,000.00
						<b>Total Authorized</b>	<b>Total Encumbrance</b>	<b>Total Expended</b>	
						\$ 1,790,000	\$ 895,587	\$ 663,716	