

**Agenda**  
Sacramento Suburban Water District  
and  
San Juan Water District  
**2x2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee**

9935 Auburn-Folsom Road  
Granite Bay, CA 95746

February 5, 2015  
1:00 p.m.

Where appropriate or deemed necessary, the Committee may take action on any item listed on the agenda, including items listed as information items. Public documents relating to any open session item listed on this agenda that are distributed to members of the Committee less than 72 hours before the meeting are available for public inspection in the customer service area of the District's Administrative Office at the address listed above.

The public may address the Committee concerning an agenda item either before or during the Board's consideration of that agenda item. Persons who wish to comment on either agenda or non-agenda items should fill out a Comment Card and give it to the General Manager. The Committee Chair will call for comments at the appropriate time. Comments will be subject to reasonable time limits (3 minutes).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you have a disability, and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, then please contact Sacramento Suburban Water District Human Resources at 679.3972. Requests must be made as early as possible, and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting.

**Call to Order**

**Roll Call**

**Public Comment**

This is the opportunity for the public to comment on non-agenda items within the Committee's jurisdiction. Comments are limited to 3 minutes.

**Items for Discussion and Action**

- 1. Approve Notes of December 18, 2014 Committee Meeting**
- 2. Discuss Policy Items**
- 3. Discuss Meetings Held To-Date and Results**
- 4. Financial Summary of Phase 2A Project To-Date**
- 5. Discuss Upcoming Tasks and Meetings**

\* \* \* \* \*

2x2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee

February 5, 2015

Page 2 of 2

I certify that the foregoing agenda for the February 5, 2015, joint Committee meeting of the Sacramento Suburban Water District and San Juan Water District 2x2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee was posted by February 2, 2015 in a publicly-accessible location at the Sacramento Suburban Water District office, 3701 Marconi Avenue, Suite 100, Sacramento, California and the San Juan Water District office, 9935 Auburn Folsom Road, Granite Bay, California and was freely available to the public.

---

Robert S. Roscoe  
General Manager/Secretary  
Sacramento Suburban Water District

# AGENDA ITEM 1

## 2x2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Notes

Sacramento Suburban Water District  
Thursday, December 18, 2014  
10:30 a.m.

**Committee Members:** Ted Costa, San Juan Water District (SJWD) Director, Chair  
Neil Schild, Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD) Director  
Bob Walters, SJWD Director  
Kevin Thomas, SSWD Director

**District Staff:** Rob Roscoe, SSWD General Manager  
Shauna Lorange, SJWD General Manager  
Dan York, SSWD Assistant General Manager  
Christine Bosley, SSWD Executive Assistant

**Members of the Public:** Michelle Smira-Brattmiller, Committee Consultant, MMS Strategies  
Dan Bills, SSWD Finance Director  
Dave Simpson, Orange Vale Water Company (OVJWC)  
Bob Churchill, Citrus Heights Water District (CHWD)  
Al Dains, CHWD  
Judy Albietz, CHWD  
Debra Sedwick, Del Paso Manor Water District (DPMWD)  
Greg Young, Tully & Young  
William Eubanks, SSWD Ratepayer

### Call to Order

Chair Costa called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. It was noted that Bob Wichert, new SSWD Committee member, was absent; Kevin Thomas was present and served as alternate.

### Public Comment

None.

### Items for Discussion and Action

#### 1. Approve Notes of November 20, 2014 Committee Meeting

Bob Walters moved to approve the November 20, 2014 Committee Notes; Kevin Thomas seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 2. Discuss Follow-up Items from Joint Board Meeting

Neil Schild stated he had a number of comments for Committee consultant John O'Farrell regarding the draft report and requested staff set up an appointment. Dan Bills will schedule the appointment.

William Eubanks commented that his concern is that ratepayers be kept informed. Mr. Eubanks stated that SSWD has very open process and he is concerned with the creation of too large of an organization, with its additional bureaucracy, and the potential to lose touch with customers. Mr. Eubanks feels that Chair Costa's idea to meet at Citrus Heights Council Chambers and then broadcast the meeting was an excellent idea. He suggests focusing on water supply reliability issues and also using a professional moderator with the two general managers answering questions. Mr. Eubanks feels that by taking this extra step it couldn't be said later that the public wasn't notified.

Mr. Eubanks is also concerned with the legislation that must be passed in order to provide a more representative Board.

Director Schild agrees with Mr. Eubanks' comments regarding a meeting at Citrus Heights Council Chambers.

Shauna Lorance commented that one of the follow-up items from the joint Board meeting was the question of legal representation at the joint Board and Committee meetings. Chair Costa commented that he wants legal counsel to ensure that the procedure of outreach and transparency is done correctly. Director Walters stated that he doesn't see a compelling reason to have an attorney at every meeting and suggested having legal counsel review the process and provide an analysis. There was discussion regarding whether each agency would hire outside legal counsel or if the Committee would hire its own legal counsel. After deliberation, it was decided that, until each District has its own outside legal counsel, Bartkiewicz, Kronick, and Shanahan (BKS) would be asked to review the Committee's outreach efforts and render an opinion.

### **3. Approve MMS Strategies Phone Survey Task Order**

Michelle Smira-Brattmiller of MMS Strategies stated they will provide a coordinated outreach plan prior to the next Committee meeting for Committee members' review. Regarding larger facilities for outreach efforts, MMS Strategies has also received offers from the cities of Roseville and Folsom, and they will continue to look at other options as well. She went on to say that Supervisor Susan Peter's office has offered her "Coffee Meetings" as a potential venue and there was discussion of contacting schools, the Sacramento Sheriff's Department community meetings and using the Fair Oaks Water District building as other potential outreach avenues.

There was also discussion on the telephone surveys which included:

- How they would be conducted
- Types of questions
- Number of people surveyed/Margins of error
- How areas of ratepayers are identified
- Days of week and hours of day surveys will be conducted

Once the raw data of the surveys has been collected, a final report will be generated and presented to the Committee in February. Both Districts will have links on their websites to a common website which will provide the outreach information to maintain consistency.

It is expected that the survey will include 500 – 600 participants with an expected margin of error rate of approximately 4-5%. Chair Costa stated he would like a copy of the raw data. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller replied she would forward the data to him once she receives it.

Director Thomas questioned whether emails would be sent to ratepayers as well. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller indicated emails would be sent but not in the form of a poll, rather they would be used as an additional means to gather other questions ratepayers may have. A mailer might also be sent which will provide information on upcoming events and to direct ratepayers to the two district websites to gain more information. The logistics and costs of a direct mail piece were discussed.

Director Walters stated his concern that survey questions not be leading. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller assured him they would not be leading as they are not intended to illicit a certain response. Some ideas on questions were discussed along with examples of how questions might be posed. Chair Costa confirmed again that the survey would include no less than 500 people polled.

Debra Sedwick questioned whether neighboring districts' customers would be contacted for the survey, causing confusion for those neighboring districts' ratepayers. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller explained that the survey will be conducted based on address and other districts' customers would not be contacted for the survey. Ms. Lorance commented that it might be a good idea to contact neighboring districts and let them know of the survey in case customers in those districts hear about it.

Director Schild stated his concern that the task order for the survey company did not detail the particulars of the survey. Ms. Lorance explained the first order of business was to hire the firm that will conduct the survey and then the questions would be developed. Ms. Lorance asked whether the Committee would be comfortable with staff approving those questions before they go out. There was discussion among the Committee members. Chair Costa and Director Thomas both suggested letting the polling consultant, as an expert, frame the questions. No dissent was noted. Director Schild stated he would like a copy of the questions before they go out so that he could respond to any questions a constituent might have after receiving a call from the polling firm. Director Schild also agreed to let the pollsters frame the questions but requested a telephone number of someone he could call and talk with should he have a question regarding why a particular question was being asked. Ms. Lorance agreed with providing a telephone number and stated that Committee members will receive a copy of the questions a day in advance of the survey along with the date the survey will start. In an effort to clarify the Committee's direction to staff, Ms. Lorance asked if the Committee members had intentions of approving the questions before the survey could be conducted. Chair Costa stated the Committee had already recommended letting the

pollsters dictate the questions to be asked. Director Walters agreed and echoed previous statements with regard to the pollsters being the experts.

Director Walters made a motion to grant staff the authority to sign the work order after amending the contract with MMS Strategies, to include a modest cost increase up to \$35,000, reflect the minimum number of phone calls required, the timing of the survey, the areas to be covered and the timely distribution of the survey questions to the Committee prior to the start of the survey. Staff committed to providing the questions to the Committee members at least 24 hours in advance of the survey, as well as the date the survey will start. Director Thomas seconded.

Chair Costa then called for public comment.

Bob Churchill posed a question with regard to the validity of the survey results as there are three areas to consider – SSWD, SJWD Retail and SJWD Wholesale - with two-thirds of the population residing in the SJWD Wholesale area boundary. He believes the questions would have to be different for the different areas. Mr. Churchill also stated the questions in the survey need to be summarized by the wholesale agencies' boundaries so the agencies are able to pick out the questions relevant to their district.

Al Dains questioned if there had been outreach to the Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller replied that she had been in touch with them and will be meeting with them again. Ms. Smira-Brattmiller stated she has also spoken with Sac Metro Chamber and Citrus Heights Chamber and has made requests with Fair Oaks, Folsom and Roseville.

The motion carried by unanimous vote.

#### **4. Discuss Upcoming Tasks & Meetings**

Ms. Lorance stated there will be a slight delay in completing the final report. The final report will likely be completed in February; however, a formal outreach schedule will be prepared with additional review time as requested.

Chair Costa commented that, if a televised outreach event does take place, the Boards should take note of Mr. Eubanks' previous comments and have both full Boards meet prior to the event to determine a procedure on how the event is to be conducted. Ms. Lorance stated she would ensure it is added to the public information plan which will be brought back before the Committee.

Chair Costa made a comment with regard to the low amount budgeted for the consultant, John O'Farrell, and the great deal of work he has done. Ms. Lorance stated this had been discussed with regard to where the Phase 2A study ends and the Phase 2B study will begin, as the work load has been larger than expected. Additional budget for consultants may need to come before the Committee.

Director Walters asked if timelines could be added to the chart that had been presented. Ms. Lorange replied they could be added; however, they would be estimations only.

Chair Costa called for final comments; there were none.

**Adjournment**

Chair Costa adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

---

Robert S. Roscoe  
General Manager/Secretary  
Sacramento Suburban Water District

# AGENDA ITEM 2

## STAFF REPORT

---

To: 2X2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee

From: Shauna Lorange, GM SJWD  
Rob Roscoe, GM SSWD

Date: February 5, 2015

Subject: Policy Items

---

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

This item is provided for information. Action is not requested at this time.

### BACKGROUND

After the SJWD and SSWD Boards of Directors (Boards) receive the draft Phase 2A report that is ready for public comment, the comment period ends, and responses to comments have been received, both Boards will receive the final version of the Phase 2A report. At that time, the Boards will be determining whether or not to proceed to Phase 2B. If the majority of both Boards individually elect to proceed to Phase 2B, both Boards will need to make some additional policy decisions. These policy decisions are provided in this staff report to provide notice that such decisions are still remaining, but are decisions that will not be made unless or until the Boards elect to proceed with merging the two Districts. However, staff desires to receive Committee input at this time while the Phase 2A report is still in process of completion.

### CURRENT STATUS

The Phase 2A report was designed to provide additional information, such as validating the Phase 1 findings, identifying "fatal flaws", if any, and further analyzing the benefits and risks of merging (reorganization), sufficient to allow the two Boards to make the decision on whether or not to continue to proceed with potentially merging (reorganizing) the two Districts by moving to a Phase 2B process that would include providing a recommendation to LAFCo and beginning the LAFCo approval process.

As Phase 2A winds down and if a decision is made to proceed with Phase 2B, the following policy questions must be answered:

1. Continuing the Process and beginning Phase 2B



Phase 2B is defined as completing the steps necessary to apply to LAFCO to reorganize the two districts into one single District.

- a. Should the two Boards of Directors proceed and initiate Phase 2B?
  - i. If no, stop. The evaluation is over.
  - ii. If yes, Boards separately adopt similarly worded resolutions and proceed to item 2.

2. Scope of Work and Budget for Phase 2B Process

The level of detail researched and discussed, and the decisions made, in Phase 2B will be determined based on the amount of information the Boards determine should be decided in advance by the two Boards versus the decisions to be made by the new Board of Directors. The balance will be to make enough decisions that both Boards are comfortable with the decisions, but to retain enough flexibility for the new Board of Directors to identify the most effective and efficient way to run the new organization.

The level of detail determined to be appropriate will drive the scope of work and budget for the Phase 2B process. The Boards will decide whether to set the scope of work at the level to provide the necessary information to meet the requirements of LAFCO, or to develop exceedingly detailed information with a very detailed scope of work and detailed management of every step of the process. The budget necessary for the project will depend on the detail requested for the Phase 2B process.

- a. Do the Boards wish to have legal counsel for Phase 2B?
- b. Do the Boards desire to meet the requirements of LAFCO and let the future Board of Directors make the decision on details?
  - i. If yes, then develop scope and associated budget
  - ii. If no, staff will develop a more detailed decisions tree for the new Board of Directors to utilize as an inaugural level of detail to develop associated budgets.

3. Successor Agency

Which agency should be the successor agency? At this time, the agencies have been discussing reorganizing SSWD as a part of SJWD.

- a. Do the agencies desire to reorganize into one agency?
  - i. If yes, proceed below.
  - ii. If no, there needs to be further discussion on how a merger would proceed.
- b. Do the Boards of Directors desire to maintain SJWD as the successor agency?
  - i. If yes, go to number 4.
  - ii. If no, continue
- c. Do the Boards of Directors desire to maintain SSWD as the successor agency?
  - i. If yes, go to number 4.

- ii. If no, determine approach and consider additional study on that approach.

4. Directors of the new Board of Directors

How should the Directors of the new board be elected?

- a. Should the Directors be elected at large, by division or residing in a division?
  - i. If yes, go to number 5
  - ii. If no, continue
- b. Should the directors be elected by division, residing in that division?
  - i. If yes, go to number 5
  - ii. If no, what?

5. Number of Directors on the new Board

How many directors should ultimately be on the Board of Directors?\*

- a. 5
- b. 7
- c. 9
- d. 11
- e. ?

(\* Note: For more than 5 directors, special legislation required if a Community Services District is the selected successor structure.)

6. Transitional Board of Directors

The makeup of the transitional Board is the initial Boards of the pre-existing districts.

- a. Should the transitional Board of Directors comprise all ten of the existing Directors?
  - i. If no, identify how the transitional Board should be determined.

The following policy questions will need to be considered as additional information is developed and will be provided to the committee and Boards of Directors for policy direction at various points throughout the Phase 2B process.

- 1. Human resource principles for employees
  - a. Organizational chart
  - b. Transition to one salary schedule
  - c. Benefits
  - d. Application of PERS retirement rules and PEPRA
- 2. Principles on water resources
  - a. Identification of cost structure
  - b. Assurances to wholesale customer agencies on pre-1914 water rights reliability and cost benefits
  - c. Assurances to SSWD on reliability and cost benefits of existing groundwater resources

3. Financial
  - a. Both districts current bond covenants require maintaining separately the books of each predecessor district until such time as the bonds can be refinanced or retired. At this point the earliest feasible refinancing period is 2019 to 2022.
  - b. Because of "a." above, rates will remain separate for customers in the current service areas of each district until – 1) all pre-merger debt is refinanced into the name of the new district, 2) reserve amounts of the predecessor districts are fully utilized in the pre-existing service areas, 3) and infrastructure and other district-specific pre-merger costs can be appropriately charged to customers in pre-existing service areas.
  - c. Revenues and Costs solely attributable to the new district can be identified and equitably charged to the new district customers.
4. Terms and conditions for LAFCo application other than those noted above, e.g. effective date
5. Selection of General Manager

# AGENDA ITEM 3

## STAFF REPORT

---

To: 2X2 Ad Hoc Water Management Committee

From: Shauna Lorance, General Manager SJWD  
Robert S. Roscoe, General Manager SSWD  
Michelle Smira-Brattmiller, MMS Strategies  
Marilyn Wright, MMS Strategies  
John O'Farrell, Consultant

Date: January 30, 2015

Subject: Meetings Held To-Date and Results

---

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

Information Only.

### BACKGROUND

When both John O'Farrell & Associates and MMS Strategies were brought on to assist with the Phase 2A Study and Process, one of the primary tasks of each firm was to perform outreach, advocacy and hold stakeholders meetings. To date much of the outreach function has been completed as detailed more fully below. The primary outreach remaining to be performed is customer outreach. Other than the telephone survey that has been completed, the scope and budget for significant customer outreach was to be determined by the Joint Boards of Directors as part of the Phase 2B Process, should the Boards decide to continue with Phase 2B.

Stakeholder Meetings held to date and those planned for early February include:

#### Internal:

1. SSWD Board of Directors, all, former and new.
2. SJWD Board of Directors, all, former and new.
3. 2x2 Ad Hoc Water Management Committee, Separate meetings with each Director (4 meetings)
4. San Juan Wholesale Customer Agencies—Citrus Heights, Fair Oaks, Orange Vale, and Folsom City Council and staff.

## **External:**

### **December 2014**

#### Meetings

- ✓ Placer County Supervisor Kirk Uhler
- ✓ Roseville Council member Susan Rohan
- ✓ Roseville Utilities Director Ed Kriz
- ✓ Roseville Council Member Carol Garcia
- ✓ Roseville Council Member Bonnie Gore
- ✓ Sacramento County Supervisor Susan Peters
- ✓ Sacramento Metro Fire Chief
- ✓ City of Citrus Heights Mayor Sue Frost
- ✓ Citrus Heights Council Member Jeff Slowey
- ✓ Citrus Heights City Manager Henry Tingle
- ✓ Citrus Heights General Services Director David Wheaton
- ✓ Citrus Heights Principal Senior Engineer Chris Fallbeck
- ✓ Folsom Council Member Jeff Starsky
- ✓ Folsom Council Member Steve Miklos
- ✓ Folsom City Manager Evert Palmer
- ✓ Placer County CAO David Boesch
- ✓ Citrus Heights Chamber CEO (has since resigned)

### **January 2015**

#### Meetings

- ✓ Sacramento Supervisor Patrick Kennedy
- ✓ Sacramento Supervisor Roberta MacGlashan
- ✓ Roseville Council Member Tim Herman
- ✓ Roseville Council Member Pauline Roccucci
- ✓ Roseville City Manager Ray Kerridge
- ✓ Citrus Heights Council Member Mel Turner
- ✓ Folsom Mayor Andy Morin
- ✓ Folsom City Council Presentation
- ✓ Metro Chamber
- ✓ Roseville Chamber CEO Wendy Gerig
- ✓ Folsom Chamber Government Affairs Cmte Presentation
- ✓ Folsom Chamber President Russ Davis
- ✓ Carmichael Water District
- ✓ Sacramento County Water Agency
- ✓ City of Sacramento
- ✓ RWA
- ✓ SGA
- ✓ PCWA

### **February 2015**

#### Meetings

- ✓ Senator Richard Pan
- ✓ Senator Ted Gaines

- ✓ Assembly Member Ken Cooley
- ✓ Assembly Member Beth Gaines

Public Outreach

- ✓ Granite Bay MAC
- ✓ Supervisor Peters Coffee Meeting
- ✓ North State BIA
- ✓ Citrus Heights Chamber

**Principle Issues and Concerns:**

(Please note all comments, concerns, suggestions from such meetings/interviews are noted in the Draft Phase 2A report. Although the report is still in process of completion, directors may refer to Section 2, pages 25 through 34, of the Draft Phase 2A report provided at the last Joint Board Meeting (December 16, 2014.)

A summary of the comments and concerns noted thus far are:

1. Water Rates/Debt/Reserves:
  - a. Are they separate or blended?
  - b. Infrastructure needs on either side – how will they be paid for?
  
2. Governance:
  - a. How many board members?
  - b. How are they to be elected? At large, by division?
  
3. Customer Service – access:
  - a. How?
  - b. Where will customers pay their bills? Ask questions? Start/Stop service?
  - c. Board meeting venues?
  
4. Water Assortment/Cost:
  - a. How will SSWD customers be impacted if water is pumped to SJWD customers – primary concern is water availability?
  - b. How will SJWD customers be impacted if water is wheeled to SSWD customers – water availability?
  - c. Effect on water rights? Contractual rights? Will reorganization change the cost of water or assurance that water will be available to existing retail – wholesale customers?
  - d. Water quality/pressure concerns?

5. Water Rights/Contracts:
  - a. Will merger affect existing water rights/contracts of Folsom, Roseville or Carmichael Water District?
  - b. Will the merger jeopardize water rights if SJWD used water from SSWD?
  
6. Employees:
  - a. No concerns voiced yet, but HR principles will need to be developed to address employees' issues.
  
7. Adjacent Agencies:
  - a. Is this merger a preview of bigger things to come? Hostile take-over or forced merger concerns, etc.?

# AGENDA ITEM 4

## STAFF REPORT

---

To: 2X2 Ad Hoc Water Management Committee

From: Shauna Lorange, General Manager SJWD  
Robert S. Roscoe, General Manager SSWD

Date: January 30, 2015

Subject: Financial Summary of Phase 2A Project To-Date

---

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve amending contract with John O'Farrell & Associates in the amount of \$8,500.00

### BACKGROUND

In August 2014, each District's Board of Directors adopted a total budget for the Phase 2A Study of \$100,000, approved a 50-50 cost-sharing arrangement between the Districts, and granted the Committee authority to manage the Phase 2A process, including the expenditure of funds. The existing contract with John O'Farrell & Associates is capped at \$30,500.00. In addition, in October 2014, as further amended in December 2014, the districts contracted with MMS Strategies for advocacy, outreach and a telephone survey. The amended contract amount with MMS Strategies is capped at \$61,000. Therefore, to-date, \$91,500.00 of the \$100,000.00 budget is contractually committed to the Phase 2A Study.

Due to a number of unforeseen events, most significantly the number of outreach meetings held with internal and external stakeholders as more fully described in Agenda Item 3 above, John O'Farrell & Associates has reached the contractual dollar limit of their existing contract. As further works remains to complete the Phase 2A report, staff recommends the Committee authorize the attached amendment to the contract with John O'Farrell & Associates in the amount of \$8,500.00 (see Exhibit A attached.)



# Exhibit A

**AMENDMENT NO. 1  
TO AGREEMENT FOR SERVICES RELATING TO  
PHASE 2A, FURTHER ANALYSIS OF CONSOLIDATING SACRAMENTO  
SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT AND SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT STUDY  
SERVICES BETWEEN SACRAMENTO SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT  
AND JOHN O'FARRELL & ASSOCIATES**

This Amendment No. 1 to the August 7, 2014 agreement between Sacramento Suburban Water District ("District") and John O'Farrell & Associates ("Consultant") concerning Phase 2A, Further Analysis of Consolidating Sacramento Suburban Water District (SSWD) and San Juan Water District (SJWD) Study services, is made effective as of February \_\_, 2015, in Sacramento, California.

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2014, the District and Consultant entered into an agreement for Phase 2A, Further Analysis of Consolidating SSWD and SJWD consulting services (Agreement);

WHEREAS, the District desires to extend the services provided by Consultant;

WHEREAS, the Consultant is willing to perform the extended services; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to amend the Agreement on the terms and conditions set forth below to provide for the continuation of consulting services by Consultant to include a continuation of the services performed under the Agreement.

AGREEMENT:

1. Description of Work.
  - (a) Continuation of the "Work" as described in the Agreement.
  - (b) Continuation of the same fee arrangement as in the Agreement, Exhibit C.

2. Compensation.

(a) The total compensation for the continued services described in this Amendment No. 1 shall not exceed \$8,500.00. Compensation shall be based on Consultant's fee schedule which is attached as Exhibit C to the August 7, 2014 Agreement and incorporated herein to this Amendment No. 1.

(b) The not-to-exceed amounts of compensation described in subdivision (a) of this Section 2 are in addition to the not-to-exceed amount set forth in Section 2 b and Exhibit C of the Agreement. With this Amendment No. 1, Consultant's total not-to-exceed compensation is \$39,000.00.

3. Term of Agreement.

This Amendment shall become effective on the date first above written. The Agreement, together with this Amendment No. 1, shall continue in effect until completion, unless terminated earlier pursuant to Section 3 of the Agreement.

4. Effect on Agreement.

Except as specifically provided herein, the Agreement, and each of its terms and conditions, shall remain in full force and effect, are incorporated herein by this reference, and apply to the work described in section 1 hereof.

SACRAMENTO SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert S. Roscoe, P.E.  
General Manager

JOHN O'FARRELL & ASSOCIATES:

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
John O'Farrell  
Consultant

# AGENDA ITEM 5

## STAFF REPORT

---

To: 2X2 Water Management Ad Hoc Committee  
From: John O'Farrell, Phase 2A Consultant  
Date: January 30, 2015  
Subject: Upcoming Tasks and Meetings

---

### **RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION:**

Information only. Receive verbal report from Consultant.

### **DISCUSSION**

Presently Mr. O'Farrell, MMS Strategies and staff are working on the following tasks:

1. Finalizing the Draft Report
2. Finalizing the Results of the Telephone Survey
3. Continuing meetings with outside entities and individuals

### **NEXT STEPS**

#### February XX, 2015, 2x2 Committee Meeting

- Present "Public Draft for Comment Version of the Phase 2A Report"
- Begins 30 day public review
- Present Results of Telephone Survey

#### March/April Joint Board Meeting

- Final administrative report draft for consideration
- Present Results of Telephone Survey
- Opportunity to take actions