



County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND PLANNING
STEVEN E. WHITE, DIRECTOR

COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 14 (Belmont Manor)

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Thursday, January 20, 2022
TIME: 6:00 PM TO 7:00 PM
LOCATION: Sunnyside High School Cafeteria

MEETING MINUTES

IN ATTENDANCE:

1. CSA 14 Community Members
2. Provost and Pritchard Consulting Group: Nick Jacobson, Matt Kemp
3. County Representatives: Sebastian Artal, Chris Bump, Brett Rush, Cheryl Ou

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Background Information
 - On August 5, 2020, a letter was sent to all community members requesting completion of a survey to obtain support to begin a feasibility study for the 1,2,3-TCP project
 - Majority of residents that responded were in favor of hiring a consultant to complete the study
 - Provost and Pritchard Consulting Group (P&P) was selected
 - Efforts were made to include nearby water system – Belmont Water Corporation (BWC)
 - BWC decided to not participate in the study with CSA 14 and continue with their current method of treatment
 - P&P completed the feasibility study and concluded that there are 4 viable alternatives:
 - Alternative 1: Connecting to the City of Fresno (City) Water System with a 16-inch transmission main
 - Alternative 2: Connecting to the City Water System with an 8-inch transmission main
 - Alternative 3: Full Consolidation with the City (and become customers of the City)
 - Alternative 4: New well + treatment
2. Feasibility Study
 - Alternative 1
 - Project costs are estimated to be \$4,800,000

RESOURCES DIVISION

2220 Tulare Street, Sixth Floor / Fresno, California 93721 / Phone (559) 600-4259 / FAX 600-4552
The County of Fresno is an Equal Employment Opportunity Employer

- Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$481 without grant funding from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
- Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$72 with grant funding from SWRCB
- There would be a master meter at the connection point with the City
- County of Fresno (County) would become a customer of the City
- City would bill the County and County would pass fee to CSA customers
- County is recommending this alternative
- Community members that were present did not oppose to this alternative
- Alternative 2
 - Project costs are estimated to be \$5,400,000
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$605 without grant funding from SWRCB
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$120 with grant funding from SWRCB
 - This alternative would require installation of a water storage tank and water distribution site which would result in increased operation and maintenance costs
 - There would be a master meter at the connection point with the City
 - County would become a customer of the City
 - City would bill the County and County would pass fee to CSA customers
 - Some community members voiced some opposition to this alternative
- Alternative 3
 - Project costs are estimated to be \$5,900,000
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$623 without grant funding from the SWRCB
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$55 with grant funding from the SWRCB
 - Project costs are not all-inclusive and other charges from the City are likely to arise if this option is pursued
 - Current CSA customers would become customers of the City of Fresno
 - Some community members voiced some opposition to this alternative
- Alternative 4
 - Project costs are estimated to be \$3,900,000
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$430 without grant funding from the SWRCB
 - Estimated monthly operating cost for customers is \$154 with grant funding from the SWRCB
 - Although project costs are estimated to be lower, the monthly operating costs to maintain the system would be higher than the other alternatives due to water treatment(s)
 - There are risks associated with this alternative: 1) It is not guaranteed that water quality of the well will continue meeting drinking water standards for other types of contaminants 2) It is likely that the regulations from SWRCB will become stricter which may have the potential for the wells to be out of compliance at a future date

- Some community members voiced support for this alternative

3. Next Steps

- Come to a consensus about which alternative will be pursued
- Complete application for SWRCB Department of Financial Assistance (DFA) which can take up to one year
- Once application is submitted, DFA review process will take at least one year to approve funding for the project
- Grant funding is not guaranteed at this point, but it is likely to happen based on conversations with State representatives

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS

- Are the same funding options available for any of the alternatives presented?
 - SWRCB is encouraging consolidation and the conversations that the County has had with SWRCB have all been heading in that direction
- Why is the County recommending alternative 1?
 - Alternative 1 is the most cost-effective, long-term viable solution for the community
 - SWRCB is pushing consolidation of water systems
 - The unknowns associated with Alternative 4 are too risky and could prove to be costly in the long run
- What is the difference between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2?
 - The main difference is the size of the distribution pipe
 - With a smaller sized pipe, more improvements within CSA 14 would be necessary, such as the need for a storage tank in order to meet fire flow demands
 - Both alternatives were included in order to exhaust all possible options
- Why can't CSA 14 do what BWC is doing for treatment (point-of-use treatment system)?
 - SWRCB representatives stated that this type of treatment is accepted as a temporary short-term measure only. Eventually a permanent solution would need to be constructed
 - If CSA 14 were to use utilize this type of treatment, it would result in having to circle back to the same alternatives presented, which would result in higher costs

ACTION ITEMS:

- P&P will finalize the report and a link to the completed report will be provided to community members
- County will issue a survey gauging customers' interest. However, County is moving in the direction of Alternative 1 unless survey results show a high percentage of opposition