Technical Memorandum Name: **Out of Town Conveyance, March 2008**
Commenter: **TAC – Finance Committee**
Comments Date: **April 28, 2008**
Responses Date: **June 18, 2008**

The following comments were submitted in response to the above listed Technical Memorandum (TM). The TM was developed as part of the EIR process for the project, in order to help facilitate and broaden the discussion of project issues important to the community. The responses should be considered preliminary because the EIR process is not complete, and the information necessary to fully respond has not yet been developed. The project team is grateful to those citizens who took the time to review the TM and provide comments at this early stage in the process. The project team will endeavor to fully address the comments and concerns through the on-going project development process.

	Comment	Response
1	Pump Station: a) How can this risk be mitigated? What would be the associated cost? b) (last bullet) "planning to mitigate long-term risks of potential force main failures" c) Please provide cost estimates for visual mitigation	The potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigations are expected to be identified in the EIR. Ultimately, the permitting agencies will establish the requirements for mitigation. The pump stations considered in this technical memo are the same as were permitted and received bid prices for the LOCSD project. The costs include any required visual mitigations, such as locating some facilities underground.
2	Please confirm that STEP/ STEG collection system does not require a pump station to convey influent to out-of-town treatment plant. (Ripley Report indicates booster pumps.) Hydraulic study may be required.	Initial, conceptual layouts of a STEP collection system in the Ripley Report did not require booster pumps for out of town conveyance. Additional design work is necessary to determine if booster pumps are required and design proposals for STEP collection systems could vary depending on system layout.
3	Request comparative cost information for all three pump station technologies (submersible non-clog, submersible grinder, and wet-well mounted) – including both capital costs, annual O&M, and energy requirements (separately).	This level of analysis is appropriate for consideration during design and value engineering. Factors to consider include capital costs, maintenance requirements, operation and energy costs, and pump system reliability.
4	Concern: Why does TM assume lowest capital cost option (submersible non-clog), when life cycle O&M costs will account for greater proportion of total cost? It's important to evaluate long-term life cycle costs in any cost comparison.	The analysis of life cycle costs includes capital costs and estimates of future O&M costs. Life cycle costs will continue to be a consideration during design and value engineering.
5	Concern regarding community acceptance of pump station location at LOVR and Pecho Rd., particularly given the high density residential area east and prevailing winds.	The technical memo developed conveyance cost estimates based on the most conservative scenarios possible, which are the routes with the highest pumping head required. A location at LOVR and Pecho Road is not recommended in the tech memo.
6	How much more would it take to pipe to Robbins?	Conveyance to the Robbins site would be shorter, with less elevation gain, than the examples in Table 3. Therefore, the costs would likely be less.
7	Given AB 32 and Global Warming, serious consideration should be given to energy requirements, apart from associated costs.	Comment noted. Greenhouse gas emissions are being analyzed in a separate technical memo and the EIR.