

Natural Resources Commission Minutes
January 23, 2017

Present: Mark Braly, Alan Pryor, Steven Westhoff, John Johnston, Evan Schmidt, Patrick Henderson, Anya McCann (Alt)
Absent: Michelle Millet
Staff: Stan Gryczko, Assistant Public Works Director
Council Liaison: Rochelle Swanson

1. **Approval of Agenda** - Approved unanimously
2. **Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons** –
 - Brief introduction of Commission for new Members Schmidt and Henderson.
 - Mayor Robb Davis mentioned Valley Energy and status of Response for Proposals for initiation of services and the recruitment for Chief Executive Officer. Current timeline has targeted October 2017 or early 2018 to start offering energy choices.
 - Commissioner McCann requested information on process for filling vacant seats on Commissions. It was mentioned that an updated Commission Handbook was on Council Agenda for approval on January 24.
3. **Public Communications**
4. **Consent Calendar** – Held over for further discussion (A) December 4, 2016 minutes due to 4 Members abstaining from vote.
5. **Regular Items**
 - A. **Recycled Water and Wastewater Treatment Plant Reuse Opportunities** - City staff, and West Yost Associates presented information gathered as part of initial effort to assess opportunities for recycled water use. Commission Members provided feedback (included as Attachment 1).
 - B. **Subcommittee reports**
 - i. **Hazardous Waste Subcommittee – Initial report and recommendations for pesticide use in the City** – Commissioner Pryor asked Commission to accept report and distribute to Open Space and Habitat and Parks and Recreation Commissions. Committee discussed wording of title for report to discussion paper vs. initial report as Committee had not had time to review and discuss. Motion by Pryor to receive draft report and approve distribution to other Commissions. Motion carried 6-0-1 (Henderson).
 - ii. **Energy Subcommittee** – Commission discussed submitting information to Council. Also suggested reaching out to other communities on energy efficiency (Boulder and Berkley). Commissioner Braly suggested adding a Member to the subcommittee. Commissioner Schmidt to attend January 27 meeting of subcommittee on time of sale ordinance.
 - iii. **Appoint Environmental Recognition Awards Subcommittee** – Commissioners Braly, Pryor, and Henderson agreed to form this years’ subcommittee.
 - C. **Water Conservation Program Update** – Brief update provided on water use in the City.
 - D. **Subcommittee Updates** –
 - Water – No update.
 - Energy – No update – see item 5b.ii above.
 - Solid Waste – Update provided on compostable ordinance. Still on track to be before Council in April.
 - Haz Mat – See item 5.b.i above.

- GHG – No update.
6. **Commission and Staff Communications**
 - a) **Long Range Calendar/Future Agenda Items.** Reviewed and updated.
 - b) **Upcoming meeting items/events.** Next regular meeting February 27.
 7. **Adjourn:** 9:05 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1: Natural Resources Commission (NRC) Comments on WWTP Options



DRAFT
Summary
Wetlands / Overland Flow Site / Water Reuse
Alternatives Evaluation
Stakeholder Meeting
January 23, 2017

Client: City of Davis
Project: City of Davis WWTP Recycled Water and Land Use Alternatives Evaluation
Subject: Wetlands/Overland Flow Site/Water Recycling Brainstorming with Natural Resources Commission
Meeting Date/Time: January 23, 2107, 6:30 PM
Location: Community Chambers at City Hall
Summary by: Natalie Muradian

Project Overview:

- Continued Community Involvement: Check-ins with commissions will occur throughout the timeline of the project. There is the potential for inclusive community meetings.
- Council Meeting: All alternatives will be presented to Council, and several alternatives will be recommended for further study but based on the input received.
- Use of treatment pond area:
 - Short term uses – used for emergency storage, stormwater storage and/or recycled water storage
 - Long term uses – in addition to storage, there may be potential for management of water associated with the landfill
 - Ponds will not be converted to an alternative use for the foreseeable future

Project Goals

Straw-Poll Scoring of identified project goals (completed at end of the presentation, see attachment for details):

- Highest ranked: Identify and achieve highest and best use of City's water and lands
- Next highest: Preserve flexibility for long-term use of recycled water, continue to meet treatment plant goals, maximize use of available financial resources
- Lowest ranked: Provide opportunities for public education
- Goals with wide ranging responses: Answers were fairly similar across the board

Please clarify how each Alternative meets the identified Project goals. See attached "Measles Chart". Note that all alternatives will meet the objective of continuing to meet WWTP effluent water quality goals and that an evaluation of maximizing the use of available financial resources will be developed under the follow-on planning efforts. Thus, these two goals were not evaluated qualitatively on the attached chart.



Project Purpose

Straw-Poll Scoring of Project Purpose "Value" Questions

- How important is it to this Commission to maintain/enhance the Restoration Wetlands as a City-owned open space? – second highest rank
- What value does the Commission put on the Overland Flow Site as a potential open space site? – lowest rank
- What value does the Commission put on reuse of the WWTP effluent versus continued discharge to Willow Slough Bypass/Yolo Bypass? – highest rank

Restoration Wetland Enhancement Options

Brainstorming/discussion:

- 300-500 people, on average, visit the wetlands per year
- Is there a balance of recreation and habitat quality? Passive recreation (ie. bird watching) is synergistic with current habitat quality. If recreation becomes more active/intensive, then habitat quality would need to be considered.
- Davis wetlands could not be considered new mitigation for the Yolo Habitat Conservancy. The Davis wetlands are already part of a mitigation project for the levee system.
- The alternative "Expand permanent wetland habitat" was clarified to "Enhance or optimize existing wetland habitat by applying additional water to existing wetland ponds year-round" ie. convert some acreage of seasonal wetlands to permanent wetlands
- How does stormwater get affected by this project? Potentially, the channel could be improved to allow more stormwater into the wetlands, and the operation of the wetlands could be adjusted to increase stormwater diversions into the wetland.
- Other options identified by commission:
 - Hand over wetlands management to the State of California. This shouldn't affect the public's ability to use Davis Restoration Wetlands, though it might impact the flexibility of Davis to use recycled water.
 - Connect Davis Restoration Wetlands to Yolo Habitat Conservancy.
 - Increase stormwater diversions to wetlands

Straw-Poll Scoring of options (see attachment):

- Highest:
 - Expand permanent wetland habitat
 - Increase educational opportunities at wetlands
- Lowest:
 - Hand over to State for Management
 - Integrate with Yolo Habitat Conservancy



Overland Flow Options

Brainstorming/Discussion

- Overland Flow Area = 170 acres
- Solar Power Facility
 - Biosolids could not be implemented in conjunction with solar panels due to logistical issues (getting farm equipment underneath solar panels)
 - This site could be double the size of the existing PVUSA solar site
- Carbon sequestration
 - 450 acres of forest is estimated to provide carbon offset for use of City's utilities
 - Willows, cottons, eucalyptus may do well in the soil
 - If City is participating in Community Choice Energy, the carbon footprint of the City may be less and therefore carbon sequestration may not be as necessary
 - Concern about lack of habitat created by forest – mono culture of one type of tree
- Organic processing/energy generating facility
 - City Staff is investigating this option further to provide City Council with more detailed information. City's study will would be done in conjunction/parallel with this study.
 - County currently hauls organics to Lathrop, so having an organic processing facility or a way to handle biosolids nearby could be advantageous
- Biosolids Disposal
 - Biosolids are currently sent to landfill and used as Alternative Daily Cover, but landfills may not always be able to take the biosolids
- Options:
 - Repository to threatened trees, potentially in conjunction with UC Davis

Straw-Poll Scoring of options (see attachment):

- Highest (highest to lowest)
 - Expand solar power facility
 - Convert to habitat
- Lowest (lowest to highest)
 - Convert to active recreation site
 - Do nothing
 - Tie: Sell/lease to third party, Tree preserve
- Options with wide ranging responses
 - Organic processing facility
 - Biosolids disposal
 - Convert to ag land



Recycled Water Options

Brainstorming/Discussion:

- Potential Costs: the further away the recycled water use is from the WWTP, the more expensive the alternative will be.
- The amount of tertiary effluent potentially available for recycled water uses = approximately 1.5- 2 MGD in summer
- Q: Can City use Enterprise funds to pipe recycled water into town? A: Yes, city staff believe so (assuming funds are available)
- There is the potential for grant funding for a recycled water project through the State and Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Program.
- City owned lands for agriculture
 - Almonds are potentially being planted on the City owned land – West Yost/City Staff to follow up with Tracy
- Fill station:
 - Not currently being studied for residential use since use of gas to get out to WWTP offsets benefit of recycling water.
 - If recycled water got piped into town, a residential fill station could be an option.
- Groundwater Recharge
 - Potentially just recharging intermediate aquifer.
 - If desirable to recharge deep aquifers, a site would need to be identified that has some connectivity between intermediate and deep – West Yost has low confidence that such a site could be found close to the WWTP.
- Industrial Use
 - Woodland has received a grant and is sending recycled water to industrial users. One known user is the biomass plant.
- Establish a water market:
 - Q: Has this alternative been discussed with Yolo Flood Control and Conservation District as a potential buyer? A: No, but if this option is identified as desirable, identifying potential buyers would be part of the feasibility study.
- Municipal Use
 - City is currently converting intermediate wells for irrigation. This would need to be considered in a feasibility study to compare costs and electrical uses.

Straw-Poll Scoring of options (see attachment):

- Uses of Recycled Water (ranked highest to lowest)
 - Habitat purposes
 - Landscape Irrigation
 - Farming/agriculture



- Recycled Water Alternatives
 - Highest
 - Use recycled water to create additional wetlands on City-owned lands
 - Use recycled water for groundwater recharge
 - Lowest
 - Use recycled water for commercial water truck filling station at the WWTP
 - Sell recycled water for industrial applications in the area
 - Wide ranging responses:
 - Purchase a portion of Conaway Ranch to use for recycled water application (either farming or habitat)
 - Sell recycled water to agricultural users in the area
 - Convey recycled water to City for municipal uses (either landscape irrigation or habitat)
 - Establish a local water market