

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

May 21, 2025

1:30 p.m.

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Board of Directors was called to order in person, by teleconference, and remotely - Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 84449923962#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/84449923962?from=addon> at 1:33 pm. DCA Executive Director, Graham Bradner, noted that Item seven (7)c would be presented prior to Item seven (7)b, however the balance of the Agenda remains unchanged.

2. ROLL CALL

Board members in attendance from the DCA Boardroom were, Director Gary Martin, Director Miguel Luna, Director John Weed, and Alternate Director Michael Plinski sitting in for Robert Cheng. President Martin Milobar, Director Tony Estremera and Director Adnan Anabtawi participated remotely.

Alternate Directors in attendance remotely were Sarah Palmer and Dennis LaMoreaux. Alternate Directors Jacquelyn McMillan, Mark Gilkey, and Shiloh Ballard attended from the DCA Boardroom; the Board Clerk captured their attendance for the record.

DCA staff members in attendance were Graham Bradner, Josh Nelson, Adrian Brown, and Julia Adelman.

Department of Water Resources (DWR) member in attendance was Janet Barbieri.

3. CLOSED SESSION

No public comment requests were received for the closed session item.

4. OPEN REGULAR MEETING & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Milobar opened the regular session at approximately 2:00 p.m. and asked Josh Nelson to report out on closed session. There were no reportable actions.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment requests were received.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a) Recommendation: Approve the April 17, 2025, Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve Minutes from April 17, 2025, as

Noted:	Estremera
Second:	Anabtawi
Yeas:	Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed
Nays:	None
Abstains:	None
Recusals:	None
Absent:	None
Summary:	7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as MO 25-05-02).

b) Recommendation: Approve the May 15, 2025, Special Board Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve Minutes from May 15, 2025, as

Noted:	Estremera
Second:	Weed
Yeas:	Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed
Nays:	None
Abstains:	None
Recusals:	None
Absent:	None
Summary:	7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as MO 25-05-03).

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a) May Monthly Board Report

Informational Item

Mr. Bradner presented the Monthly Report for April 2025 activities. He began by reviewing the DCA focus areas: continued engineering and environmental support for the Department of Water Resources (DWR) permitting efforts, including the ongoing Change in Point of Diversion (CPOD) hearings at the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB); advancing engineering studies on project design innovations to improve constructability, reduce costs, and manage risk; and setting a long-range goal to update the cost estimate

and system-wide Basis of Design Report (BODR) by early calendar year 2027. He noted that more context on that schedule would be provided in the next Agenda item on the three (3)-year work plan.

Turning to internal preparations, Mr. Bradner described work to develop management plans, procedures, and workflows in anticipation of transitioning to Program Delivery upon the participating Public Water Agencies (PWA's) decision to implement the Delta Conveyance Project (DCP). He emphasized the need for the DCA organization to be ready to transition seamlessly without losing time or momentum. He reported that the reorganization launched earlier this year was largely complete, and the DCA is now evaluating program resources and identifying where augmentations were needed. He added that systems used over the past five (5) or six (6) years would need to evolve for Program Delivery, and that DCA is prioritizing and sequencing those updates.

Regarding financial performance, Mr. Bradner reported that the currently approved fiscal year (FY) 2024/25 budget stood at \$43M, with \$35M committed through contracts and task orders and \$22M incurred through April FY 2024/25. The updated year-end estimate was \$33.1M, forecasting an underrun of approximately \$10M, largely due to geotechnical (Geotech) work being incomplete. He stated that the upcoming FY 2025/26 budget would similarly include set-aside reserves for potential Geotech investigations.

Mr. Bradner explained that the percentage complete and percent spent remained well aligned to date, noting that May through June was traditionally a busy period to finalize deliverable work products, and complete quality control and quality assurance reviews.

Regarding small business participation, Mr. Bradner reported that 12% of committed contracts were designated Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) and accounted for 9% of invoiced amounts to date.

He then informed the Board on strategic support services procurements, stating that notices of intent to award had been issued for Executive Strategic Support, Deputy Director Services, Facilitation Services, and Human Resources support. The first wave of contract negotiations and awards requiring Board approval, those exceeding \$250,000, would return in June, with the remainder coming back in August. He added that smaller procurements, including business services and scheduling software, were progressing.

Mr. Bradner concluded with outreach highlights, including DCA's participation in the Southern California Water Coalition (SCWC) luncheon, where DWR Director Karla Nemeth also presented. He also noted that social media engagement had rebounded, showing an 11% increase since March.

Director Martin asked how the percent complete was determined, specifically whether it was based on deliverables from external vendors or from work done by the DCA staff.

Agenda Item 6a

Mr. Bradner explained that the percent complete is currently calculated based on contractually obligated deliverables, which are discrete work products tied to known costs and tracked monthly via vendor reports. He noted, however, that this method under weighs ongoing DCA efforts and other activities without discrete outputs. As a result, the current percent complete figure is skewed toward easily quantified deliverables.

He said the DCA plans to evolve the methodology, aiming for a more representative, quantitatively driven approach that incorporates both vendor deliverables and internal staff contributions. This will involve updating systems and processes to produce a repeatable, weighted calculation of percent complete. He anticipates providing several updates to the Board as the new approach is phased in, likely beginning July 1.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

b) Sustainability Program Update

Informational Item

Mr. Bradner introduced DCA Sustainability Manager Catherine Sheane and Sustainability Lead Julia Adelman. Ms. Sheane explained that the DCA Programmatic Sustainability Policy's key commitment aspects include balancing sustainability with other DCA goals and embedding sustainability practices at both the organizational and Project Implementation levels. She presented two (2) sets of goals first at the DCA level, the Programmatic Sustainability Plan, which includes process-oriented goals that describe how sustainability activities will be established, coordinated, and communicated as the DCP evolves. Second, performance-oriented goals, tying sustainability actions to measurable targets.

She then outlined the structure for establishing sustainability goals and carrying them out through Program Delivery. The diagram, included in the sustainability policy, shows the three (3) foundational documents that will guide and drive sustainability integration within the DCP. It began with the high-level goals outlined in the policy. At the DCA level, the Programmatic Sustainability Plan develops those goals into detailed requirements, including management plans developed by the design and construction teams, post-procurement. She noted the DCA is now on the cusp of completing benchmarking and target-setting work to finalize the Programmatic Sustainability Plan. All of this establishes the foundation for DCA to assume responsibility, advance the actions, and measure and report on progress.

Ms. Sheane summarized FY 2023/24 and FY 2024/25 activities into three (3) major categories: Leadership, Commitment, and Engagement; Processes and Frameworks; and Technical Approach. Each category has progressed in parallel to and coordinated with

related efforts such as permitting, the community benefits plan, and communications activities.

In the Leadership FY 2023/24 category, the DCA began monthly sustainability updates to the Board and conducted peer-project benchmarking, reviewed PWA policies, and surveyed organizational and DCA sustainability frameworks for applicability. In the Technical Approach category, staff completed an initial Envision rating assessment and produced a strategy memo outlining the next FY key steps. The sustainability team updated the strategy memo and expanded the Envision assessment report, yielding clear requirements and resource estimates for the Programmatic Sustainability Plan.

Ms. Sheane reported that FY 2024/25 formally established the sustainability working group. This group continued monthly meetings, supplemented by additional workshops. Those workshops enabled consensus on shared values of sustainability including but not limited to, benefits of sustainability, opportunities, and obstacles to consider moving forward. Key components identified included the program's sustainability culture, collaborative approach, shared vision for success from a sustainability perspective, and strategies for communicating sustainability to key audiences.

In the Processes and Frameworks category, the sustainability team mapped environmental commitments to Envision measures, established baselines and targets through interactive workshops, and evaluated performance-tracking tools.

Ms. Sheane concluded by noting that these efforts set the stage for the Programmatic Sustainability Plan, which will translate programmatic requirements into actionable work during PD. She then turned the presentation over to Ms. Adelman to discuss the environmental-commitment mapping process in greater detail

Ms. Adelman explained that a major focus of the past two (2) years has been mapping and benchmarking environmental sustainability commitments. She presented a sample of approved design and environmental commitments within the Programmatic Sustainability Plan. To provide additional details, she noted that four (4) sustainability goals had been selected for progress tracking, and specific strategies were identified as well. Ms. Adelman stated that the initial Programmatic Sustainability Plan omitted climate resilience, however the mapping exercise revealed existing environmental, design commitments that covered climate resilience, so those items were added to present a complete picture.

To illustrate the mapping, Ms. Adelman pointed to the commitment to design for a 100-year operational life. She explained that while longevity may not immediately evoke sustainability, it conserves natural resources by maximizing material use, reducing the need for new extraction, and minimizing waste. Furthermore, a 100-year lifespan enhances resilience to climate impacts and avoids greenhouse gas emissions from material replacement and waste management.

Ms. Adelman then summarized how sustainability is benchmarked across project phases. During planning, the Bethany Reservoir alignment was selected as the least-impactful alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the establishment of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) helped define what “the right project” looks like to DCA’s diverse stakeholders. She noted preliminary engineering laid the groundwork for material conservation and established climate resilience. Detailed design development will create opportunities to innovate including refining material selection to consider embodied carbon emissions. As procurement documents are prepared, construction-phase commitments, such as reuse of materials and adoption of innovative technologies, will further enhance sustainability during construction.

She explained that the team has begun benchmarking the DCP against the Envision framework. Envision, developed by the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure (ISI), evaluates sustainability across environmental, social, economic aspects, using a standard set of strategies and thresholds. The framework emphasizes a collaborative approach spanning discipline stakeholders and project phases. Unlike Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) for buildings, Envision focuses on unique infrastructure challenges and opportunities, including water conveyance infrastructure. A third-party verification review from ISI can confirm the self-assessed award level. Since Envision is open source, it can serve simply as a benchmarking tool, which the DCP has utilized thus far.

Through workshops and document reviews, the DCA assessed the DCP’s current status against Envision’s five (5) categories. Staff then identified opportunities for DCA for more conservative actions and ambitious targets. Areas requiring further data or external coordination were placed in a “Future Knowledge Needed” category, and those deemed infeasible given current DCA constraints were also categorized. The results indicate that, as-is, the DCP qualifies for the Envision “Verified” award level by achieving over 20% of possible points. Given identified opportunities and the team’s experience with the framework, Ms. Adelman expressed confidence that the “Silver” or 30-40% total points available awarded level is an achievable target. She then turned the presentation back to Ms. Sheane for the next steps.

Ms. Sheane began by summarizing actions drawn from the updated strategy memo and the detailed Envision assessment report. She explained that the report’s robust analyses, conclusions, and recommendations are represented in the high-level summary. Looking ahead to the next FY 2025/26, Ms. Sheane stated that the sustainability team would prioritize efforts supporting the transition to Program Delivery as part of the three (3)-year plan. The focus in that transition will be on refining how sustainability integrates into the DCP before issuing the first procurement package. A key decision will be whether to pursue full Envision verification or continue using Envision as a self-assessment and benchmarking tool. Regardless of approach, setting a target award level helps the team discover and achieve innovative sustainability success as the DCP evolves. For Leadership, Commitments and Engagement, the sustainability team will review and update sustainability policy goals,

define more specific objectives where appropriate and continue engagement with key stakeholders in collaboration with other DCP staff. Under Processes and Frameworks, the team will complete any remaining technical assessments needed to finalize performance benchmarks, associated metrics, targets and tracking mechanisms while working closely with engineering and environmental staff. Lastly, in the Technical Approach category, the team will develop the first full draft of the Programmatic Sustainability Plan which will serve as the roadmap for executing Sustainability Policy goals and as the bridge to specific sustainability plans.

Ms. Sheane concluded by emphasizing that key related activities include coordinating with environmental and engineering teams to integrate sustainability into design guidelines, standards, and contract packages for procurement. Throughout all these efforts, the Sustainability team will keep the overall DCP goal in mind of completing all major permits and obtaining PWA approval to proceed with Program Delivery.

Director Weed observed that the term “public benefit” has historically referred only to environmental factors, but under the Envision presentation, Economic Development and Health and Safety also qualify. He encouraged the Sustainability team to identify projects on the Safe and Affordable Funding for Equity and Resilience (SAFER) list that might apply and in which DCA could participate.

Ms. Sheane noted that the Envision rating framework includes attributes beyond environmental considerations. She explained that the sustainability team’s document review reflected Envision’s triple bottom line approach to sustainability, encompassing economic, social and environmental aspects.

Director Luna asked whether Envision was the same program developed about 15 years ago with Harvard’s involvement. Ms. Sheane confirmed that it was. Director Luna commented that the City of Los Angeles participated in its conceptual development and found it fascinating to see where the program stands today. He then posed two questions. First, regarding the Technical Approach on exploring funding to determine resources needed and planning outline, he asked what steps the sustainability team envisioned for that process and where the current status stands, noting that resource requirements would be particularly interesting. Second, he asked whether the one-hundred-year operational life aligned with the project’s expected life or whether it extended beyond that, given rapid technological evolution in other fields and potential roles for AI.

Ms. Sheane described the Sustainability team’s funding discussions with DWR, Best Best & Krieger LLP and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. These early-stage conversations aim to leverage sustainability activities for innovative financing, though they remain in the exploratory phase. Regarding the 100-year operational life, she explained that large-scale civil infrastructure cannot anticipate technological changes over such a span. The focus is on reducing greenhouse gas emissions through improved maintainability and durable materials. Envision does not directly address technological innovation, but it

requires an operations and maintenance plan with a continual review cycle to allow for reevaluation as conditions change.

Director Luna asked again how AI might fit into sustainability evaluations. Ms. Sheane suggested that AI could be most valuable in assessing climate-change risks over time. She acknowledged that AI has not yet been integrated into the Sustainability team's work and said it would be explored for the next update. Director Luna thanked her and recommended that the President Milobar and Executive Director Bradner consider deeper dives into these topics at future meetings.

Director Weed raised the point that CEQA approved design must accommodate a ten-point-two (10.2) foot sea-level rise, approaching a 200-year flood event. He encouraged matching CEQA's terminology for timescales and impacts.

Mr. Bradner clarified that the 100-year life expectancy refers to facility design life, whereas the hydraulic design accounts for a 200-year return-period flood event under downstream conditions. He acknowledged the numerical confusion and clarified that the 100-year figure denotes the facilities' expected lifespan, and the 200-year figure denotes flood design criteria.

Director Anabtawi commented that sustainability measures often involve complex cost-benefit relationships over time. He asked whether there is a plan to evaluate the upfront costs of moving from the current state to a targeted sustainability level and the downstream returns, such as reduced long-term rehabilitation costs under a 100-year design life.

Ms. Sheane explained that they continuously evaluate cost implications for activities beyond the as-is baseline. When deciding whether to pursue full Envision certification or to implement conservative or ambitious opportunities, the sustainability team will provide life-cycle value contexts so that DCP can make informed decisions.

Director Weed made a follow-up observation that the 100-year tolling period would start at the operational date, projected around 2045.

Mr. Bradner confirmed that the 100-year design life would run from the start of operations in 2045 through 2145.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

c) DCP Three (3)-Year Workplan Overview

Informational Item

Mr. Bradner introduced the Three (3) Year Work Plan by noting the familiarity of the schedule first released with the May FY 2023/24 cost estimate. He explained that the schedule anticipates completion of major permit activities by the end of FY 2025/26, pre-design and full-design procurement beginning in FY 2025/26, and early works construction commencing in mid-FY 2028/29.

He emphasized that the decision by the participating PWAs to implement the project, a critical step following permit completion and preceding land acquisition, is vitally important. The schedule provides a high-level overview and corresponds to the benefit-cost analysis released in May. He stated the current focus involves determining the requirements necessary to meet the schedule.

He informed the Board about the next three (3) years, reflecting on the previous schedule and major permit activities. Environmental support tasks focus on the DCA activities, however certain milestones fall outside of DCA control. Major permit activities include final permits for CPOD and the Delta Plan Consistency by end of calendar year 2026. To support that process at DCA, engineering and environmental work will continue in close coordination with the permitting agencies.

Mr. Bradner explained that staff are starting to focus on internalizing environmental commitments and permit requirements. Ensuring that those elements are incorporated into the schedule remains an ongoing process as permits are issued with refined requirements, necessitating updates. He emphasized the need for clarity regarding overlapping and conflicting permit requirements, with a commitment to communicate those interactions back to the permitting team in the near future. He identified establishing collaboration between DCA and DWR for environmental compliance as a significant near-term effort. He noted that understanding the environmental compliance requirements to ensure implementation of those obligations is important. In the case of near-term field work, initiation of Environmental Compliance and monitoring required by permits may be necessary. He stressed the necessity of compliance during early activities, including readiness to provide monitoring reports in accordance with permit conditions.

Next, Mr. Bradner outlined the plan to develop a system-wide BODR that will provide a system-wide engineering update for the entire DCP. He noted a Concept Engineering Report was finalized last fall, which focused on the selected project, the Bethany Reservoir alternative. The overall average design level for that project was approximately 10%, sufficient to support the CEQA analysis as well as environmental permitting. He explained the next calendar year 2026 will involve performing a significant amount of additional engineering to update the design to roughly 20%. He said this effort will support a Class Three (3) cost estimate, moving from a Class Four (4), thereby tightening accuracy ranges and reducing uncertainty. The design update work will start next Spring, extend through Summer and Fall, and feed into a more comprehensive economic analysis.

Agenda Item 6a

In terms of Program Delivery planning, Mr. Bradner noted that the organizational restructuring for Program Delivery is largely complete. However, there is a vast number of activities to be completed, including drafting program management plans, establishing procurement packages for design and construction contracts, and setting design and construction guidelines and standards. He mentioned ongoing engineering evaluations of potential innovations and continued coordination on power infrastructure with the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA). He stated that work on temporary entry permits and coordination with Right-of-Way Engineering continues. He also informed the Board that the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) with DWR lacks the implementation language needed for PD transition and will require renegotiation. He noted in 2024 the Program Delivery phase was initiated for early Geotech and other data collection activities. Integrating investigative work into Program Delivery prevents confusion with the permitting and planning phases while informing conservative assumptions necessary for full project design and construction.

Beginning in early 2027, final designers for early project features will be engaged to enable construction commencement in mid-FY 2028/29. Significant community outreach efforts will be required during this and reestablishing community advisory groups will help guide the final design of project facilities. The property acquisition phase remains on the critical path which follows participating PWA approval to proceed with the DCP. Superimposing fiscal year 2025/26 onto this three (3)-year work plan clarifies the scope for the next year and lays the foundation for budget priority discussions.

Director Luna requested that the Community Benefits Program be explicitly distinguished from Community Outreach, emphasizing its importance.

Mr. Bradner agreed and committed to incorporating that distinction in future presentations.

Director Weed encouraged board members to review the SWRCB SAFER website. He explained that, in 2019, California enacted legislation establishing a ten (10)-year, \$1.3B funding mechanism to assist economically disadvantaged communities with ten (10) or more customers. He noted revenue continues to be collected. He reported Alameda County Water District (ACWD) received funding through this program to assist a Community Services district in the San Joaquin Valley. He explained six (6) districts were paired under the California Urban Water Association (CUWA). Director Weed described the program as broad in scope. Noting that, in 2024, thousands of locations were identified on the website. He recommended expanding community benefit considerations beyond environmental improvements to include economically disadvantaged communities in watershed areas. He concluded by expressing hope that this initiative could be incorporated into the DCP.

Director Martin asked whether the work plan schedule is predicated on the recently announced trailer bill proposals.

Mr. Bradner responded that, while the bills could provide significant benefits, the schedule itself is not dependent on legislative action. He noted that those bills could influence PWA decision points and other project scenarios, but the core timeline remains intact regardless.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

d) Adopt Resolution Approving the Sixth Amendment to the Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. Agreement for Engineering Design Manager Services

Approve Resolution

Mr. Bradner opened with a presentation focused on amendments applicable to items seven (7)d and seven (7)e, which concern the not-to-exceed amount amendment requests for the Jacobs Engineering (Jacobs) and Parsons Transportation Group (Parsons) contracts. He introduced Adrian Brown, DCA's Chief Contracting Officer, who would discuss additional amendments. The first two (2) amendments largely address capacity increases.

Mr. Bradner explained that Jacobs provides engineering design management services for the DCA. This team delivered all conceptual engineering and will transition to design management as the DCP enters the PD phase, pending approval from participating PWAs. The original contract, awarded in 2019 for California WaterFix, carried a capacity of \$93M and a five (5)-year term. When Governor Newsom's administration directed a shift to a single tunnel, DWR rescinded the environmental document, restarted the process with a single tunnel objective, and repurposed Jacobs to provide all in-house engineering for project concept development. In May 2023, the contract was revised to include another five (5)-year term, extending its validity through FY 2028/29. At that time, uncertainty surrounded next-phase funding, and the DCA continued to operate under existing planning and permitting funds. Now that funding has been authorized and all participating PWAs have independently voted to continue at their current participation level, the Board must reconcile contract capacity with the anticipated scope of work through FY 2028/29.

He noted that the Parsons team provides DCP Program Management services, covering Design, Administration, Information Technology, Quality, Sustainability, Procurement, and Program Controls, under a Program Support contract awarded in 2019. That contract carried a capacity of \$40M and a five (5)-year term, extended in May 2023 through June 2029 without capacity increases due to funding uncertainty. Mr. Bradner explained that both contracts span through mid-2029, encompassing the transition from Permit Support

to Program Delivery. By that point, design of several project facilities will be well underway, with construction slated to start in mid-FY 2028/29. These backbone contracts remain critical to advancing the project and a substantial increase in expenditures is expected.

He emphasized that Master Agreement capacity does not guarantee expenditure; DCA issues annual vendor Task Orders with defined scope, budget. Capacity under Master Agreements enables issuing those Task Orders without obligating funds at that ceiling. Task Orders collectively form each FY budget, which will be discussed at the next Finance Committee meeting. The Board approves the budget annually, generally at the June Board meeting. Internally, DCA develops draft Task Orders per the JEPA, shares them with DWR's Delta Conveyance Office (DCO) for input; ultimately, the Board adopts the FY budget. At year-end, any unspent Task Order funds return to DCA as each fiscal year stands alone. At fiscal year start, DCA issues a new set of Task Orders with fresh scope, budget. At closeout, DCA reconciles expenditures, explicitly carrying any necessary work into the next Task Order. Changes in scope or budget during the year follow a rigorous change management process, which may trigger additional Board or DWR approvals as defined in the JEPA and the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA).

Mr. Bradner continued by explaining that for contract capacity analysis, DCA employs two (2) complementary approaches. The first relied on actual expenditures through April 2025, associated staffing levels, and forecasts of future work based on the high-level schedule. The second leveraged the FY 2024/25 cost estimate, which detailed labor and soft costs by activity. Those estimates were integrated into a Master Schedule and truncated to June 2029 to determine the required funding for the identified scope. A 15% contingency on labor and soft costs from the FY 2024/25 estimate was applied, alongside a three (3) percent annual escalation to account for inflation between now and 2029.

Regarding the Jacobs contract, actual expenditures through April 2025 totaled \$81.8M of the \$93M capacity. Forecasted spending for the remainder of FY 2024/25 is \$5.4M, bringing the total to roughly \$87.2M and leaving about \$5M unspent. Forecasted expenditures for the next four (4) years range between \$31.6M and \$34.5M. Including the 15% contingency that yields an additional need of \$152.7M. Adding \$152.7M to \$87.2M results in approximately \$240M. Therefore, Mr. Bradner recommended amending the maximum contract capacity to \$245M.

For the Parsons contract, actual expenditures through February 2025 totaled \$31.7M of the \$40M capacity. Forecasted spending for the remainder of FY 2024/25 is \$3.2M, leaving about \$5M unspent. Forecasted expenditures for the next four (4) years increase from \$10.3M to \$18.8 M. Including a 15% contingency produces \$68.8M and adding \$34.9M for the unspent balance results in \$103.7M, rounded to \$110M. He reiterated that this represents a capacity ceiling, not an obligation of those funds.

Mr. Bradner turned to Mr. Brown for other contract term amendments.

Mr. Brown stated that administrative changes include updating agreement administrators from Kathryn Mallon to Graham Bradner and revising Key Personnel on both contracts.

Mr. Brown stated that several sections of the Jacobs contract are being adjusted, including Exhibit C, the Fee Schedule. The revisions will address the multiplier within the fee schedule. He also noted additional minor changes, such as updating the designated recipients for notices to reflect the new names in the agreement.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

Recommendation: Approve Resolution Approving the Sixth Amendment to the Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. Agreement for Engineering Design Manager Services

Motion to Approve Passing Resolution Approving the Sixth Amendment to the Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. Agreement for Engineering Design Manager Services, as

Noted: Luna

Second: Estremera

Yeas: Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed

Nays: None

Abstains: None

Recusals: None

Absent: None

Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as Resolution 25-05).

e) Adopt Resolution Approving the Fourth Amendment to the Parsons Transportation Group Inc. Agreement for Program Management and Associated Design and Construction Program Management Support Services

Approve Resolution

Mr. Bradner noted that the not-to-exceed amount was covered in the previous presentation.

DCA General Counsel, Josh Nelson, referenced the redline changes, a key modification in the agreement between Jacobs and Parsons involves the Fee Structure: Jacobs uses a

multiplier, while Parsons currently employs an all-in rate fee schedule. Minor adjustments to Exhibit C reflect efforts to standardize these exhibits for future years.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

Recommendation: Approve Passing Resolution Approving the Fourth Amendment to the Parsons Transportation Group Inc. Agreement for Program Management and Associated Design and Construction Program Management Support Services

Motion to Approve Passing Resolution Approving the Fourth Amendment to the Parsons Transportation Group Inc. Agreement for Program Management and Associated Design and Construction Program Management Support Services, as

Noted: Martin
Second: Estremera
Yeas: Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed
Nays: None
Abstains: None
Recusals: None
Absent: None
Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as Resolution 25-06).

f) Adopt Resolution Approving the Third Amendment to the AECOM Technical Services, Inc. Agreement for Geotechnical and Fieldwork Services

Adopt Resolution

Mr. Bradner informed the Board that this item does not involve a contract Capacity Amendment but instead concerns the terms of the Agreement, specifically administrative provisions to ensure consistency among contracts as the Board addresses the other two (2) amendments. He noted the contract is being presented with redline changes but without a not-to-exceed amendment.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

Recommendation: Adoption of Resolution Commending and Thanking Dan Flory for His Service on the Board

Motion to Approve Adoption of Resolution Commending and Thanking Dan Flory for His Service on the Board, as

Noted: Luna
Second: Estremera
Yeas: Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed
Nays: None
Abstains: None
Recusals: None
Absent: None
Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as Resolution 25-07).

g) Adopt Resolution Approving the First Amendment to the Best Best & Krieger LLP for General Counsel Professional Services

Adopt Resolution

Mr. Bradner stated that this item is a time-only extension. No capacity increase is required, but the contract term will need to be extended by an additional five (5)-year term, through FY 2029/30. He requested Board approval for the extension.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

Recommendation: Adoption of Approving the First Amendment to the Best Best & Krieger LLP for General Counsel Professional Services

Motion to Approve Adoption of Approving the First Amendment to the Best Best & Krieger LLP for General Counsel Professional Services, as

Noted: Plinski
Second: Estremera
Yeas: Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Plinski, Anabtawi, Weed
Nays: None
Abstains: None
Recusals: None
Absent: None
Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as Resolution 25-08).

8. STAFF REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

President Milobar mentioned that members of the public may address the Authority on matters pertaining to the Reports at this time.

No public comment requests were received for any of the staff reports.

a. General Counsel's Report

Mr. Nelson reported two (2) items not listed in the written report. First, he expressed appreciation for the Board's approval of their contract amendment and his commitment to continued excellent service. Second, Mr. Nelson confirmed that the Governor's trailer bill proposal, intended to fast-track the DCP, is being monitored on an ongoing basis. Upon the release of specific bills, letters of support will be prepared in alignment with the action taken by the Board last week.

President Milobar commended Nelson's performance as excellent throughout prior meetings.

No comments or questions were received from the Board.

b. DCP Communications Report

DWR's Communications Manager, Janet Barbieri, presented to the Board that DCA's communications efforts are continuing including for participation at the American Water Works Association Conference (ACWA) in Anaheim, followed by the SCWC luncheon in Temecula. Ms. Barbieri stated that DCA had attended the ACWA conference in Monterey, where staff hosted a project briefing and staffed an exhibition hall booth to provide information to attendees.

She continued that new fact sheets were now available for Antelope Valley East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) and ACWD. Ms. Barbieri added that a cost-containment overview fact sheet had gone live, highlighting DCA's role in controlling project costs.

Ms. Barbieri mentioned the press release supporting the Governor's trailer bill language had been issued, and she noted the Governor's office release had referenced the Board's action from the prior week. She said DCA's Communications team continued to support inquiries about the trailer bill, handle press requests, and provide updates during committee hearings.

Ms. Barbieri stated the Missed Opportunities figures are updated. This theoretical analysis shows if the DCP were operational today, 952,000 acre-feet could have been captured and moved. A new Fact Sheet will be released soon showing totals for the last four (4) years.

This background information clarifies the system's capabilities, potential benefits of the DCP.

CPOD hearing recaps are now posted on the website after each testimony panel, with updates available online. She then reminded the Board that the annual progress report, covering 2019 through 2024, remained accessible as a comprehensive project summary.

Ms. Barbieri concluded with noting that the Environmental Justice Outreach team had attended roughly 60 Delta events, reaching approximately 20,000 attendees via tabling at farmers markets and festivals. The outreach effort had proven to be a valuable communication tool.

No comments or questions were received from the Board.

c. DWR Environmental Report

Mr. Bradner noted that Mr. Nelson's legal update and Ms. Barbieri's communications update had addressed relevant environmental report items.

Mr. Nelson thanked Director Luna and Mr. Bradner for providing a policy statement at the CPOD hearing on Monday.

Mr. Bradner added that Ms. Nemeth had likewise provided policy statements and thanked Ms. Nemeth and Director Luna.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

d. Verbal Reports, if any

No verbal reports were received.

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Director Luna asked that future agendas include sustainability topics when the time is appropriate, given the volume of ongoing work.

Mr. Bradner agreed, noting that milestones would accelerate and reaffirmed that updates would be scheduled accordingly.

Ms. Barbieri added that a suite of supporting materials on sustainability was forthcoming.

President Milobar asked if associated costs will be addressed.

Mr. Bradner confirmed that costs would be included, ensuring a well-rounded discussion on the role of sustainability in the DCP.

Director Luna introduced a legal matter for Mr. Nelson regarding Alternate Directors attending closed sessions. He described it as an opportunity for alternates to gain necessary insight. He asked that it be placed on a future agenda.

Mr. Nelson agreed.

Alternate Director Palmer thanked Director Luna for bringing this item up for discussion, as it has been a topic of great interest to her for quite some time.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

President Milobar adjourned the meeting at 3:32 p.m., remotely-Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 84449923962#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/84449923962?from=addon>