

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES  
SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT # 6  
FOR  
CITY OF PFLUGERVILLE WATER TREATMENT PLANT  
OWNER’S REPRESENTATIVE SERVICES**

**STATE OF TEXAS           §  
  §  
COUNTY OF TRAVIS       §**

This Supplemental Agreement No. 6 to a contract for Professional Services is made by and between the City of Pflugerville, Texas ("City") and Garver, LLC ("Consultant"). City and Consultant may be referred to herein singularly as "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed an Agreement for Professional Services ("Agreement") on the 24th day of March, 2020 for the City of Pflugerville Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Owner’s Representative Services project ("Project") in the amount of One Hundred Ninety-Nine Thousand, Eight Hundred and Twenty (\$199,820) Dollars and Zero Cents; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed a Supplemental Agreement #1 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of Forty-Nine Thousand, Nine Hundred and Forty (\$49,940) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add WTP Site Buildout Planning and Cost Estimating Services to the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed a Supplemental Agreement #2 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of One Million, Two Hundred Twenty Thousand, Six Hundred Fifty-Seven (\$1,220,657) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add Design Oversight, Project Management and Water Rights Acquisition Support to the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed a Supplemental Agreement #3 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of Twenty-Six Thousand, Six Hundred Ninety-Seven (\$26,697) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add Jar Testing Laboratory Services to the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed a Supplemental Agreement #4 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of Three Hundred Eleven Thousand, One Hundred Thirty-Two (\$311,132) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add Preliminary Engineering Services for the Expansion of the Colorado River Raw Water Intake System; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant executed a Supplemental Agreement #5 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of Thirty-Eight Thousand, Sixteen (\$38,016) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add Texas Water Development Board Funding Services; and

WHEREAS, the City and Consultant desire to enter into a Supplemental Agreement #6 for Professional Services for the Project in the amount of Three Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand, Four Hundred Forty-Eight (\$382,448) Dollars and Zero Cents, to add a Reuse Feasibility Study to the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, it has become necessary to amend the Agreement to modify the provisions for the Scope of Services and Compensation; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the City to amend its agreements from time to time to comply with changes in state law relating to contracts of municipalities.

NOW, THEREFORE, premises considered, the City and the Consultant agree that said Agreement is amended as follows:

1.

Article III. Scope of Services and Exhibit A, shall be amended as set forth in the attached Addendum to Exhibit A.

Article IV. Compensation to Consultant and Exhibit B (Fee Schedule), shall be amended by increasing by \$382,448 the amount payable under the Agreement for a total of \$2,347,114 as described in the attached Addendum.

2.

Except as amended hereby, and as previously amended as indicated above, the terms of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

**EXECUTED** and **AGREED** to as of the dates indicated below.

**CITY OF  
PFLUGERVILLE**

**CONSULTANT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Printed Name: Sereniah Breland

Printed Name: Dan Olson, P.E.

Title: City Manager

Title: Vice President

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 4/20/22

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles E. Zech  
City Attorney  
DENTON NAVARRO ROCHA BERNAL & ZECH, P.C.

**CITY OF PFLUGERVILLE  
WATER TREATMENT PLANT OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE  
SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT NO. 6**

**ADDENDUM TO EXHIBIT A – SCOPE OF SERVICES**

**Background**

The City of Pflugerville seeks to supplement and diversify its water supply portfolio by accepting treated effluent from the Brushy Creek East Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (BCE). The transfer of water from BCE to Lake Pflugerville will benefit the City by incorporating up to 25,000 acre-feet/year of a drought-resilient water source into their water supply, and it will benefit the Lower Colorado Regional Authority (LCRA) by helping them achieve the “No Net Loss” requirement stipulated in HB 1437. This project, in its entirety, is referred to herein as the Project.

This Supplemental Agreement No. 6 is for a feasibility study that evaluates Project alternatives for incorporating treated BCE effluent into the City’s water supply. The study will seek to identify the best possible alternative based on cost, impacts to Lake Pflugerville, and other criteria.

**1. Project Management and Administration**

Garver shall provide project management and quality assurance during development of the feasibility study.

- 1.1 Prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP) to include relevant project criteria, project completion plan, communications protocol, project schedule, description of deliverables, budget control plan, document control procedures, project team contact list, health and safety plan, contract and scope of work attachments.
- 1.2 Prepare a Quality Control (QC) Plan to document the approach for quality assurance and quality control.
- 1.3 Prepare a schedule showing key project milestones and update monthly.
- 1.4 Schedule monthly progress meetings, up to twelve (12) are anticipated. Ten (10) of the twelve (12) monthly progress meetings may be via teleconference.
- 1.5 Schedule and participate in monthly meetings with project stakeholders, including City of Pflugerville, City of Round Rock, LCRA, and Brazos River Authority (BRA). The goal of these meetings will be to determine a path forward to make the project beneficial to all parties, and to divide up efforts as appropriate.
- 1.6 Prepare for and conduct project kickoff meeting. The following items will be discussed at the kickoff meeting:
  - 1.6.1. Project objectives, deliverables, communications, schedule, trending documentation, etc.;
  - 1.6.2. Request relevant information to be obtained from Owner; and
  - 1.6.3. Based on discussions during the kickoff meeting, the proposed project approach will be refined, if necessary. Kickoff meeting minutes will be prepared that document decisions.

## 1.7 Meetings with Regulatory Agencies

Coordinate with Owner to conduct one (1) meeting with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). The meetings will serve to introduce the project's goals, obtain preliminary guidance on the anticipated path to regulatory approval, and determine funding eligibility.

**Estimated Task 1 Fee: \$54,382**

## 2. Data Collection and Analysis

### 2.1 Review Available Data

- 2.1.1. Obtain and review existing documents, reports or studies; identify baseline conditions; and determine what information is readily available and what information is needed.
- 2.1.2. Obtain influent wastewater and treated effluent characteristics (DMRs) for BCE.
- 2.1.3. Obtain water quality data for Lake Pflugerville that establishes baseline water quality, including seasonal.

### 2.2 Develop and Administer Sampling Plan(s)

- 2.2.1. Once existing data has been compiled and reviewed, one or more sampling plans will be developed as needed to provide any additional data that will be needed for the feasibility study. Sampling plans may be developed for BCE effluent, Lake Pflugerville, or both. Sampling plan will include parameters, frequency of sampling, total duration of sampling period, proposed analytical techniques for each parameter, and the maximum acceptable detection limit for each parameter.
- 2.2.2. Coordinate with the selected laboratory to ensure that sampling stays on schedule. Review lab reports as they are received to identify any potential issues with data or analysis techniques that may need to be resolved with the laboratory.
- 2.2.3. Collect samples and submit to laboratory in accordance with the sampling plan.

### 2.3 Document data that will be used as the basis of planning and modeling in a Technical Memorandum.

**Estimated Task 2 Fee: \$53,888**

## 3. Lake Pflugerville Hydrodynamic Model

3.1 Develop a calibrated hydrodynamic model of Lake Pflugerville. The model will be used to evaluate the impact of various water supply augmentation options on the water quality in Lake Pflugerville. All modeling will occur in TCEQ-approved hydrodynamic modeling platforms, such as QUAL-TX, CSTR or EPA WASP. Every effort will be made to calibrate the Lake model with the best-available historical data for Lake water quality under average hydrologic conditions (for precipitation, evaporation, and Lake withdrawals).

### 3.1.1. Update Lake Model Setup to Add Wastewater Discharge

Garver will consider the maximum available augmentation flow from BCE in the update of the calibrated Lake Model for a new point-source discharge. The new wastewater discharge will be assigned to grid cells at the upper boundary representation of the Lake, representing the shortest path of the BCE effluent pipeline to the Lake for discharge. A

defined (1) set of wastewater quality characteristics will be determined upon review of the best available data and applied as inputs to the expanded Lake model.

### 3.1.2. Update Lake Model Setup to Add Indirect Wastewater Discharge via New Treatment Wetland

A second model update will be performed by Garver for an indirect discharge scenario of the BCE effluent at the predicted maximum available flow to a Treatment Wetland. In this modeled scenario, it is assumed that the Treatment Wetland will be constructed adjacent to the existing Lake. Preliminary costs for property easements and acquisitions (if any) will be provided based on the best-available data (e.g., County Commissioners, and Texas Water Development Board).

### 3.1.3. Presentation of Modeling Results

Garver will develop a summary presentation of the two Lake modeling scenarios, with the results of 5-year Lake water quality simulations presented for both scenarios. This presentation will be scheduled for one of the monthly stakeholder meetings. Comments from stakeholders will be considered in any updates to the Lake model and resulting 5-year forecasts. Potential water quality impacts to be evaluated will include both the eutrophic-state of the Lake, the suspended solids, and the balance of conservative substances (e.g., Total Dissolved Solids) in the Lake.

**Estimated Task 3 Fee: \$124,616**

## 4. Baseline Alternatives Analysis

4.1 The baseline alternatives analysis will provide sufficient information to determine the feasibility of indirect potable reuse (IPR), direct potable reuse (DPR), and aquifer storage and recovery (ASR). The baseline alternatives analysis will look at using treated wastewater effluent with no environmental buffer (DPR), one environmental buffer (IPR outfall to Lake Pflugerville), and two environmental buffers (IPR outfall to constructed wetlands ahead of Lake). The ASR option, which involves storing treated drinking water during periods when production exceeds demand and withdrawing during periods when demand exceeds production, is a water supply management strategy that will be viable regardless of whether IPR or DPR is implemented in the future. At a minimum, the baseline alternatives analysis will assess the viability of each water supply strategy, endeavor to determine whether new permit limits can be expected for BCE (IPR and DPR options) and develop planning level costs and schedule for each option. The following alternatives will be evaluated:

#### 4.1.1. Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR)

4.1.1.1. Direct Discharge of BCE Effluent to Lake before routing to WTP

4.1.1.2. Indirect Discharge of BCE Effluent to Constructed Wetlands Upstream of Lake

#### 4.1.2. Direct Potable Reuse (DPR)

4.1.2.1. Advanced Treatment Facility to produce a new source water (from pumped BCE effluent) for blending with raw water at the Pflugerville WTP (for additional treatment, storage, and distribution). This option will assume that the new treatment facility will be located at the existing WTP site.

#### 4.1.3. Aquifer Recharge (AR) and Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)

4.1.3.1. ASR to provide underground aquifer storage of treated water from the City that can be recovered as necessary to meet water demands. ASR will be evaluated for water that has been treated to meet drinking water standards (prior to underground injection).

- 4.1.3.2. ASR feasibility will be assessed specifically for the Trinity, Edwards, and Carrizo Aquifers, using data from the TWDB's Statewide Survey of ASR and AR Suitability Database. This feasibility study will be limited to the data available from this source; no additional aquifer geophysical data will be acquired, and this scope does not include independent aquifer modeling.
- 4.1.3.3. Background will be provided on ASR, the City's objectives for ASR, water supply, water demand, source water quality, target storage volume (TSV), and environmental, regulatory, legal, and institutional considerations.
- 4.1.3.4. Hydrogeological parameters for each aquifer will be reviewed and assessed based on existing data and literature reviews. Parameters may include hydraulic conductivity, storage zone depth, available draw-up, dominant lithology, secondary porosity, aquifer thickness, storativity, specific yield, aquifer thickness, sediment age, groundwater quality, confinement, hydraulic gradient, available drawdown, and drift velocity, as applicable. Field data collection of additional hydrogeologic information is not included in this scope.
- 4.1.3.5. Site selection and well/wellfield conceptual design will be discussed, and a preliminary cost estimate will be provided based on a single conceptual alternative for well spacing and conveyance based on a location approved by the City. Garver will not perform modeling of the aquifer(s).

**Estimated Task 4 Fee: \$86,280**

#### **Additional Services**

The following items are not included in the current scope and will only be initiated upon receiving written direction from the City:

1. Feasibility Study Report

In accordance with guidance provided by BOR in the Reclamation Manual Directives and Standards WTR 11-01, the feasibility study will include the following sections:

- a. Introductory Information

Identification of the non-Federal project sponsor(s), description of the study area and an area/project map, etc.

- b. Statement of Problems and Needs

Describe key water resource management problems and needs for which a water reclamation, recycling or desalination project will provide a solution.

- c. Water Reclamation, Recycling or Desalination Opportunities

Address the opportunities for water reclamation and recycling in the study area and identify the sources of water that could be reclaimed.

- d. Description of Alternatives

Include a description of the non-Federal funding condition; a statement of the specific objectives all alternatives are designed to address; a detailed project cost estimate for the proposed alternative (including annual O&M costs and life cycle costs); a description of waste-stream discharge treatment and disposal water quality

requirements (if applicable); and a description of one or more alternative technologies that could be used in the proposed project.

e. Economic Analysis

Provide an economic analysis of the proposed water reclamation or recycling project relative to other water supply alternatives that could be implemented by the non-Federal project sponsor. This assessment needs to identify the degree to which the selected project alternative is cost-effective, and the economic benefits that are to be realized after implementation.

f. Selection of the Proposed Water Reclamation, Recycling or Desalination Project

Provide a justification of why the proposed project is the selected alternative in terms of meeting objectives, demands, needs, cost effectiveness, and other criteria important to the decision.

g. Environmental Consideration and Potential Effects

Although the review of a water reclamation feasibility study does not require compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the feasibility study report must include sufficient information on the proposed project to allow BOR to assess the potential measures and costs that will be necessary to comply with NEPA, and any other applicable Federal law.

h. Legal and Institutional Requirements

Identify any legal or institutional requirements, or barriers to implementing the proposed project (e.g., water rights issues).

i. Financial Capability of Sponsor

Provide sufficient information to allow BOR to make a determination that the non-Federal project sponsor is financially capable of funding the non-Federal share of the project's costs.

j. Research Needs

The feasibility study must include a statement on whether the proposed water project includes basic research needs (i.e., whether further research is necessary to implement the proposed project), and the extent that the proposed project will use proven technologies and conventional system components.

**Fee for Additional Service 1: \$38,150**

2. BOR WaterSMART: Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects Funding Application

After completion of the feasibility study, Garver will complete the BOR's WaterSMART: Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects Funding Application according to the FY 2023 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the program. Garver cannot guarantee that BOR funding for this project will be available or that the City will be selected as a recipient.

- a. Garver will complete and submit the funding application to the BOR by the due date included in the NOFO.
- b. Garver will coordinate with the BOR and the City as needed to complete the application.
- c. The City will be responsible for providing necessary data to Garver, completing the mandatory federal forms and official resolution, and gathering letters of support required to complete the application.

**Fee for Additional Service 2: \$21,236**

3. Modeling of Treated Effluent from City-Owned WWTP

If any of the project stakeholders withdraws from the ongoing effort to provide treated BCE effluent to the City as a water supply source, the Lake Pflugerville model will have to be recalibrated and updated for a new water source with a different flow and quality, presumably flow from a City-owned WWTP. Depending on the timing of this change, this could require collection and analysis of an additional set of water quality data, re-calibrating the model for the new flow and water quality, and updating any analysis of model results that had previously been completed.

**Fee for Additional Service 3: \$3,896**

The following items are not included under this agreement and will be considered as extra work:

1. Surveying
2. Geotechnical
3. Preliminary Design
4. Final Design
5. Bidding
6. Construction Services
7. Operational Assistance
8. Submittals or deliverables in addition to those listed herein
9. Construction materials testing
10. Coordination with FEMA and preparation/submittal of a CLOMR and/or LOMR
11. Services after construction, such as warranty follow-up, operations support

Extra Work will be as directed by the Owner in writing for an additional fee as agreed upon by the Owner and Garver.

**Payment**

For work described in this Amendment to the Scope of Services, the Owner agrees to pay Garver on a lump sum basis in the amount of **\$382,448**. This lump sum fee is summarized in the attached Addendum to Exhibit B. Payment invoices for the lump sum amount above will be submitted to the owner on a monthly basis, under separate invoices with progress reports included for substantiation, and payment will be made on a percent-complete basis for this additional work.

**Schedule**

The schedule from Supplemental Agreement 2 will be updated to include the tasks described in this Agreement. Garver shall begin work under this Agreement within ten (10) days of a Notice to Proceed and shall complete the work in accordance with the schedule below:



<u>Phase Description</u>	<u>Calendar Days</u>
Initial Data Analysis	30 Days from NTP
Water Quality TM	60 Days from NTP
Calibrated Hydrodynamic Model	180 Days from NTP
Draft Alternatives Evaluation	210 Days NTP
Title XVI Feasibility Study (if pursued)	240 Days from NTP
BOR WaterSMART Application (if pursued)	March 2023 Application Deadline

APPENDIX B

City of Pflugerville  
PSSA 6: WmCo Return Flows Reuse Feasibility Study

All Tasks

WORK TASK DESCRIPTION	E-6	E-5	E-3	E-2	E-1	P-1	GARVER	SUBCONSULTANT	SUBCONSULTANT	GARVER	SUB-CO TOTAL	TOTAL
	\$292.00	\$238.00	\$167.00	\$138.00	\$119.00	\$143.00	LABOR	Danny Reible Texas Tech University	Lab Analysis	TOTAL		
	hr.	hr.	hr.	hr.	hr.	hr.		0%	0%			
<b>Basic Services Section</b>												
<b>1. TASK (Project Management and Administration)</b>												
1.1 Project Management Plan	2	4	8			1	\$3,015			\$3,015	\$0	\$3,015
1.2 Quality Control Plan	2	4	8			1	\$3,015			\$3,015	\$0	\$3,015
1.3 Schedule Creation and Updates		2	16		16		\$5,052			\$5,052	\$0	\$5,052
1.4 Monthly Progress Meetings	12	12	18	4			\$9,918			\$9,918	\$0	\$9,918
1.5 Monthly WmCo Return Flow Project Group Meetings	6	24	32	2			\$13,084			\$13,084	\$0	\$13,084
1.6 Project Kickoff Meeting	4	4	8	8	12		\$5,988			\$5,988	\$0	\$5,988
1.7 Regulatory Agency Meetings	12	6	24	12	24	6	\$14,310			\$14,310	\$0	\$14,310
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Project Management and Administration)</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>\$54,382</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$54,382</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$54,382</b>
<b>2. TASK (Data Collection and Analysis)</b>												
2.1 Review Available Data	12	12	20	20		40	\$18,180			\$18,180	\$0	\$18,180
2.2 Develop and Administer Sampling Plan	8		20	20			\$8,436	\$10,000		\$8,436	\$10,000	\$18,436
2.3 Current Lake Water Quality TM	12		24	40			\$13,032			\$13,032	\$0	\$13,032
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Quality Control Review</b>	8	8					\$4,240			\$4,240	\$0	\$4,240
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Data Collection and Analysis)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>\$43,888</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$43,888</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$53,888</b>
<b>3. TASK (Lake Pflugerville Hydrodynamic Model)</b>												
3.1 Develop a Calibrated Hydrodynamic Lake Model	24	12	20	160			\$35,284			\$35,284	\$0	\$35,284
3.1.1 5-year spin-ups for Lake WQ with Direct Discharge	8		20	160			\$27,756			\$27,756	\$0	\$27,756
3.1.2 5-year spin-ups for Lake WQ with Indirect Discharge	8		20	160			\$27,756			\$27,756	\$0	\$27,756
3.1.3 Presentation of Modeling Results	8	8	20	20			\$10,340			\$10,340	\$0	\$10,340
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Quality Control Review</b>	16	16					\$8,480	\$15,000		\$8,480	\$15,000	\$23,480
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Lake Pflugerville Hydrodynamic Model)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$109,616</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$109,616</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$124,616</b>
<b>4. TASK (Baseline Alternatives Analysis)</b>												
4.1 Alternatives Evaluation							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
4.1.1 Indirect Potable Reuse	8	16	80	80			\$30,544			\$30,544	\$0	\$30,544
4.1.2 Direct Potable Reuse	4	8	40	40			\$15,272			\$15,272	\$0	\$15,272
4.1.3 Aquifer Storage and Recovery	8	16				240	\$40,464			\$40,464	\$0	\$40,464
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Baseline Alternatives Analysis)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>\$86,280</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$86,280</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$86,280</b>
<b>Subtotal - Basic Services Section</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>\$294,166</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$294,166</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>	<b>\$319,166</b>
Hours Check	162	152	378	726	52	288	294166	15000	10000	294166	25000	319166
<b>Additional Services Section</b>												
<b>1. TASK (Feasibility Study Report)</b>												
a. Introductory Information	1	1	8	8		16	\$5,258			\$5,258	\$0	\$5,258
b. Statement of Problem and Needs	2	4	8	8		16	\$6,264			\$6,264	\$0	\$6,264
c. Water Reclamation Opportunities	2	4	16	16		16	\$8,704			\$8,704	\$0	\$8,704
d. Description of Alternatives	4	4	24	24		16	\$11,728			\$11,728	\$0	\$11,728
e. Economic Analysis	6	4	32	32		16	\$14,752			\$14,752	\$0	\$14,752
f. Selection of the Proposed Project	6	4	24	24		16	\$12,312			\$12,312	\$0	\$12,312
g. Environmental Consideration and Potential Effects	2	4	16	16		16	\$8,704			\$8,704	\$0	\$8,704
h. Legal and Institutional Requirements	1	4	12	12		16	\$7,192			\$7,192	\$0	\$7,192
i. Financial Capability of Sponsor	1	2	4	4		16	\$4,276			\$4,276	\$0	\$4,276
j. Research Needs	1	1	8	8		16	\$5,258			\$5,258	\$0	\$5,258
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Quality Control Review</b>	24	24					\$12,720			\$12,720	\$0	\$12,720
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Feasibility Study Report)</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>\$38,150</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$38,150</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$38,150</b>
<b>2. TASK (BOR WaterSMART: Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects Funding Application)</b>												
Complete and Submit BOR Funding Application	4	12	8	8	20	80	\$20,284			\$20,284	\$0	\$20,284
							\$0			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Quality Control Review</b>		4					\$952			\$952	\$0	\$952
<b>Subtotal - TASK (BOR WaterSMART: Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects Funding Application)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>\$21,236</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$21,236</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$21,236</b>
<b>3. TASK (Modeling of Treated Effluent from City-Owned WWTP)</b>												
Re-calibrating and Updating Lake Model to Reflect City-Owned WWTP Effluent				24			\$3,312			\$3,312	\$0	\$3,312
							\$584			\$584	\$0	\$584
<b>Quality Control Review</b>	2						\$584			\$584	\$0	\$584
<b>Subtotal - TASK (Modeling of Treated Effluent from City-Owned WWTP)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$3,896</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,896</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,896</b>
<b>Subtotal - Additional Services Section</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>\$63,282</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$63,282</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$63,282</b>
Hours Check	56	72	160	184	20	240	122300	0	0	122300	0	122300
<b>Project Totals</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>\$357,448</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$357,448</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>	<b>\$382,448</b>
<b>Project Totals (Cost)</b>	<b>\$63,656</b>	<b>\$53,312</b>	<b>\$89,846</b>	<b>\$125,580</b>	<b>\$8,568</b>	<b>\$75,504</b>						