

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, June 12, 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) Finance Committee was called to order in person, by teleconference, and remotely - Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 89481684101#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/89481684101?from=addon> at 1:34 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee member in attendance from the DCA Boardroom was Gary Martin.

Committee members in attendance remotely were Sarah Palmer and Martin Milobar.

DCA staff members in attendance were Graham Bradner, Josh Nelson and Claudia Rodriguez.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comment requests received.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 21, 2025, Finance Committee Meeting

Recommendation: Approve the May 21, 2025, Finance Committee Meeting

Motion to Approve Minutes from May 21, 2025, as

Noted:	Palmer
Second:	Milobar
Yeas:	Martin, Milobar, Palmer
Nays:	None
Abstains:	None
Recusals:	None
Absent:	None
Summary:	3 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as MO 25-06-01).

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a) **Review of Final Draft FY2025/26 Budget**

Informational Item

DCA Executive Director, Graham Bradner, presented the updated Board memo and noted that the budget had been refined from the draft review the previous month. He reported that the proposed budget for Fiscal Year (FY)25/26 totals \$65M and includes a revised unallocated reserve of \$4.2M. The final budget is expected to be presented to the DCA Board of Directors (BOD) for approval at its June 18, 2025 meeting, accompanied by a recommendation from the Finance Committee. He explained that the supporting materials provided offer additional details to assist in the Committee's review.

Mr. Bradner outlined the key areas of planned work for the upcoming FY, which will focus on continued support for Department of Water Resources (DWR) permitting efforts, development of the environmental compliance plan, and establishment of monitoring and reporting systems. Additional priorities include engineering analysis and documentation for a system-wide Basis of Design Report (BODR) to support an updated Class 3 Cost Estimate planned for FY2026/27; further development of the overall program schedule with additional detail related to permitting, design and construction innovations, data collection, contracting approaches, and funding considerations; and ongoing development of DCA standards, procedures, and requirements to support a potential transition into the delivery phase pending participating public water agency (PWA) implementation decisions anticipated in 2027.

Mr. Bradner summarized the agenda for the budget presentation, noting that it would begin with a review of the FY2025/26 budget-planning timeline, continue with a discussion of the proposed revisions to the FY2025/26 scope and budget, and end with time for questions and other detail-related items. Depending on the Committee's position, he stated that the recommended action would be for the Finance Committee by motion, to recommend the Board adopt the proposed budget.

Mr. Bradner reviewed the budget-planning timeline and indicated that the Committee's June 12th meeting is the third Finance Committee meeting of the fiscal-year cycle. He stated that the Board of Directors meeting is scheduled for the following Wednesday, and that this meeting provides the Committee with an opportunity to review the revisions, ask questions, and request any additional changes that staff would prepare in advance of next week's Board meeting.

Mr. Bradner highlighted the program's Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), noting its three (3) primary phases. The Program Management Office (PMO) encompasses executive functions and overall program management. Program Initiation (PI) has traditionally housed engineering work to support the environmental permitting phase, including

evaluation of alternatives, improving definition of features, design criteria, contracts and interfaces. He explained that Program Delivery (PD) will ultimately support final design and construction activities and is expected to grow significantly as the program advances.

Mr. Bradner reviewed the changes incorporated into the revised FY25/26 budget, noting that the total proposed budget remains \$65M. He explained that the red figures in the presentation indicate adjustments made since the draft budget was reviewed on May 21. Overall, he stated that the budget remains largely consistent with the earlier version, with most revisions reflecting updated information and refinements made during the reconciliation process.

He reported that the DCA is increasing its on-site presence requirement for vendors from two (2) days per week to three (3) days per week beginning July 1. This change results in additional travel needs and associated costs, which are now explicitly captured in the revised budget. He added that staff have completed a comprehensive update of billing rates across all contracts to simplify rate structures and separate travel and other direct expenses that were previously embedded in billing rates. These expenses will now be reimbursed based on actual costs, resulting in shifts across line items but not significant changes to the overall budget.

At a high level, Mr. Bradner noted that the PMO budget decreased slightly from \$26.8M to \$26.5M; PI, which includes the BODR work, increased from \$26.1M to \$27.3M; and PD decreased from \$12.1M to \$11.2M. He emphasized that these adjustments reflect the cleanup and reallocation associated with the revised travel approach. He highlighted that the updated travel cost expectations and reimbursement processes align with the forthcoming travel policy updates that will be presented to the Board as a main agenda item the following week.

Moving to the vendor budget summary, Mr. Bradner conducted a comparison between the revised FY25/26 budget and the figures presented at the May 21 meeting. He explained that these adjustments account for shifts that reduced the unallocated reserve from approximately \$5M to \$4.2M. He pointed that the largest single vendor, Jacobs, reflects only minor refinements. Parsons, however, shows an increase due to higher travel costs associated with expanded onsite requirements; the shift to a three (3) days per week presence beginning July 1 has resulted in several hundred thousand dollars of additional travel expenses for key program support staff.

He stated that AECOM's adjustments are minor and primarily reflect rate clean up. Lucas Public Affairs, the new communications consultant, has been revised from the initial \$900 thousand placeholder to approximately \$1.05M following detailed scope of negotiations and development of a task order for next FY. He added that the placeholder for Deputy Director Services was originally \$600 thousand, but contract negotiations and the decision to accelerate onboarding will increase that amount to \$976.5 thousand for FY25/26.

Mr. Bradner emphasized that remaining changes across other vendors are minimal and largely attributable to the clean-up process going on.

Committee Chair Martin asked for clarification to ensure the committee had a consistent understanding of the budget refinements. He inquired whether, aside from updates to placeholder figures, there had been any substantive scope changes that would account for the minor adjustments reflected in the refined numbers.

Mr. Bradner confirmed that this understanding was accurate, stating that he was not aware of any scope changes since the May 21 Board Meeting.

DCA Board Clerk, Claudia Rodriguez, noted that during the rate refinement process, additional details had been incorporated into the budget packet, specifically line items identifying with Other Direct Costs (ODCs) and travel costs. She emphasized that these additions were part of the refinement of rate information, not changes in project scope.

Mr. Bradner reiterated that while certain items were now presented more explicitly, the scope itself had not changed. The revisions reflected adjustments in the team's pricing approach rather than any expansion of work.

Committee Chair Martin summarized that the changes primarily reflect how different team members price their services, to which Mr. Bradner agreed.

Committee Member Milobar indicated that the only notable change appeared in the geotechnical budget and asked whether this was due to the current inability to conduct the work as originally planned.

Mr. Bradner explained that while funding remains allocated for geotechnical activities, the work is presently enjoined due to ongoing legal constraints. The budget includes a modest investigative geotechnical program planned for the spring, contingent upon the resolution of legal issues. He clarified that the work shown under AECOM represents this limited spring program. Additionally, geotechnical funding has been partially set aside within the "undefined allowance" category, which was reduced from \$5.1 million to \$4.2 million. This adjustment also provided a buffer to absorb cost refinements associated with Communications and the Deputy Director's scope, enabling the team to maintain the overall budget target of \$65 million.

Committee Member Milobar asked whether the team would simply shift the funds if clearance to resume geotechnical work were granted.

Mr. Bradner confirmed that they would. He added that, unlike prior years, the unallocated reserve had been positioned within the phase where the team expects it to be used, although it will not be issued through task orders until the work can legally proceed.

Committee Chair Martin requested an explanation for the \$65 million budget target for the benefit of the public and other interested parties, stressing the importance of avoiding any perception that figures were adjusted merely to fit a predetermined ceiling.

Mr. Bradner explained that the program operates within funding constraints set by the PWAs, whose multiyear financial commitments guide the budget. Current work is funded by allocations made in 2020 for the 2021–2024 period, now extending into 2025. Because PWA funds are released incrementally rather than as a lump sum, careful consideration of cash flow is required. The upcoming fiscal year serves as a transition period between the expiring 2021–2024 funding and the new PWA commitments for 2026–2027. Those commitments anticipate a nonlinear expenditure pattern, with spending ramping up significantly in early 2026. The program anticipates approximately \$20 million in expenditures for the remainder of 2025 and approximately \$45 million in early 2026, giving rise to the \$65 million annual target. He emphasized that the organization has consistently operated below its authorized budget for the past five (5) years, and any future need to amend the topline budget would require Board consideration.

Committee Chair Martin stated that he is confident in the reliability of the numbers presented, noting that the team had provided detailed backup, including staffing, rates, and scope documentation. He then asked whether the unallocated reserve was limited to geotechnical uses.

Mr. Bradner clarified that there are no restrictions. While positioned in the geotechnical phase for planning purposes, the funds may be reallocated anywhere within the work breakdown structure. The intent is simply to position the reserve where expenditures are most likely to occur, reducing the need for significant midyear budget adjustments.

Committee Member Palmer asked whether the reserve could be removed from the PD category entirely, and Mr. Bradner confirmed that it could.

Committee Chair Martin asked whether reallocations of that magnitude would be communicated to the Board.

Mr. Bradner affirmed that they would. He added that the unallocated reserve and the AECOM spring geotechnical program budget will not be included in the July 1 task orders and will be held back until the work can commence.

Committee Member Milobar stated that the committee appears to be in a strong position to move the budget forward for approval at the next Board meeting.

Committee Chair Martin reiterated for the benefit of observers that the committee received detailed task order listings early in the process, and that full scope information exists behind all figures presented. He noted that it is not the committee's role to perform

a detailed audit of each number but rather to ensure appropriate information has been provided. He stated that he is prepared to accept a motion.

Committee Member Palmer asked whether a regular Board member's request to comment could be recognized as public comment.

DCA General Counsel, Josh Nelson, clarified that, under the Brown Act, Board members attending a standing committee meeting may observe but are not permitted to speak, including during public comment. He apologized to Director Cheng and noted that the committee could not recognize his comment.

Director Palmer stated that her questions had been answered and the budget was sufficiently clear. She suggested that the committee forward the budget to the Board for consideration.

Recommended Action: The Finance Committee recommend by motion that the Board of Directors adopt the proposed budget for FY 2025/26.

Motion to Recommend that the DCA Board approve the FY25/26 Budget, as

Noted:	Palmer
Second:	Milobar
Yeas:	Martin, Milobar, Palmer
Nays:	None
Abstains:	None
Recusals:	None
Absent:	None
Summary:	3 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as MO 25-06-02).

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

6. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

a. Verbal Reports

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Martin adjourned the meeting at 2:07p.m., in person, by teleconference, and remotely - Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 89481684101#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/89481684101?from=addon>