

Web_Page	Simple Scenario	SubCriterion	Comment
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Technical Feasibility	Reduced the rating for potable reuse. Depending on the type of reuse it is not widespread.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Technical Feasibility	I changed the potable reuse from widely used to demonstrated mainly because potable reuse is a broad area and for example indirect potable reuse is not widely used, nor is direct potable reuse.
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Technical Feasibility	Downrated potable reuse--based on the type being considered.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Legal Feasibility	I am having difficulty with this model. When I try to "click" out and get back to the previous page to perform additional ratings, it appears all of my weight changes and ratings have been eliminated and chnaged back to the default settings. Each time I leave I am brought back to the email and need to start over again. Aml dong something wrong? I am not sure why this is happening.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Freshwater and Riparian Health	My only comment is on potable water. Will the regulatory agencies agree that the effect on aquatic life is positive??
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Freshwater and Riparian Health	Will the regulators agree that augmenting freshwater with reuse water does not have adverse impacts to aquatic life in streams?
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Reliable Supply	I am not sure I agree with the assessment that reducing demand makes the system less reliable. That all depends on the reliability goal that the agency is setting. Hardwiring a reduction in demand would seem to increase reliability of a given supply.
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Reliable Supply	Disagree somewhat that reducing the demand reduces reliability--seems counterintuitive and sends the wrong message to the community. "Saving water is making us less reliable" is not the message to send out.
Alts Ratings	Billion Gallon Gap	Reliable Supply	Similarly, I would change the proposals on landscaping and water neutral development from negatino "no change". I dont see how these proposals would reduce reliability. Also, I would move expanded treatment plant (which includes an option for an additional plant) to a high rating of reliability.
Alts Ratings	Billion Gallon Gap	Reliable Supply	How does watersmart make system less reliable. At most it would be no change, but not less reliable.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Preserves Future Choices	Again, I am not sure I fully understand this criterion. I view it as a no regrets criterion. For example the city may need an additional treatment plant for operational reliability anyways. This would not reduce future choices to augment supply reliability. If the idea is that by pursuing this approach it may impact future options then I could see how these rating were done but I am not sure this is as important as a no regrets solution.
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Preserves Future Choices	Same comment as before regarding "No regrets solutions" versus eliminating future choices--I am not sure the latter can be taken without no regrets considered.
Alts Ratings	Billion Gallon Gap	Preserves Future Choices	I dont quite understand this criterion. Is is saying are these now regrets solutions? For example, an expanded treatment plant I think, is an example of a no regrets solution since it provides infrastructure and operational reliability. Thus, even though this proposal may be "locking in", I dont think it reduces future choices, but I may be misunderstanding this criterion.
Alts Ratings	Billion Gallon Gap	Flexibility	I rated expanded treatment capacity higher since the city has only one 50 year old plant and greater ooperational resiliency would be provided.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Cost to Customer: Rates	Why is the expanded treatment plant among the lowest cost in term of cents/1000 gallons, when it had the highest capital and second highest O&M costs?
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Cost to Customer: Rates	Again, the cost per 100 gallons for expanded treatment is the lowest at "1", yet it has the highest capital costs and the second highest O&M cost. Something seems wrong.
Alts Ratings	Zero Gap	Local Economy	Raised the ratings in almost every category. I done see how improving the water supply and or reliability has a negative effect on the economy.

Web_Page	Simple Scenario	SubCriterion	Comment
Alts Ratings	640 MG Gap	Local Economy	Again, ratings seem too low. I dont see how improving reliability adversely impacts the economy. Maybe I dont understand this criterion.
Alts Ratings	Billion Gallon Gap	Local Economy	I dont understand why a number of proposals would have a negative effect on the economy--such as expanded treatment capacity. It seems like this would increase reliability and this would have a positive effect?
Weights	Zero Gap	N/A	If I'm not mistaken, many of these proposals would have terrestrial impacts (of course those would be less than the aquatic impacts). "Environmental Well-being This criterion relates to the degree to which a water supply or demand management strategy contributes to or impacts the quality and sustainability of the natural environment.Note: "terrestrial" was taken out as a subcriterion because none of these proposals appeared to impact terrestrial resources."