

## AGENDA

### WSAC Planning Subcommittee

Friday, May 8, 2015

**Attendees:** Rosemary, David B, Doug, Heidi, Nicholas, Bill F, Rick, Bob R, Karen R

**Apologies:** Erica, Sid, Mark, Sarah

**Special Guests:** Greg Pepping (not present)

Meeting Desired Outcomes:

- Agreement on follow up work from April/May
- Identification of any changes to MCDS evaluation criteria based on scenario planning work from April/May meeting
- Identification of any additional actions related to the enrichment series
- Agreement on meeting schedule for the WSAC Agreement Development Subcommittee

1. Debrief on April/May meeting and discussion of follow-up technical work plan

- **Bill and Heidi summarized Tech Team takeaways from April/May meetings**
  - **Clearly a lot of interest in, and questions about, CA-16. For example, see questions from Baskin, Keutmann, Engfer (separate document)**
  - **Work underway; have answers to many questions already.**
  - **Bill reminded that many of the answers will be probabilistic in nature; Committee will need to get comfortable with that.**
  - **Have met with Pueblo, K/J, Piret Harmon (SVWD)**
  - **David asked for the team to consider and re-evaluate Ricker's numbers on costs and water-supply productivity due to the significant disparity between Ricker's numbers and Bill's numbers**
- **Bob spoke to the team's focus on the open questions, some of which are in the Baskin et al document.**
  - **Also looking at other "backup" or "adaptive management" alts (such as recycling, etc.).**
  - **Karen presented and discussed various storage-oriented options and her memo that summarizes the options in front of us through a 'storage lens' (separate document)**
- **David B introduced and the group discussed the question list that he, Charlie, and Doug had submitted, pertaining primarily to CA-16**
  - **Spurred primarily by the various known and unknown unknowns, notably relating to reliability, productivity, timing, and cost (particularly as you start to consider the various individual components that must be aggregated in order for ASR to work).**
  - **Focus of the work is to resolve as many questions as possible, so Cmte can reach a reasoned conclusion on a portfolio.**

- Rick noted that ‘rate of aquifer refill’ is one key consideration that could become a design parameter that would allow us to focus our research on a more-specific set of design parameters (number of wells, mode of storage (injection v in-lieu recharge, e.g.), etc.).
- Bill observed that hydrology (SLR water availability) is also a key consideration.
- Rosemary reinforced the need for reliable and timely “recovery” (withdrawal) as a key component of any ASR strategy, both in terms of volume that is available and rate of production.
- The group pivoted to discuss the various ‘backup’ or ‘adaptive’ options (recycling, etc.), whether for direct use or as inputs to an ASR strategy.
- Karen offered to create an “information roadmap” that would help the Cmte understand what they will know when, and what we are unlikely to have answers to.
- David introduced the topic of reaching out to other entities with which we are considering collaborating with. David expressed concern about how far we can go with that outreach without direction from the City Council.
  - Rosemary suggested inviting Piret, Ron/Taj to the next meeting as guest participants.
  - RM offered that SCWD is meeting with SqCWD to discuss the water-transfer strategy (management and directors). Bruce Daniels has proposed that it would be on agenda for the district.
- Karen asked for inputs on focus for Technical Team.
  - Doug: Winter flow based ASR is primary focus for now
  - Rosemary: How much productivity can we get (from the river on storage and from the aquifer on recovery) and how reliably?
  - David: Timing and cost considerations remain significant, too.
  - Bob: Want to look comprehensively at portfolio in order to minimize stranded assets, as regards ‘backup’ or ‘adaptive’ strategies.
  - David, Rosemary, Doug: North Coast farm transfer uncertainties pivot around (1) farmers’ interest in the recycled water and (2) potential productivity of the wells up there.
  - Rick reminded the group that stormwater infiltration was a key component of Ricker’s work, and was the most cost-efficient approach to aquifer restoration. He’d like to see it included in the technical team’s work.
    - Heidi talked about work the City has done in the past, on the Westside.
    - Westside is challenging, both in terms of cost of land acquisition and suitability of the geology for infiltration.
    - Rick pointed back at Fall Creek study, which looked at Scotts Valley and Mid-County as desirable areas.

- Karen reinforced that the drought offers an opportunity to accelerate various strategies, at least at the State level.
    - Nicholas reminded about the probabilistic aspects of our upcoming discussions, and that he'd work with us on that. Also, he noted that folks may now start to move to positional discussions, which would present additional challenges for our upcoming conversations.
      - Rosemary pointed out that adaptive pathways can be a tool not just for our recommendation, but also for how we manage our diligence work over the coming months.
2. Any takeaways on MCDS evaluation criteria from April/May meeting? Changes needed?
- Robustness discussion – David comfortable using existing terms.
  - Doug offered that the tool would be more useful as we try to decide between various alternative portfolios and sub-components.
3. Refresh on enrichment topics for coming weeks/months
- CCA
    - CCA – in June (17<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup>?).
    - Leader of local efforts will speak.
    - Examples in Marin and Sonoma could be informative.
    - What is role of renewables in the City's likely power portfolio?
    - What is water/energy nexus, both with current system and going forward?
    - What is cost differential between renewable and non-renewable sources?
    - David asked about full life-cycle energy footprint (construction, etc.), reminding that the full life-cycle carbon footprint might outweigh the operational.
      - Bill noted that the Team is focusing on operating energy consumption, rather than construction-related (at least for now).
  - Re-use
    - Bob talking with speakers on Tuesday; scheduling has been tricky. Will have more to report then.
  - Stormwater recharge (Rick)
    - Bob "Looking a bit; not yet made great progress"
    - Bill: regionally very powerful, but questions about how much it affects the City situation.
      - Rick: anything we can do to improve the aquifers would be relevant, to the extent that it could make City withdrawals more timely or reliable
      - How do these costs compare to other investments (direct injection, reservoirs, etc.)? – could be cost-effective for cities to rehab/retrofit landscapes, parks, streets, parking lots, etc. Could be a "rolling implementation" approach.

- Rosemary pointed out that Portland has done a lot of this kind of work along the lines of stormwater management; cost-effectiveness of retrofitting is key (since it's generally required for new construction already). \$\$\$/water volume will be tricky. Need to find a way to make a direct link to our supply that is cost-effective.
  - Rick took the item to try to quantify the potential productivity in order to give Rosemary greater confidence in the approach.
  - David doesn't see this as a high priority item for the team, but is open to pursuing it informationally since it's not a lot of money.
  - Rick lining up speakers for evening of 26 May at Simpkins, including a representative from Fall Creek Engineering
    - Fall Creek - \$120/hour for 2 hours
    - Simpkins rental fee
4. WSAC Agreement Development Subcommittee meeting schedule –
- Maintain Friday 9 to 10:30 time slot?
  - Suggested dates:
    - i. May 29,
    - ii. June 19,
    - iii. July 10,
    - iv. July 31,
    - v. August 21,
    - vi. September 4,
    - vii. September 18
- **June 19 tough for David (surgery)**
  - **August 21 tough for Doug; asked for switch to 28 August**
  - **Rosemary to send out a Doodle poll on this**
  - **29 May 2015 preliminary agenda topics**
    - Contingent agreement examples
    - Tech update
    - June flow agenda review