

AGENDA

WSAC Agreement Development Subcommittee

Friday, June 19, 2015

9 to 10:30 am

Santa Cruz Water Department

Attendees: Rosemary, David B (phone), Doug, Nicholas (phone), Bill F (phone), Sarah, Bob R (phone), Rick, Mark, Erica

Apologies: Sid, Heidi

Meeting Desired Outcomes:

- Feedback on last meeting
- Discussion and feedback on ideas and approaches for next steps

1. Feedback and debrief on last meeting

- **Sarah reported some public frustration with / confusion about the state of the “working portfolios”**
 - Rick related SCDA conversations and concerns about portfolios, and SCDA meeting with Rosemary. Those concerns stimulated the volume of public comment.
 - Discussion of how public response is a reflection of the public’s lack of familiarity with where we are in our process.
- **Doug related what Mike will be writing about in this month’s OpEd**
- **Mark raised the point of better managing public comment (timing) and participation (shouting from the audience).**
 - David reminded that there is reasonable uncertainty about when comment will happen (the committee decides in some cases).
 - Sub-committee agreed to add info to the agenda making clear when comment will be taken (to eliminate uncertainty).
 - Mark related that at the Planning Commission, general comments (non-agenda-item specific comments) can only address items not otherwise on the agenda. Agenda-item-related comments can only happen during the comment period relating to that agenda item.
 - Nicholas will work out the mechanics (whether electronic or paper; audible or visual), and will ensure that the new policies are clearly communicated at the meeting and in the meeting materials.

- **Discussion of how to better engage members of the public who have put a lot of work into the process (specifically Scott M and Jerry P).**
 - Sub-committee agreed to create an opportunity for them to meet with the technical team (including Bill and Gary, maybe others)
 - David suggested that that conversation must also make clear how we are defining and using scenarios to guide our work, and that our work (at this time) is predominantly analytic in nature.
 - Bill F: Yield and costing are likely the primary subjects. He and Gary could provide some prefatory materials ahead of the meeting/call, in order to focus and ground our discussion.
 - Sarah: It's critical that Jerry and Scott are heard; she suggested that we have Scott and Jerry present their materials on yield and cost.
 - Doug: Allow Jerry and Scott to contribute to if not set the agenda (with agreement from our team), so that the needed topics get on the table.
 - Mark suggested that the meetings be separate, in order to better manage the time and the agenda(s).
 - Rosemary suggested that the meeting(s) be held on the Thursday of the Committee meetings (i.e. Jul 23) when Bill and Gary are in Santa Cruz. Others suggested that it would be better to hold the meeting(s) earlier and to use Skype. It was agreed to propose meetings via Skype or other web-based audio/video technology soon after the July 4 holiday when Gary will be back from vacation.
 - **Nicholas raised the topic of how to help committee members ensure that their constituencies are informed and, to the extent that they participate in Committee meetings, do so in a manner that is consistent with our collaborative-engagement approach (per our Charter).**
 - **Discussion of how to manage the "blurring out" behavior**
 - Nicholas offered that by better-defining public comment, the opportunities for frustration will be reduced if not removed.
 - Helpful, too, if committee members can speak up under these circumstances.
 - David suggested that Nicholas can call for a recess.
2. Discussion and feedback on ideas and approaches for next steps
- **Rosemary provided an overview of her thinking about the structure and content of our eventual Contingent Agreement.**
 - Mindful that we are time-limited in terms of the level of detail we will be able to pursue, make sure we focus clearly on the "what" items, with less emphasis on the "how" implementation details.
 - The level of detail must allow for and support reasonable triggers and goals. As an example, we might identify "enhanced demand management" with a goal of 200MGY by 2035, with an emphasis on peak season, without specifying the individual components that would make up that enhanced demand management.

- At July meeting, we will have more information about the 6 working portfolios, along with information about the level of risk tolerance among Committee members. Risk tolerance will inform folks' evaluations of and changes to those working portfolios, as we begin to look for areas of general agreement. There will be a "build your own portfolio" exercise that is interest based (so that we don't encourage the development of positions) – may be in the format of an assignment before the July meetings.
- Eventually, governance around and management of the Committee's plan will fall into the existing City structures (Water Commission, City Council, etc.).
- Nicholas discussed his concerns about interests v positions, and how the "build-your-own-portfolio" exercise may distract Cttee Mbrs from the collaborative development of options that reflect the interests of all on the Cttee and make it harder for all to develop options collaboratively.
- The sub-committee discussed the approach and implications
 - General agreement with the approach, including governance, goal-oriented approach, level of detail.
 - Level of detail must be properly titrated to serve the decision matrix. Can't be so general that the plan isn't actionable or the Committee fails to deliver appropriate value to the City.
 - Several members suggested that the portfolio discussions could help focus the work of the Committee and the technical team, and uncover areas of agreement and dis-agreement (which could in turn drive decision paths in an adaptive-pathway approach).
 - Rosemary and Nicholas will prepare a draft communication to the Committee teeing-up the build-your-own-portfolio assignment, for the sub-committee's review in order to make sure that it's properly characterized so that it's a truly constructive exercise.
- David raised the question of how emerging groundwater management agencies will affect the ability of various water departments to engage in meaningful joint agreements. Bill to take this on board as a risk element.