

## Water Supply Advisory Committee

Meeting June 11 and 12, 2015

Both sessions at the Police Department Community Room

### Meeting Summary

#### ***Use and Meaning of the Meeting Summary:***

*The Summaries of the Water Supply Advisory Committee are intended to be general summaries of key issues raised and discussed by participants at meetings. The presentation of issues or items discussed is not designed to be totally comprehensive, or reflect the breadth or depth of discussions. However, it is intended to capture the gist of conversations and conclusions.*

*Where a consensus or other agreement was reached, it will be so noted. Where ideas or comments are from only one or several participants, or where a brainstormed list is presented the content of which was not agreed to by all Committee Members, the facilitators will to the best of their abilities note these qualifiers. Where the facilitators believe that the insertion of additional information would be useful to the group they insert it in this summary and indicate that the insertion comes from them, rather than from the Committee.*

*An early draft of this summary is sent to Committee Members so that they may provide comments to the facilitators and permit the preparation of a more reliable Presentation Draft for review at the Committee's next meeting. If the Members' comments conflict with each other the facilitators do their best to resolve the conflict in the Presentation Draft. When Members raise comments about the meeting Summaries, or make other suggestions or comments following meetings that propose changes that are more than "corrections" to the Summaries, the facilitators add these in a section at the end of the item or at the end of the meeting Summary captioned "Post Script".*

\*\*\*\*\*

This meeting consisted of two daily sessions. The first lasted 4 hours, the second lasted 4 1/2 hours. Here is a list of the Members of the Committee. All Members attended both sessions except as specified.

David Green Baskin (absent from both sessions), Dana Jacobson, Charlie Keutmann, Sue Holt, Rick Longinotti, Sarah Mansergh, Rosemary Menard, Mark Mesiti-Miller, Mike Rotkin, Sid Slatter, Erica Stanojevic, Doug Engfer, Peter

Beckmann (absent from first session), Greg Pepping, David Stearns (absent from first session).

### **First Session, Thursday June 11**

#### **Public comment**

There was public comment by 12 members of the public regarding the following:

- Take ASR seriously;
- Use SLR excess flows;
- Take apart existing portfolios so elements can be evaluated on their own merits;
- Reconsider sale price of water to SqCWD;
- The usefulness of Hansen Quarry for storage;
- Maximize storage in Loch Lomond, Santa Margarita, Purisima and support required infrastructure;
- Keep sea water desalination on the table;
- Desalination/Recycled water require scrutiny because they will be tough sales;
- Stop pursuing desalination, IPR and DPR;
- ASR should be pursued starting now; and
- Look at independent projects, not bundles, portfolios or CAs.

#### **Committee Member updates**

Four Committee Members reported that

- SqCWD hosted a staff meeting regarding behavioral changes;
- Desal Alts group is currently focusing on a precautionary principle;
- The Sustainable Water Coalition heard a report on WSAC; and

- Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce and Santa Cruz Business Council meet monthly and continue to follow WSAC's progress.

### **Agenda review**

The facilitator Nicholas Dewar reviewed the meeting's agenda with the Committee. Members noted confusion in the Public Comment about the "Consensus" reached by the Committee at the April/May meeting and asked for a discussion of this before the SWOT Set-Up item. The Committee agreed by consensus to accept the agenda with this amendment. The Flow Agenda and the Official Agenda can be downloaded from the list of documents at [this link](#) and [this link](#).

### **Clarification of consensus from April/May meeting**

Committee Members discussed the public references to "Consensus" within the Committee at the April/May meeting. They made the following points:

The portfolio groups each focused on winter harvests separately. The Committee never reached or discussed a consensus. Also, the portfolios used in those tasks did not address many of the Committee Members' interests and concerns.

Due to the lack of consensus, the Committee has not given a definite direction and should remain receptive to all possible solutions. The "parallel philosophies" that were discovered during the previous meeting provide the Committee with a good starting point for today's task. Concerns and critiques of the current set of portfolios should be made during discussion after the SWOT analyses.

### **Portfolio Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analyses Task Set Up**

Bob Raucher of Stratus Consulting and Bill Faisst of Brown & Caldwell made presentations explaining the SWOT analyses task.

The materials distributed in advance of the meeting can be downloaded at the following links:

[4a Summary of Florida Everglades ASR](#)  
[4a-1 Presentation: Evaluating 4 Portfolios](#)

[4a-2 Handout: Copy of Portfolio Results, Final](#)  
[4a-3 Handout: Portfolio Summary June 2015](#)  
[4a-4 Handout: Draft of Overview of All Portfolios Map](#)  
[4b ASR Summary V6](#)  
[4c Portfolio 1 In Lieu IPR](#)  
[4c-1 Handout: Draft of Portfolio 1 Map](#)  
[4d Technical Memo on Portfolio 2 ASR-DPR](#)  
[4d-1 Handout: Draft of Portfolio 2 Map](#)  
[4e Portfolio 3 ASIR+IPR-DPR](#)  
[4e-1 Handout: Draft of Portfolio 3 Map](#)  
[4f Portfolio 4 ASIR+DWDesal](#)  
[4f-1 Handout: Draft of Portfolio 4 Map](#)

Each group received their portfolio, which consisted of a Plan A, Plan B, and a trigger. The task of each group was to analyze these components in combination and as individual elements using a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). Each group was to review all of the portfolios, with a primary focus on their assigned portfolio. The SWOT analysis process was briefly described and defined.

Bob reviewed the portfolios described in the materials that were distributed. (See links above.) In this review, Bob reminded the Committee of some of the key “scenario parameters” which the portfolios are intended to address. Specifically: for storage-based solutions, the need for 3 BG of available storage; for all solutions, the need to bridge a 340 MG average year peak-season gap and a 1,110 MG worst-case peak-season gap (“design drought with climate change”).

Discussion during this section included the following:

The portfolios assume that the in-lieu recharge approach will allow Scotts Valley and Soquel Creek to rest the aquifers. This provides some regional benefit but it’s possible that it will not provide any water back to Santa Cruz.

Robert Marks of Pueblo Water Resources and Mike Cloud of the Independent Review Panel were asked how much water would be recovered from the aquifers using the in-lieu recharge approach. They said that significant study and testing would be necessary before being able to answer that question.

### **Portfolio SWOT Analyses**

The Committee formed four break-out groups and completed their analyses that were to be reported to the full Committee at the Friday session.

The materials distributed for this agenda item can be downloaded at the following links:

[5a Thursday Exercise June 2015 WSAC Meeting](#)  
[5b Protocols June 2015 WSAC Meeting](#)

### **Correspondence received from the community**

Mike Rotkin, the Corresponding Secretary, reported that the community continues to send suggestions to the Committee and that he forwards all of them to the Committee Members.

### **Subcommittee and Working Group Reports and Technical Work Plan Update**

The materials distributed for this agenda item can be downloaded at the following links:

[7a WSAC Outreach 5.13.15](#)  
[7b WSAC Sentinel Editorial #4](#)  
[7c Planning Subcommittee Agenda 4.10.15 Notes](#)  
[7d Planning Subcommittee Agenda 4.24.15 Notes](#)  
[7e Planning Subcommittee Agenda 5.08.15 Notes](#)  
[7f Agreement Development Subcommittee 5.29.15 Notes](#)  
[7g Tech Team Update June 2015](#)  
[7h Updated Technical Workplan Graphic](#)

#### Outreach Subcommittee

Charlie Keutmann invited questions about the material provided by the Outreach Subcommittee. There were no questions.

#### Planning Subcommittee

Doug Engfer invited questions about the material provided by the Agreement Development Subcommittee. There were no questions. Doug reported that the Subcommittee expects to obtain examples of contingent agreements to provide the framework of the eventual agreement.

Nicholas noted that the Agreement Development Subcommittee was initially called the Solutions Framework Subcommittee. The Committee agreed by Consensus to use the name "Agreement Development Subcommittee." Nicholas also noted that the Planning Subcommittee is identified as one of the entities that can give direction to the Independent Review Panel. Now that the Planning

Subcommittee no longer exists, the Committee agreed by consensus to allow the Agreement Development Subcommittee to give directions to the IRP.

#### Peak Season Demand Group

For lack of time the Committee agreed that Sarah Mansergh would provide her report of this Group's work near the beginning of the Friday session.

#### Technical Team Workplan Update

There were no questions about the update material provided by the Technical Team.

#### **Materials resulting from the previous meeting**

The Committee agreed by consensus to approve the Summary and the Action Agenda of the April/May Committee meeting. These documents are available at the following links:

[8a WSAC Action Agenda 4.30.15](#)

[8b Summary of 4.30 Meeting - Presentation Draft](#)

#### **Amendment to Independent Review Panel Protocols**

Since the Planning Subcommittee has been discontinued and the Agreement Development Subcommittee has been created, the Committee agreed by consensus that the Agreement Development Subcommittee will take the place of the Planning Subcommittee in the protocols of the Independent Review Panel.

#### **Overview of the July 23-24 meeting agenda**

Rosemary Menard, Water Department Director, briefly described the proposed agenda for the July meeting.

The preliminary draft of the July agenda is available at this [link](#).

#### **Public Comment**

There was public comment by one member of the public including the following:

- Will the MCDS analysis be performed on the four portfolios discussed today? Rosemary Menard responded yes.

### **Evaluation of the Session**

Four Committee Members entered evaluations of this session at SurveyMonkey or by handing in hand-written evaluations.

Facilitator's Note: One member of the public has asked for an opportunity to submit an evaluation but has not yet done so (as of 6/19/15). We will include those comments in the Presentation Draft if they are available.

- How well did the session meet your needs?
  - Half the respondents felt the session met their needs "very well" or "pretty well"
  - One found the "unruly" public comment during presentations so distracting that s/he recommended using a timed signal to inform speakers when their time limit approached and a cut-off switch on the microphone
  - One reported that confusion and lack of progress resulted from the distortion in the portfolios of the in-lieu recharge strategy, the gross inflation of cost figures and the use of unsubstantiated assumptions about zero return of water from the aquifers to Santa Cruz.
- How did this session help the Committee work towards its long-term goal?
  - Respondents noted that the Committee has begun to look at specific sets of actions and that this is helping to recognize the difficulties in finding solutions.
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of the session?
  - One respondent noted that the Committee is working well as a group
  - One noted that the focus on greater detail in the Portfolios enabled the Committee to have a more meaningful discussion
  - One noted that the SWOT task felt rushed and suggested that this was unnecessary given the early end to the session

- One noted that progress was slowed by the lack of accurate, internally consistent and complete information on Portfolio 1
- One respondent felt that the early disclosure of the composition of the break-out groups and of the assigned portfolios would have made the Committee members more comfortable and that delaying the disclosure seemed silly and unnecessary.
- What would you like to see at the next meeting?
  - After completing the MCDS analysis, one respondent looks forward to starting to build the portfolio that we will recommend to the Council
  - One respondent looks forward to firmer control of public comment
  - One hopes to see better quality information
  - One respondent hopes for better oversight of Water Department staff by the Committee and the Agreement Development Subcommittee

**Adjourn**



## Second Session, Friday June 12

### Public comment

There was public comment by four members of the public including the following:

- Desalination is not an appropriate solution for Santa Cruz; plenty of water in SLR; do cheapest thing(s) first including dual pipe and Ranney collectors; look for storage; do WTP upgrades last.
- Belief that the information the Committee is receiving from the technical team and staff were not necessarily what was asked of them. Generalities, as seen with the CAs and an apparent lack of transparency, are not acceptable ways to do business; and
- Request to keep desal as an option on the table.

### MCDS Discussion

Committee Members discussed MCDS's role in WSAC's progress. Committee Members should be sure to rate Plan A and Plan B separately in the MCDS tool even if the Committee Member has the same rating for the two. Committee Members should make sure they are rating the right criteria and the right application. MCDS staff are working on making an option to blanket-rate (pre-populate) some or all plans to reduce workload to committee members.

The use of the comment button as an important tool in distinguishing subsets of plans was also discussed.

### Peak Season Demand Group

Sarah Mansergh presented the progress report of the Peak Season Demand Group that had been postponed from Thursday's session. They have been teasing out what they think the best concepts for conservation are and looking for peak season demand reduction opportunities. Communication skills, especially with addressing large landscape accounts are important. Their final work product is in progress.

## Portfolio SWOT Analyses Report Out

Each of the four Portfolio SWOT analyses break-out groups reported on their findings and identified the following strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each of the portfolios.

The Portfolios consisted of the following major elements. All portfolios include conservation program C-rec:

Portfolio 1 Plan A: Winter flows for Regional In-Lieu Recharge with possible water transfer back to Santa Cruz (includes raising the dam and adding second pipe)

Portfolio 1 Plan B: Purified recycled water (IPR) pumped to Loch Lomond

Portfolio 2 Plan A: Winter flows used for Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)

Portfolio 2 Plan B: Purified recycled water (DPR)

Portfolio 3 Plan A: Winter flows used for ASR plus IPR used for seawater barrier wells

Portfolio 3 Plan B: Convert IPR to DPR to provide purified recycled water

Portfolio 4 Plan A: Winter flows used for ASR plus Deepwater Desal as supplement

Portfolio 4 Plan B: Deepwater Desal

### Portfolio 1 Plan A

#### Strengths:

- Interties create regional system (used ½ of Rick's estimate for return volume);
- In-lieu opportunities may increase as adjacent districts see increased demand;
- Assists in restoring aquifers; and
- Seems popular with the public.

#### Weaknesses:

- In-lieu opportunities may decrease over time as adjacent districts decrease demand and find new sources;

- Cost in time/dollars if it proves infeasible;
- High capital, operating, and energy costs;
- May not be feasible;
- Requires excess winter water which may not materialize;
- Sufficient returns from adjacent districts may not exist;
- Long time to “bank” water may leave us with severe curtailments (including ramp up of C-Rec) and harm to fish and river ecosystem; and
- Water rights and agreements required may fail.

Opportunities:

- Aquifer recharge reduces seawater intrusion – leakage may benefit river fish flows

Threats:

- If adjacent districts become disinterested they could find other sources.

**Portfolio 1 Plan B**

Strengths:

- Can provide a supply to meet demand;
- Proven technology, rapid implementation;
- Ensures fish survival and river ecosystem health;
- Enhances in-lieu recharge opportunities with extra production;
- Weather independent;
- May keep Loch Lomond topped off;
- May allow resting of Beltz Well field with attended benefits;
- Only operate when needed, reducing operating/Energy costs;
- Scalable; and
- No water rights/agreements.

## Weaknesses:

- Capital/operating costs still high;
- Energy costs can be mitigated;
- Useful mostly when reservoir needs topping off; and
- Education is needed to demonstrate safety.

## Opportunities:

- Excess production helps with aquifers and fish flows/river health;
- Santa Cruz would be seen as a leader;
- And other uses possible for pipeline.

## Threats:

- Adjacent districts uninterested in an idling facility.

During the Portfolio 1 report-out, Committee Members raised the following issues:

- needing more technical information on feasibility,
- asking when the benefits of C-Rec will be realized,
- asking how long it will take until water is returned,
- needing consistency in cost estimates (examples include raising Loch Lomond and installing a dual pipeline),
- requesting to establish a cost estimate protocol to make comparisons across portfolios fair,
- asking where the staff would make tweaks regarding the difficulty staying with Plan A when Plan B seems to work and that there appears to be fewer risks/uncertainties with Plan A,
- establishing a technically based trigger,
- commenting that the trigger could be related to inter-agency interest,
- noting that pilot testing has not been discussed, and

- asking how much water would a second pipe yield.

From an institutional perspective:

- will adjacent systems participate;
- various water rights questions;
- will Plan B be politically/publicly acceptable.

## Portfolio 2

Strengths Plan A and B:

- Ranney Collectors are a proven technology;
- Funding sources are all applicable;
- Over drafted aquifers get rested;
- Upgrades GHWTP and distribution system;
- Closes all peak-season gaps;
- It is the most cost-effective of all portfolios; and
- Least energy intensive portfolio.

Weaknesses Plan A:

- It does not capitalize on Loch Lomond storage;
- There are possible hydraulic loss problems;
- It is rainfall dependent; and
- ASR is untested, and testing will be lengthy.

Weaknesses Plan B:

- Only one funding source;
- Doesn't capitalize on LL storage; and
- Possible stranded ASR assets.

Opportunities Plan A:

- Perfects the water right; and
- Ranneys may reduce costs to GHWTP.

Threats Plan A:

- Problems siting injection wells;
- Site for Ranney Collectors may not have appropriate sub-riverbed conditions, other siting problems;
- Possible pipeline siting difficulties; and
- The City does not reach interagency agreements.

Threats Plan B:

- Public doesn't accept CAT;
- Failure to regulate private wells; and
- No interim supply while ASR being tested.

During the Portfolio 2 report-out, Committee Members raised the following issues:

- asking how long it would take to understand the feasibility of ASR,
- requesting clarification for Ranney collectors and associated water quality,
- noting the trigger felt abstract and needs to be clearer, and
- asking what an indisputable trigger is.

From an institutional perspective:

- what about private wells;
- well and pipeline siting;
- funding support.

**Portfolio 3 Plan A**

Strengths:

- Scalable;

- With ASR, can use preexisting wells;
- Installs a saltwater barrier; and
- Accelerates recharge.

Weaknesses:

- High energy use;
- High cost;
- Gaining community acceptance for IPR will be difficult;
- Would need a strategy for determining needed recharge rate; and
- Potential for over investment.

Opportunities:

- Potential to drop one strategy would be simple;
- Passive infiltration;
- There is a lot of state funding for these types of projects; and
- Would lead to regional groundwater agency.

Threats:

- Geochemistry compatibility;
- Getting the desired agreements;
- Water rights;
- Aquifer leakage; and
- Future economic conditions.

**Portfolio 3 Plan B**

Strengths:

- Use of preexisting asset: Wastewater treatment plant.

Weaknesses:

- Gaining community acceptance for DPR will be difficult;
- Holds the potential to leave assets stranded;
- High cost for O + M;
- High energy use;
- No longer rebuilding aquifer; and
- Scale up plant from Plan A – larger increase in cost.

Opportunities:

- There is a lot of state funding for these types of projects and
- Passive recharge.

Threats:

- Legality;
- Safety concerns; and
- Future economic conditions.

During the Portfolio 3 report-out, Committee Members raised the following issues:

- asking to what extent SCWD needs accelerated recharge, and
- suggesting to add in-lieu recharge by sending water to SqCWD now and potentially to Hansen Quarry.

**Portfolio 4 Plan A**

Strengths:

- Proven technology;
- Steps to resolve 'known unknowns' are well-defined and understood;
- Political support is likely; and
- Regional benefits encourage regional collaboration.

Weaknesses:



- The time to production;
- Uncertainties;
- Collaboration is new to us (SCWD not trusted); and
- Holds the potential to leave substantial investments if it is infeasible.

Opportunities:

- Could reduce CAPEX by using the same wells for injection and extraction;
- May reduce number of wells to drill and operate;
- Ranneys at Tait; and
- If ASR proves infeasible, expect enhanced political support for Plan B.

Threats:

- Continued pumping by non-agency well owners.

**Portfolio 4 Plan B**

Strengths:

- Cost-effective hedge;
- The distance of the desal plant may help local politics;
- Minimal stranded assets; and
- Drought-resilient (not weather-dependent).

Weaknesses:

- All ASR uncertainties apply;
- The desal plant would not be under SCWD's control and management;
- Costs for desal are unclear (pumping, energy and carbon costs); and
- Posited time for desal minimizes hedge's time value.

Opportunities:

- If ASR works, SCWD may be able to sell desal share;

- Change GHWTP operating rules to minimize plant expansion costs;
- Peak season demand reductions in addition to C-Rec; and
- SCWD involvement may improve plant's odds of success.

Threats:

- Regional opposition to desalination;
- Possibly a Measure P vote is required;
- Escalating energy costs; and
- Rise in water prices.

During the Portfolio 4 report-out, Committee Members raised the following issues:

- asking (regarding to Deepwater Desal) what the buy-in cost would be, the timing of the project and the energy usage/greenhouse gas emissions;
- requesting clarification for the operating strategy with Deepwater Desal (ex. who gets priority);
- requesting clarification of the pump's energy needs and greenhouse gas emissions,
- asking if SCWD can change operations at the GHWTP to produce more in the winter time,
- noting the spirit of Measure P may require a call for vote,
- requesting clarification on energy needs of Plan A;
- requesting a change in the trigger based on its equation; and
- requesting staff to explore any issues with private water supplier controls, agreements, operational flexibility, etc.

From an institutional perspective:

- earning trust by trying ASR;
- JPA or other terms for DWD (Control & terms, intra-regional sharing).

**Public Comment**

Several comments including:

- Loquifer cost is much cheaper than desal;
- 16 pieces of misinformation in the portfolios;
- how do we get questions answered?

### **Committee Conversation and Next Steps**

The following topics were addressed while Committee Members conversed with SqCWD's Ron Duncan:

- a deal with Deepwater Desal is a take or pay type of commitment,
- the pricing for a pipeline from the edge of the facility to SqCWD (roughly \$50 million),
- the possibilities of going carbon negative with desal,
- increasing communications with SCWD,
- open mindedness to all potential options, and
- a focus on ending saltwater intrusion.

The following topics were addressed while Committee Members conversed with Scotts Valley Water District's Piret Harmon:

- Santa Cruz has the most water available in wet years coinciding with Scotts Valley's lowest demand,
- interagency communication is key to recharge possibilities,
- potential for large grants with regional projects,
- Scotts Valley's focus on recharging the aquifers,
- the plausibility (and potential importance) of cost sharing among agencies,
- Scotts Valley would be willing to return aquifer water if it benefits both agencies,
- Scotts Valley Water Department is much smaller and therefore less suitable to face the brunt of aquifer recharge costs,

- Scotts Valley would be willing to take the water they received in the winter to use for the summer, and
- there is no ranked list in terms of importance of supply projects.

After the brief discussion with representatives from other agencies, the Committee discussed ways to fortify the portfolios:

**Portfolio 1 Elements of Plan A “extended season”:**

- What are regional potentials for recharging Purisima and Santa Margarita and what is the percentage likelihood that the estimate is reliable? Suggestion that the IRP should be engaged to consider this.
- At what point can water come back to Santa Cruz?
- How much additional volume would a second pipeline bring to Loch Lomond?
- What is the additional volume if Loch Lomond is raised?
- To what extent do Ranney Collectors include additional available water?
- Be creative with rule curve at Loch Lomond – recognize risk(s) associated with lowering end elevation of Loch Lomond.
- Review costs of dual pipeline – are they reflecting joint trench construction?
- Technical team to provide information on surface storage in Hansen Quarry. (not a portfolio addition, but information requested by the committee)

**Portfolio 2 Fortification:**

- With Plan A – request for more explicit scaling up information;
- Decision making detail: does rate of recharge matter (in-lieu vs. ASR)? Is there a cost comparison of number of wells vs. recharge rate?
- Make Plan A regional
- Clarify if Ranney collectors are actually in this portfolio or not and review cost/Confluence data to make sure they are consistent.

**Portfolio 3 Fortification:**

- Clarify annual costs of Plan B (ex – is IPR same scale as DPR?)
- Maximum parallelism in timeline to minimize inefficiencies/costs.

**Portfolio 4**

- Get better information on Deepwater Desalination schedule,
- Maximum use of wells for ASR and minimum number of new wells;
- Get cost information refined for Deepwater Desal.

**Portfolio 5**

- Committee Members suggested the addition of SCWD2 as an alternative to Deepwater Desal to see what differences there may be between the Committee Members' evaluations of the two desalination projects.

**Portfolio 6**

- Committee Members suggested the modification of Portfolio 1 to explore how much more water can be stored with a raised dam and a dual pipeline instead of a single one.

After discussing portfolio fortifications, Committee Members discussed criteria and ratings scales:

- One Committee Member discussed how characteristics, objectivity, reliability and ability take precedence over age and time and should be captured somehow. Carie Fox, of the decision support team, suggested using the umbrella term “clarity” to define those components.
- Carie suggested that Philip Murphy, also of the decision support team, add the technical team’s uncertainty levels onto his work.
- Another Committee Member suggested quantifying a timeline to determine feasibility (for example – will “it” be feasible in five years, two years, etc).
- Another Committee Member suggested including ecosystem impacts within each portfolio.

The committee reviewed the Criteria memo presented by Rosemary making the following suggestions:

- control stranded assets;
- add back legal feasibility;
- add potential for outside funding;
- change timing scale of technical feasibility;
- change scale of full scale production;
- remove regional water benefit.

David S., Sue, Greg and Sid volunteered to host upcoming kaffeeklatsches.

*Facilitator's note: It was subsequently recognized that three kaffeeklatsches would be sufficient so the hosts will be Sue, Greg and Sid.*

### **Oral Communication**

Three members of the public participated in oral communication, including the following:

- Refer to rejected alternatives as “dormant;”
- Keep in mind that all water storage projects have some form of “leakage;”
- What are the following steps after a trigger is triggered?
- Request to see a portfolio that has only rain-dependent solutions;
- Concerns over length of time since the EPA last passed drinking water regulations.

A Committee Member proposed that for each individual alternative that is no longer being actively considered in the Committee’s discussions an explanation should be provided for its absence. After some discussion the Committee clarified that these explanations should be provided not for consolidated alternatives or portfolios but for each Alternative. It was proposed that this should be done in time for the August meeting. The Committee agreed to this proposal by consensus.

### **Evaluation of the Session**

Four Committee Members entered evaluations of this session at SurveyMonkey or by handing in hand-written evaluations.

- How well did the session meet your needs?
  - Respondents generally found this session was OK and that the Committee made progress
  - One noted that it was good to have an opportunity to hear the thoughts of other Committee Members
- How did this session help the Committee work towards its long-term goal?
  - Respondents felt the session enabled them to clarify the qualities of specific alternatives and open them up to possibilities
  - One found that hearing from other members was very useful in prompting lateral thinking about alternatives
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of the session?
  - Half of the respondents noted how useful it was to have Ron Duncan and Piret Harmon at the meeting. One noted that it was particularly helpful to hear their perspectives on collaboration
  - One noted how good it was to hear from other Committee Members
  - One felt that it would have been better if Portfolio groups had been encouraged to share the results of their analyses of all portfolios, not just their assigned portfolio
- What would you like to see at the next meeting?
  - Continued involvement of other water districts

**Adjourn**