

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	Deep water may reduce adaptive flexibility depending on terms of agreement
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	Adaptive Flexibility - So, i've tried to take a comprehensive view here, taking into account and giving weight to (1) regional collaboration and cooperation, (2) regional interconnects and infrastructure, as well as (3) varied supply sources. If we are able to build a solid foundation of rational, regional collaboration, and the infrastructure to support it, then we will, by definition, have more adaptive management tools at our disposal.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	All Plan B's provide non-rainfall dependent water sources and therefore provide significant adaptive flexibility benefits.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	Rated 4.1A and 4.2A higher than 2A and 3A due to the reliability provided by having a non-rainfall dependent supply available for depositing water into the aquifers.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	Rated 1.1A higher than 1.1B as the increased capacity of the Loch provides more flexibility.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Adaptive Flexibility: Plan A	For plan A I have assumed that it works as proposed throughout both aquifers to the extent that eventually we will have at least 3 billion of reliable storage. If it doesn't work or works to a lesser degree, then the ratings would change.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	Admin Feasibility - I'm convinced that our neighboring water districts / departments are motivated to work with us, and interested in finding ways to make things work (rather than ways to prevent things from working). Thus, I'm confident that workable, even-handed agreements are very likely. That said, I do not minimize the complications involved, and I'm counting on our forming groundwater districts to be active advocates for and supporters of regional collaboration. I understand IPR in portfolio 1 to be an SC-centric solution, and that therefore there is no need for collaboration under that Plan B scenario. Perhaps I've misunderstood this.
Rick Longinotti	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	Does "agreement essential" give this a low score compared to "agreement not needed"? If so, then we need to re-think this criterion.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	Again I think it is unlikely that SV or SqCrk Water Districts will be willing to enter into agreements related to ASR that will assure SCWD of the ability to get water back during drought years when we will need it, as it will require them to limit water sales to their own customers during those periods. None of the plan B's require an agreement with the other water districts. The agreement for Deep Water Desal should be relatively easy to do once the project has reached the point in regulatory approvals and capital commitments where it is assured that it will proceed.
Sarah Mansergh	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	For portfolio 2 and 3 I am assuming that the DPR is for Santa Cruz only. If it were water that would be used for the region then some agreements would need to be made and would likely be agreed upon.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	I assume 2B and 3B are DPR just for Santa Cruz
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Administrative Feasibility: Plan A	it would be nice if each title of a column had an i link to give a full description of each plan
Greg Pepping	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	This looks to be data-based, so 14 people went to tables and pulled it out and then put it in here. Maybe I'm missing something? If not, we should have asked you to remove this rating.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	Annualized costs - This is just an attribute, not a criterion, so I've used the value of \$K/MG here. Note that I have made the following budgetary adjustments, in the interests of fairness and consistency: * For CapEx factors, I have used the "Not in CIP" data (and for portfolio 1.2 I have deducted the costs associated with the Newell Creek Dam). Regrettably, I can't evaluate any potential CIP savings, so these are ignored throughout. * For S2CWD Desal, I have used 60% of the costs, since we would presumably be splitting them with SqCWD in some fashion; I believe that this was (about) the split that was in the previous deal. * Not having access to the weighted-average calculations the team made, and having no interest in re=creating them, I estimated new weighted-average values based on my corrected budgetary figures. I continue to be concerned about the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the budgetary numbers that we are using here. It's truly regrettable that these same (wrong!) numbers were used at the CC/WSAC meeting, creating a false impression of the relative and absolute costs of the approaches we are considering. I'd really like to understand why ASR has lower "non-CIP" costs than in-lieu (even after accounting for the Newell Creek Dam) given the number of wells that must be drilled and piped-to. I also would like to understand what this "30-inch diameter reclaim tunnel pressure pipe for reservoir discharge storage" is - it was 24" before, and I believe it's part of the discharge work that needs to be done to make the dam save for de-watering, no? Assuming so, shouldn't this be in CIP? WE MUST GET ACCURATE, OR AT LEAST CONSISTENT, NUMBERS!
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	Some questions about cost calculations -- Shouldn't costs of CIP commitments be excluded? Similarly, shouldn't savings from no-longer-necessary CIP plans be netted out as avoided costs? In some portfolios, Plan B costs include Plan A costs, while in others, the costs are separated. This confusion is also likely to inflate costs of Plan B.
Rick Longinotti	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	I'm also anticipating increased energy costs of 6% per year by 2035.
Rick Longinotti	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	I'm rating in lieu on cost data in County's "Conjunctive Use and Water Transfers Final Report". I'm not using tech team cost data which includes non-essential elements to the in lieu strategy.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	I reduced the relative annualized costs for portfolio 4.2A and 4.2B because SCWD would only be on the hook for 59% of the \$140m capital cost of the SCWD2 desalination project per prior agreements reached with SqCWD.
Sid Slatter	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	info should have been pre loaded
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Annualized Unit Cost \$/mg: Plan A	This info should have been preloaded.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Avoid Negative Consequences: Trigger	Timing for in-lieu - I'm specifically reacting to the 3-year requirement for 2MGD production for 180 days. Too much too soon.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Avoid Negative Consequences: Trigger	The trigger analysis shows the limitations of using the Plan A/Plan B approach. We should not wait to pursue Plan B. Rather, we should approach the portfolios as items that should be pursued simultaneously using adaptive flexibility. Triggers could tell us when to increase or decrease the emphasis of one Plan within a portfolio and correspondingly increase or decrease the reliance upon another. For example, if we pursue ASR and DPR, we could proceed with ASR 2A, 4.1A or 4.2A (all identical) and DPR 2B or 3B (both identical)simultaneously so that we are assured of having a drought proof supply with DPR, but might reduce our dependence upon DPR if and when ASR proves viable and there is sufficient water stored that we are confident can be retrieved.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: No. They need to be enhanced to reflect more dimensions.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: No. They need to be enhanced to reflect more dimensions.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Charlie Keutman	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: They are better constructed with quantifiable milestones but I am concerned about the timelines.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: They hurt my brain, but I THINK they're working okay. It's tough. We have work to do there but it's improving in clarity.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: They hurt my brain, but I THINK they're working okay. It's tough. We have work to do there but it's improving in clarity.
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Triggers - greatly improved; still need work. I've detailed my suggestions in my comments on that ratings page.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: The triggers did not seem to work well, as there are more criteria that should be considered to determine whether or not ASR is working or is on track. In addition, the depth of the aquifers we are dealing with is unknown. The deeper the aquifer, the longer it will likely take to recharge.
Sue Holt	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Yes. Lots of careful thought here.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Benchmarks were used as triggers to ditch Plan A. The use of benchmarks should be as signals to make adaptive management decisions to improve on Plan A---to make it work.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Benchmarks were used as triggers to ditch Plan A. The use of benchmarks should be as signals to make adaptive management decisions to improve on Plan A---to make it work.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Portfolio 1 trigger seemed a bit odd as it requires 15% curtailments to occur in 3 of any group of 6 years which seems unrelated to whether or not Plan A is reasonably feasible. Portfolio 2 trigger seemed clear enough and was my personal favorite as it moved to plan B quickly and before the bulk of the \$ are spent on constructing the ASR system. I would shorten the time to say 4 years and increase the recovery percentage to be at least 60%. Portfolio 3 and 4 triggers were good but 15 years is way too long and appears likely to result in wasting all the \$ constructing the ASR system only to find out it doesn't work - not good approach. I am more in favor of a triggerless plan that uses performance testing to size various system components allowing configuration adjustments as knowledge is gained. More about all that another time...
Dana Jacobson	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Each portfolio had many individual triggers relating to different aspects of the criteria that may kill a project. could we call it something besides a trigger?
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Not so much. They need to be clearer since I suspect they will be the conflict area for our group rather than what goes in A or B.
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Did the triggers seem to work well? Why or why not?	C4: Not so much. They need to be clearer since I suspect they will be the conflict area for our group rather than what goes in A or B.
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	I can't recall whether DPR is less energy intensive than IPR due to the fact that we won't need to pump to loch.
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Without knowing the energy profile of the deepwater project I'm giving the slight edge to a local plant considering SC's commitment to carbon neutrality per the SCWD2 EIR.
Greg Pepping	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	This is data-based, so I don't know why 14 people looked it up and rated it. Perhaps I'm missing something though. Hope not.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Energy Profile - Enough of the information available here is either unclear or (potentially) inaccurate that my ratings should be deemed questionable. I've made the following assumptions or observations (to the extent that any of these assumptions are valid, they should be so documented in our work): * IPR and DPR energy profiles are worse that desal because the water that they create requires additional treatment before it's inserted into the supply. * I can't understand why the energy profile of ASR is better than the profile for in-lieu. Nor can I understand why 1.1 and 1.2 have different energy budgets for the in-lieu portion. For the sake of my work, I've assumed that these numbers are wrong, and that in-lieu is less energy intensive than ASR. * Other than the in-lieu portfolios, the energy-profile data for the full portfolio don't appear to take into account the "failed" ASR option, and the energy expended in that technical feasibility work. * I can only make sense of the energy footprint of the IPR for seawater barrier Plan A option if I assume that all of the IPR pumping-related energy costs are actually factored in there in Plan A. * I cannot make any sense out of the different energy profiles between Portfolios 4.1 and 4.2, unless I infer that we are accounting for the entire energy footprint of the DW Desal plant (rather than just the component for which SC is responsible). I used 1/4 of the values for 4.1 (DW Desal).
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Energy Profile - Contrary to comments made by some Committee members at recent meetings, I believe that energy use matters, whether it's "clean" or "dirty" energy. Certainly, it matters more if it's "dirty". But the extent to which we can "do more with less" means that society can find other uses for the (perhaps clean) energy that we don't need to use. Energy efficiency is and will remain a Good Thing, and we should value it accordingly (and not be seduced by the notion that "because it's green it's okay to use a lot of it").
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	There are similar weighted average energy use errors for Portfolio 4.1, Plan A and Plan b.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	There appears to be an error in Table 16, line H. The weighted average is too high and should be somewhere between the low of -1.6 and the high of 3.9.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	These ratings could have been populated from Tables 10-21, line H.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Energy profile seems less important as I imagine whatever energy required to power the selected water system portfolio will be either entirely sustainably sourced power from the beginning or will become rapidly green sourced as time goes by due to falling prices of PV solar systems, battery storage systems, and the likely success of the proposed Community Choice Aggregation project to which the City is a partner. For example, I've heard the Marin County CCA has moved to a 50% green power mix after only one year of existence.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Why not pre-load the values from Line H of Tables 10 through 21 of the Portfolio Update and have us simply provide opinions, questions or exceptions in the comment box? It's not like we're going to run our own energy calculations with any accuracy.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	Energy use ratings were performed by comparing the energy use information in the Portfolios Update to each other on a continuum. However, I do not consider energy use a particularly significant criteria except as it relates to cost, since over time we will move to a more renewable energy profile, making carbon footprint analysis a lesser consideration.
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	IPR takes a ton of energy. dang
Sid Slatter	Alts Ratings	Energy Profile: Plan A	This info should have been pre loaded

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Greg Pepping	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	I'm disappointed that this doesn't have more detail. Committee members expressed considerable support for this criterion nearly every time we discussed it. The way it's written almost suggests it's been minimized to a "do whatever you like here." Unfortunate.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	Environment - Right off the bat, any approach that improves the health of our aquifers gets up-rated; there are so many down-stream (intended) benefits that can't be ignored. I've taken it as a given that any of our approaches take into account DFG-5 flows, so I've ignored SLR fish habitat as a discriminant here. Highly energy intensive approaches are down-rated here, due to broader carbon impacts of high energy use; this creates some space between in-lieu and ASR as primary strategies. I have considered I/DPR as acceptable only when/if the health-related consequences are fully understood, so I've not down-rated them here. I/DPR are marginally better than desal, because recycling has merits over newly-created water.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	Most Plan A environmental benefit derived from potential for increased SLR base flows from Scotts Valley ASR. Plan 3A has added benefit of decreased waste discharge into Monterey Bay. Plan 4.1B loses the base flow enhancement with very high energy impacts.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	Some factors to consider -- how much flow is left in the river, how much are aquifers restored and therefore baseflow to creeks, do we avoid threats to Santa Cruz's sustainability reputation?
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	My ratings for the Plan A - ASR options assumes ASR is feasible and works as desired. Because the Plan B options allow us to provide DFG-5 flows and protect/preserve a healthy river habitat, all Plan B options provide significant environmental benefits.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	For Plan A in all portfolios I have assumed a moderate but not complete level of success. IPR and DPR both have the most environmental benefit in that they enable us to stop discharging wastewater from our treatment plant into the ocean. All the other plans, if successful, will make it easier for us to improve releases to sustain fish habitat.
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Environmental Profile: Plan A	lots of trade-offs for plab B. more water in creeks, more energy use, etc
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	Further development of triggers across the board needed
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	Trigger: clarity / flexibility - Here I think we've sacrificed flexibility for clarity, with the result that the triggers are arbitrary and not necessarily related to what we need to know. Also, they do not incorporate any "continuous improvement" cycles along the way. I would propose that, in addition to proving the productivity of the respective aquifer recharge strategies (in-lieu, ASR), we should also be continuously monitoring the health of the aquifer, presumably by means of water-table monitoring of some sort. We should be able to estimate the recovery rates of the various aquifers we are working with, based on the water we are either supplying (in-lieu) or injecting (ASR). We should use that data to confirm along the way that our approach is working within reasonable parameters. If it's not, then we need to consider what else we need to do in order to improve the performance of the approach, or abandon it as unsuccessful (in the event that (1) it's not working and (2) we've run out of cost-effective tactics to make it work). Presuming we can do these calculations and perform this monitoring, then we relax the need for such rigorous and costly "feasibility demonstrations" (such as pumping 3MGD for 180 days & 2 MGD for 180 days for 3 years in a row). Rather, we could confirm the behavior of the aquifer at least in part using our monitoring system, rather than by pumping a billion gallons out of the ground. As regards ASR, the target well-productivity percentage(s) should be based on (1) the total available aquifer storage and (2) SC's maximum need from that storage, with a hedge. The formula should be published and transparent, so that as we get to more clarity about any of the variables, we can adjust our trigger. For example, if we have 6BG of available aquifer storage, and we need 3 BG of available supply, and we agree that a 10% operational hedge is appropriate, then our wells need to perform at 60% effectiveness in recove
Rick Longinotti	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	Not sure that flexibility and clarity are polarities on the same spectrum.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	Triggers for 1.1, 1.2 and 2 are adequate if you subscribe to the strategy whereby a Plan B is not initiated until Plan A failure is established. I have strong reservations about recommending a sequenced approach with a significant Plan A analysis timeline.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	I found the scales for this to be useless and the information we have to measure the adequacy of the triggers to be inadequate. There has been insufficient modeling of the aquifers to provide a profile from which we can measure the storage capacity of the aquifers and the relative increase or decrease in the amount of water stored over time. There has been no pilot studies of any of the aquifers and the ability to retrieve water whether using in lieu or injection for recharge. There is no data specific to the aquifers upon which we can evaluate the adequacy of the triggers. This is all guess work.
Mike Rotkin	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	uncertainty about the cost factors make my ratings there not that useful in the end, but I did my best.
Mike Rotkin	Alts Ratings	Flexible Trigger	uncertainty about the cost factors make my ratings there not that useful in the end, but I did my best.
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	Regional solutions and recycled water are strong for grants.
Greg Pepping	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	Don't like the scale. Would prefer top=MOST likely to secure outside funding & bottom=LEAST likely to secure outside funding. I get it that grants are better than low interest loans, but don't like how the scale was set up.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	Grants and Loans- Should have been populated by those who are qualified to have an opinion. Conflating grants and loans is not helpful - check boxes here instead of radio buttons? More options that truly circumscribe the available rating options (G+ L+; G+ L-; G- L+; G- L-). I've tilted toward grants, since loans would basically function like bonds. Also, the information available to us should have been parsed out better between the respective Plans A and B, since that is how we are rating things.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	There should be an additional scale choice that is "strong for grants and loans" just as there is a one for "low" for both.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	All of the proposed projects are the types of projects identified in the Prop 1 Guidelines for money from the state either in the form of grants or loans.
Sid Slatter	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	Grants and loans should be combined as they are for "low for grants and loans" or you should be able to check two boxes. It could be good for one but not the other. Hope this make sense!
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Grants and Low Interest Loans: Plan A	assumed grants preferable to loans, so gave only grant ratings and rated one X as moderate for grants and two Xs as strong for grants (from Funding Table final.pdf)
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Legal Feasibility: Plan A	Legal feasibility - again, lay-person's opinion. YMMV. Mindful that we are confounding "difficulty" with "timing", I've focused my ratings on the "difficulty" side of the equation, rather than the timing side. So, I've rated both "in lieu" and "ASR" as "probable", though I believe it will take longer for the ASR stuff to resolve. For the various Plans B, I'm assuming new EIRs will be required, and that we can't start that process until we know that we need to pursue those projects.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Legal Feasibility: Plan A	I think it is going to be difficult to get legally enforceable commitments from our partner water districts that will result in reliable, enforceable rights to retrieve water from the aquifers in drought years which will likely be done at the expense of reductions by the districts own customer base. IPR is currently legal and the approval process does not appear challenging. The CA Dept of Water Resources is supposed to promulgate regulations for DPR in 2016. Once promulgated the legal rights issues will be minimal.
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Legal Feasibility: Plan A	do legal challenges to regulatory processes fit here or in the other criteria, i.e. regulatory feasibility?
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: I thought of them more separately rather than as a whole package.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: I thought of them more separately rather than as a whole package.
Charlie Keutman	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Essentially that the political, regulatory and administrative challenges would likely be diminished if several years down the road any given Plan A failed and wee had to begin implementation of Plan B. Every Plan A is dependent on our ability to recover stored water from either passive or active aquifer recharge. Since there is so much uncertainty regarding the geological ability to store water and the regulatory ability and timeline for extraction, it negatively influenced my confidence on several criteria ratings.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Following the assignment, I rated B as if it would happen AFTER A failed. I did that as we were instructed to. However, I don't want to offer a solutions set to Council that way. I prefer to have A & B & C & maybe D all implemented, some at the same time, some dynamically set to start either right away or as we observe aquifer levels, end of season Loch levels, dry water years, etc., changes in regulations, etc. I'm describing triggers, but not "head to tail" A fully pass/fail and THEN B, but rather A&B now, maybe C soon, maybe D pretty quickly thereafter. That's what I'm starting to prefer. Cost could challenge that approach, but that's where I am on the A vs. B; hope I've answered the correct question here.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Following the assignment, I rated B as if it would happen AFTER A failed. I did that as we were instructed to. However, I don't want to offer a solutions set to Council that way. I prefer to have A & B & C & maybe D all implemented, some at the same time, some dynamically set to start either right away or as we observe aquifer levels, end of season Loch levels, dry water years, etc., changes in regulations, etc. I'm describing triggers, but not "head to tail" A fully pass/fail and THEN B, but rather A&B now, maybe C soon, maybe D pretty quickly thereafter. That's what I'm starting to prefer. Cost could challenge that approach, but that's where I am on the A vs. B; hope I've answered the correct question here.
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: A v B weightings - I believe I outlined this in my comments on that page.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: I don't understand the distinction.
Sue Holt	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: I looked on Plan Bs as designed to be more fail-safe than Plan As.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Plan A relies on ASR in one form or another and while I would love to have ASR work as desired, it seems very risky and I don't want to spend lots of money trying to make it work. Accordingly, I want to spend a small amount of money/time to determine if ASR will work and what it will likely provide at what cost. So plan A doesn't necessarily need to be feasible but if it turns out to be not so good, Plan B must be a guaranteed solution with a short time to full production. Hopefully my weights reflect this philosophy.
Dana Jacobson	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: If A fails, money, and politcal considerations matter less while reliability and time matter more.
Sid Slatter	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: in my mind the Bs have less uncertainty than the As such I give more credibility to the B plans.
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Not sure what the question means exactly, but the plan As have many benefits with respect to the criteria but the Bs are the reliable solutions, so when you put the issues together the projects appear closer together than they might be in reality. mike
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Please tell us your philosophy in weighing A versus B criteria.	C5: Not sure what the question means exactly, but the plan As have many benefits with respect to the criteria but the Bs are the reliable solutions, so when you put the issues together the projects appear closer together than they might be in reality. mike
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Political Feasibility: Plan A	If plan A doesn't work plan B will be widely acceptable
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Political Feasibility: Plan A	IPR, DPR and Desal will all have public acceptance issues, all of which can be overcome over time as the public realizes the uncertainty of ASR and the need to have a supplemental supply plan that we know with certainty will work.
Greg Pepping	Alts Ratings	Political Feasibility: Plan A	As with many of the scale descriptions, the very helpful Google doc references do NOT match the scales on Decision Harvest site. I think they should. When they don't, it forces interpretation, and that ain't good.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Political Feasibility: Plan A	the dam in 1.1 will meet resistance
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Political Feasibility: Plan B	The best thing about the KK was thinking about the alternatives with others
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Regulatory Feasibility: Plan A	Regulatory Feasibility - For good or ill, you're getting a lay-person's opinion here. In-lieu - lay up. ASR - some work to do to ensure we comply with state regs. I/DPR - state regs need to be finalized Desal - lay up.
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Regulatory Feasibility: Plan A	everything in these profiles would require multiple years of CEQA process, so the lower end of the scale doesn't tell us much. But the scale could work much better on the other alts
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	I am getting more comfortable with the concept of a longer trigger when a drought proof solution is part of recharge
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	Trigger: sufficient time - The timings on many of these appear to be arbitrary (7 years; 11 years). Instead of something so arbitrary, we should set a Plan A timeframe that is based on (1) our overall timeframe for having a solution on line, and (2) our estimation of the timing to get Plan B up and running if/after Plan A fails to completely solve our problem. So, for example, if our goal is to have a solution up and running in 15 years, and we believe that it will take 5 years to get Plan B operational, once Plan A has failed, then we have 10 years to prove the feasibility of Plan A. I also note some confusion relating to some of the triggers. I see references to 7, 10 and 11 years in the triggers for Portfolios 3, 4.1, and 4.2. I have assumed that all of these should be 11 years. If that assumption is incorrect, then my ratings for 3, 4.1, and 4.2 should be "maybe" instead of "clearly". Coupled with my comments about the "clarity/flexibility" of the triggers, I've rated the in-lieu triggers higher than the ASR ones - ASR will take more work / more time to prove, and we will need that time.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	Concerned that in a continuing drought we may have limited winter flows to provide in lieu volume and the lack of rainfall will make it difficult to estimate natural aquifer recharge rates.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	Difficult for me as a novice to anticipate how much time will be necessary.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	The trigger times for Plan A to work in all cases are guesses. We have no information that is specific to these aquifers that enables us to determine how long it will take to see if ASR works or to what degree. NASA data suggests that aquifer recharge could take much longer, especially for aquifers of greater depth.
Erica Stanojevic	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	Ok I found the trigger info; please ignore my previous comment
Erica Stanojevic	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	I am having trouble finding the updated information on the triggers.
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	why are yield targets for triggers in In Lieu different than for ASR?
Dana Jacobson	Alts Ratings	Sufficient Time to Demonstrate Success: Trigger	trigger for 1.1 and 1.2 is a high bar. it requires a lot of water to be returneable early prior to aquifer recovery. not usre that's realistic
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Supply Diversity: Portfolio	Supply diversity - since this is a portfolio criterion (not a Plan A/B criterion), there is no meaningful difference among our portfolios. Also, while it's intellectually seductive, the notion that supply diversity necessarily equates to or improves supply reliability is false. Supply reliability is a factor of the actual supply sources chosen or developed, not a natural by-product of diversity for its own sake. (One could create a diverse portfolio of marginally-effective solutions, and be poorly off as a result.) All of this suggest to me that this criterion could be dropped (at least as regards my evaluation of the portfolios). I'll be interested to see how others approached this one.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Supply Diversity: Portfolio	When evaluating this criteria I assumed all portfolio elements will be implemented as needed i.e. Plan A and, if triggered, Plan B will be fully developed and implemented.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Supply Diversity: Portfolio	Plan B in portfolios 2, 3, 4.1 and 4.2 are the only plans that have a certainty of providing supplemental supply in extended droughts
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Drought proof or not...that is the question and the difference between resolve and very likely.
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Disregard previous comment
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Each plan would resolve the problem if it succeeded
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Supply reliability - ASR down-rated cf. in-lieu and the various Plans B due to uncertainties attendant on recovery of injected water. Those uncertainties are eminently resolvable in a reasonably timely manner, however.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	It's difficult to keep adaptive flexibility distinct from supply reliability, as both incorporate changes in climate, etc. I'd benefit from two concrete examples -- one that's adaptive but not reliable, and one that reliable but not adaptive.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	As all Plan B's result in a weather independent water supply, the supply reliability issue is resolved.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	My ratings for the ASR options assume ASR is not only feasible but works as desired.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	4.1 and 4.2 rated higher because of the introduction of new, weather independent water sources for accelerating recharge and the potential for extraction.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Continuing frustration with the common uncertainty of ASR projects limiting the ability to provide differential ratings thus diminishing the value of MCDS analysis.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Supply Reliability: Plan A	Ratings for Plan A are based upon the assumption that ASR will work at some, but not all, locations and/or due to difficulty in reaching agreements with partner agencies, it will not provide the full 3 billion gallons of storage needed. Plan B portfolios 1.1 and 1.2 reflect limited storage capacity of Loch Lomond.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Technical Feasibility: Plan A	Tech Feasibility - DW Desal down-rated here due to the greater number of moving parts involved (JPA; data center; long pipeline to construct; third-party managing the construction). Also, the published timelines (2017!!!) are sufficiently unrealistic to raise concerns about management's suitability for this project.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Technical Feasibility: Plan A	Tech Feasibility - In-lieu has to be considered a given with respect to feasibility; it was foundational to S(2)CWD desal strategy, and we are already seeing the aquifers begin to stabilize under recent pumping-reduction regimes. ASR trickier, but the path to proving it seems straightforward. All of the water-manufacturing approaches are similar and technically proven; they therefore make good "fallbacks".
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Technical Feasibility: Plan A	All Plan A ASR options share the common uncertainty of complete success under local geologic conditions. Procedural point: The rating scales in the support documents from the notebook should reflect the options in the MCDS model for all criteria.
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	Deep Water estimates suggest 7 year roll out
David Stearns	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	The extra draw down from the Loch could accelerate the time it takes to discern efficacy. (1.1 compared to 1.2)
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	Time to Tech Feas - Generally, I don't believe that anything much can happen in < 2 years. That said, in-lieu will show promise (and even have the ability to return at least some water) in that time frame. Also, DW Desal, as a Plan B option, presuming that the project is moving forward "around" us, will be "flip a switch" easy to move to. Everything else is in that 2++ year window.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	I am curious why Portfolios 4.1 and 4.2 have longer trigger periods (11 years vs. 7 years for #2 or #3) when some form of Desal will provide accelerated recharge rates.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	I am curious why Portfolios 4.1 and 4.2 have longer trigger periods (11 years vs. 7 years for #2 or #3) when some form of Desal will provide accelerated recharge rates.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility: Plan A	Time analysis for all Plan A's is confused by the lumping together of the two aquifers. SV and SqCrk aquifers are vastly different. SqCrk aquifer is vastly different within itself.
Doug Engfer	Alts Ratings	Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	Time to full scale - I'm assuming that we are reasonably motivated to implement each Component, and have not arbitrarily extended any of the time-frames. Conversely, again, all of the Plan B items, given the circumstances, are well-situated to be up and running quickly, if needed - A Good Thing.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Alts Ratings	Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	Seems to me the time to full scale production once all permits are obtained for all ASR options (whether in-lieu or active injection) could be quite lengthy as I am assuming one would have to put a fair amount of water into the aquifer before one takes any out of the aquifer. I opine the delay between permits and first water out will be 5 years or more depending on our ability to reliably deposit water into the aquifer. Assuming, due to drought, we will only be able to make our desired deposits 5 out of every 7 years, it seems reasonable to assume it will be at least 5 to 10 years before we can make substantial withdrawals of water and could easily be 10-15 years when considering that we may make some withdrawals during the 5-10 year initial window. Accordingly, I figured 10-15 years to full scale production for all ASR options.
Charlie Keutman	Alts Ratings	Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	Low to moderate confidence based on limited info in Table 24 of portfolio updates. The table seems to underestimate the in-lieu timeline for full production given the uncertainty of aquifer recharge rates under passive or active recharge.
David Baskin	Alts Ratings	Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	Again the inclusion of both aquifers lumped together for rating hurts the rating. SV likely a quicker timeline to determine if it works than SqCrk because of size and less diversity of geology.
Sue Holt	Alts Ratings	Time to Full Scale Production: Plan A	hard to know how many years to full scale production
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Yes some of the costs but since this is lower on my weights scale I just input the numbers we were given.
Charlie Keutman	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: I found regulatory feasibility difficult to rate with any confidence. Several others were frustrating because I felt staff or the technical team was far better qualified to provide default rating values that could be changed or challenged with the comment function if so desired. Those criteria are: Time required to demonstrate technical feasibility Time required to full scale production Energy profile Cost metrics
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Time Req'd to Full Scale & Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility were a bit challenging to sort out from one another. Regulatory & Admin were challenging.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Time Req'd to Full Scale & Time to Demonstrate Tech Feasibility were a bit challenging to sort out from one another. Regulatory & Admin were challenging.
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Criteria hard to rate - Costs were so confounded by bad data that it was nearly impossible to do good work. Regulatory and Legal feasibility should have been provided to us. Outside funding available data was inconsistent with the rating scale provided.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: The triggers. I thought they were ambiguous. Energy comparison. The information on energy was unclear. Cost. Having some plan b's be totally independent of plan a and other had part of plan b in plan a. Made it like comparing apples and oranges.
Sue Holt	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Yes, adaptive flexibility vs. supply reliability.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Trigger: Avoiding unnecessary negative consequences. The main criteria for triggers should be demonstrated performance. The focus of this criterion on a time frame misses this. The criteria about time required for demonstrated feasibility and time for full scale production need more discussion regarding their level of importance. Admin feasibility criterion needs a better scale---or maybe should not be included.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Trigger: Avoiding unnecessary negative consequences. The main criteria for triggers should be demonstrated performance. The focus of this criterion on a time frame misses this. The criteria about time required for demonstrated feasibility and time for full scale production need more discussion regarding their level of importance. Admin feasibility criterion needs a better scale---or maybe should not be included.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: Yes - Energy profile as the tabled values seemed internally inconsistent and I could not seem to make much "sense" of them. Cost metrics - SCWD2 desal figures did not appear to take into account the 59/41 cost sharing agreement nor the fact O&M costs would only be incurred when the SQWD2 desal plant was delivering water to SCWD. Grant/loan potential - just couldn't really find much guidance on evaluating one portfolio against the others in this regard.
Dana Jacobson	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: flexible trigger. there were so many decision points along the way . environmental profile required trade-offs and how do you decide between positive impacts such as water in creeks for fish and negative impacts such as energy use.
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: cost was difficult because of a lack of confidence in the estimates.
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Were there any criteria you found particularly hard to rate?	C0: cost was difficult because of a lack of confidence in the estimates.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Yes. The first ones since there are many different parts in the costs and description that really aren't necessarily pertinent to the project.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Yes. The first ones since there are many different parts in the costs and description that really aren't necessarily pertinent to the project.
Charlie Keutman	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Portfolio 4.1 consisted of two major areas of uncertainty with ASR and DW Desal. There are so many unknowns related to inter-agency cooperation, land acquisition, regulatory issues, legal issues and time to full scale production.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Not necessarily. I think #2 may have confused me a bit.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Not necessarily. I think #2 may have confused me a bit.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Portfolios hard to rate - no.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: The portfolio with raising Loch Lomond was confusing because it was unclear to what extent that made a performance distinction.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Portfolio 1 included too many non-essential capital improvements to afford a meaningful rating of cost. Yield information is still out of synch with the County report. The timeline information for ASR seemed out of synch with the Pueblo report.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: Portfolio 1 included too many non-essential capital improvements to afford a meaningful rating of cost. Yield information is still out of synch with the County report. The timeline information for ASR seemed out of synch with the Pueblo report.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: No - they all seemed difficult in some way or another. Portfolio 3 seemed a bit weird as the addition of the sea water barrier didn't seem to add much value to plan A
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: It was harder to rate some of the portfolios that elements of B (recycled water or desal water in the plan A because of the conflation of the issues.
Mike Rotkin	Exit Survey	Were there any Portfolios that were particularly hard to rate?	C1: It was harder to rate some of the portfolios that elements of B (recycled water or desal water in the plan A because of the conflation of the issues.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Yes. IN-lieu recharge without all the extra pieces.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Yes. IN-lieu recharge without all the extra pieces.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Maybe Hansen Quarry info. ASR certainty, which we do not have, so not much to be done about that. Perhaps a bit more explanation in that update memo about why Ranneys aren't of use any more.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Maybe Hansen Quarry info. ASR certainty, which we do not have, so not much to be done about that. Perhaps a bit more explanation in that update memo about why Ranneys aren't of use any more.
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Missing pieces: Quarry (Hanson or Olympia, most likely) as an alternative to raising the Newell Creek dam (which will never happen). Presuming that a quarry (or higher dam) would get us 250 MG, then it would be interesting to do some sensitivity analysis around a 250MG lower-limit draw-down on LL (rather than 500MG), to see what we get from that in worst-year productivity.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: There were lots of unknowns that presented risks of failure that were not identified. For ASR the Hansen Quarry is under private ownership and not subject to eminent domain. We will have to make deals with our regional partners that will present challenges. The impact of the new law on forming groundwater basin management plans on the timeline for ASR was not considered. The impact of SCWD pulling out of the desal plan with SqCWD on the ability of regional partners to trust us was not considered.
Sue Holt	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: A richer version of conservation, one that is simultaneously cheaper, would have been valuable.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Passive recharge. Conservation beyond Program C.
Rick Longinotti	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Passive recharge. Conservation beyond Program C.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: Seems a piece that included the Hanson quarry in the mix would have been helpful.
Dana Jacobson	Exit Survey	Were there any solution pieces that were missing?	C3: there are no alts or portfolios relating to land use planning, building regulations, stormwater management, nor are there any policy focused solutions such as seeking legislation to change regulatory requirements
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: Many of the Plan As are really similar.
Sarah Mansergh	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: Many of the Plan As are really similar.
Charlie Keutman	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: 1.1 and 1.2 with exception of raising the dam.

Token/UserName	Web_Page	Criterion/Exit_Question	Comment
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: No, the differences were sufficiently distinct.
Greg Pepping	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: No, the differences were sufficiently distinct.
Doug Engfer	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: Portfolios the same - no.
David Baskin	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: The portfolios with ASR with injection were quite similar. The portfolios with the different desals were quite similar.
Mark Mesiti-Miller	Exit Survey	Were there one or more Portfolios that seemed essentially the same?	C2: 1.1 and 1.2 4.1 and 4.2
Charlie Keutman	WP_Exit0		One last thought. The WSAC has been charged with using a fact based process to make recommendations for a reliable water supply, and yet, while rating criteria we are given the leeway to offer our bias, opinion or interpretation. For quantifiable ratings I think we should depend on economists, engineers and other professionals to do the analysis and provide objective, fact based responses. The appropriate place for opinions is in the weights.
David Stearns	Weights Profile		Yes - plans matter most followed by triggers
David Stearns	Weights		Pursuing grants and low interest loans will affect decision making but if plan A fails then cost will be less important bc we'll be in dire need of water. Prog D-rec + drought proof supply
David Stearns	Weights		Env Profile: The Plan As tends to be the more "enviro friendly" options but if they don't work then the decision making parameters change
David Stearns	Weights		Vast majority of my plan B weights are higher assuming Plan A fails and climate experts still aren't anticipating a wetter future. Everything will be even more critical and urgent.
Doug Engfer	Welcome		My general comment is that this is _really_ hard work (in both a good and a bad way) when flying solo. I really regret having missed the opportunity to socialize this stuff with other Committee members. With material this dense, the old "none of us is as smart as all of us" saying really applies. Trudge, trudge, trudge.
Doug Engfer	Weights Profile		Weights - So, what I mean to say is that I would rather see how the A-relevant weights combine into a Plan A evaluation, and the B-relevant weights combine into a Plan B evaluation.
Doug Engfer	Weights Profile		Weights - Seems to me that "flattening" the weights so that they are all evaluated against one another is an intellectual fallacy. Rather, the "A" weights should stand alone, as should the "B" weights. The fact that I am more concerned about the technical feasibility of my Plan B (that is, I'm more willing to incur a bit of technical / time risk during my Plan A proving period) does not mean that my Plan B Technical Feasibility is the most important criterion to evaluating a portfolio. This "flattening" is forcing me to re-jigger my weights.
David Baskin	See Why		I don't understand how to read these graphs for comparison purposes to determine how the portfolios stack up. To me portfolio 2 presents the best alternative of those presented, particularly if A and B are pursued simultaneously, as it has the lowest portfolio and/or A/B capital cost and lowest A/B annualized unit cost per MG. Among the portfolios presented it represents the lowest cost alternative for exploring whether ASR will work for the long term while providing the lowest cost and most environmentally superior option for having an additional supply alternative that is drought proof.
David Baskin	Weights Profile		Lumping Plan A and Plan B together for purposes of this analysis is inappropriate. We need to see the two plans criteria and weights evaluated separately.
Sue Holt	Welcome		ASR is technically completely feasible -- as long as you're willing to pay for what it takes to make it work
Sarah Mansergh	Weights		Environmental Profile for me includes-effects on the marine environment (water, larvae and plankton removal, discharge effects); water quality effects (increases or decreases pollutants in the environment and effect on water suitability for biological health); returns natural processes (increase flows, provides habitat, stops fighting nature)
Mike Rotkin	Weights		I weighed energy low because I don't care about it except as I rate its impact on cost and environment (which we rate separately). Non carbon sourced energy is not an environmental issue for me, but it is a cost issue.
Mike Rotkin	Weights		I weighed energy low because I don't care about it except as I rate its impact on cost and environment (which we rate separately). Non carbon sourced energy is not an environmental issue for me, but it is a cost issue.
Erica Stanojevic	Weights		Energy matters if it is from a non-renewable, nasty energy source. It is much less important if we source a sustainable, less polluting source.
Sue Holt	Weights		"Legal Feasibility: Plan A When considering a Plan B that 'would' start after a trigger, clock the feasibility from the time that Plan B actually begins" Huh? What does this mean? How can weights differ between A and B if this statement links them so closely?
Sue Holt	Weights		"For help with the weighing, see "Suggestions about Inputting your Weights" in the Notebook" So where is the link to the Notebook?