

Sue on Triggers

Comments on the triggers pdf

1. Portfolio 2, last bullet, some lines of text appear to be missing – should be similar to the last bullet on page 6?
2. Regarding property rights and rights of way, Portfolio 2 does not have a specified time limit, but Portfolios 3 & 4 do (4 years and 8 years). What is the rationale for this difference?
3. Portfolio 3's peer review panel info is lacking the final sentence of the other ASR plans – "If the peer review panel cannot make this determination..."
4. Portfolio 3, page 4, last bullet – why is there mention of a sea water barrier for Scotts Valley?

From Doug

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!