### **AGENDA**

# WSAC Agreement Development Subcommittee Friday, July 31, 2015 9 to 10:30 am Santa Cruz Water Department

## NOTES OF MEETING IN BOLD

# Meeting Desired Outcomes:

- Agreement about holding an open house/public meeting on September 9, and discussion and agreement on how to engage WSAC members in planning for and participating in the session;
- Update on the status of the portfolio development work, including identifying and resolving any issues that may affect the planning for the August 13-14 meeting;
- Review and input on the preliminary draft flow agenda for the August 13-14 meeting
- Discussion and agreement on how to proceed with developing the WSAC Agreements and Recommendations document;
- Discussion and agreement on an approach to pulling together past WSAC agreements so that we make sure that the Agreements and Recommendations document accurately reflects the Committees work.

# Agenda:

- 1. Discussion about a potential Open House/Public meeting on WSAC work on Wednesday, September 9, 2015
  - Louden-Nelson; 5-7 open-house then 45-60 minutes for Q&A followed by public comment period.
  - Opportunity to reach out to community before the agreement is fully baked.
  - This needs to be an event hosted by the Cttee.
  - Purpose is to educate the Ctty by exposing our work to a broader section of community.
  - Might attract different people from the normal ones who come. Mailer to every resident in service area.
  - It precedes the Sept Cttee mtg so there will still be time to fold any significant outcomes from this meeting into the Cttee's recommendation.

- How to communicate the complexity of this issue? The mailer plus the
  opportunity to speak with Cttee Mbrs. Perhaps an exercise that invites
  selection of solutions and explains the risks. Or a "yellow brick road" showing
  how all issues have been discussed and the range of alternatives has narrowed,
  and the complexity of the journey down that road.
- Consensus to recommend that the Cttee will host this Ctty meeting on Sep 9.
- 2. Status report on portfolio development work
  - Appreciation for the Tech Team's responsiveness
  - Identification of interests satisfied by the proposed portfolio, and the extent to which they've satisfied them: this will be helpful
  - Erica will meet with SCDA people to see what they want to see and will present a proposal based on that.
  - Rick does not consider his work with Mark et al. as solely SCDA's proposal but
    he does represent SCDA and communicates with them regularly so his work
    does reflect their position. A concern was raised as to whether there would be
    an overlap of input and portfolio development with both Erica and Rick
    advancing SCDA's interests. The subcommittee was not concerned about this.
- 3. Preliminary draft of the flow agenda for the August 13-14 meeting
  - Performance measures: It was suggested that Andy Fisher and John Ricker should be in the conversation about performance measures as related to inlieu and ASR. Need to know about when performance is failing AND when it is succeeding
  - Adaptive Management strategy: how do we create a policy that has the right balance between certainty and flexibility? RM says: state a fairly exact recommendation as well as a policy framework that will guide the implementation if things don't go entirely as expected. It was discussed that our Adaptive Management Strategy has to have sufficient flexibility to change as information and circumstances change over time.
  - Add reference to Sept 9 meeting to agenda.
- 4. Populating the WSAC Agreement strategy for getting under way with the document (see attached)
  - Agreed that RM should start populating the agreement framework as described below

- 5. Pulling together the list of past agreements, e.g., the demand forecast
  - Clark will review Action Agendas to identify them and reference when they
    were agreed. The items of past agreement will include a reference to the
    Action Agenda where reported and be sent out to subcommittee members for
    review.



Outline of WSAC Agreement

		Outline of WSAC Agreement	
		Section	Status
		nittee Letter to Council Conveying Recommendations	
		tive Summary and Recommendations	Not Started
III. P	ream	ble	Rosemary is
	a.	Committee Charge	going to take a
	b.	Overview of Committee Process	crack at pulling
	c.	General Background (providing references to other	together
		documents and processes)	information
IV. A	Agreei	ments	from work
	a.	Problem Statement(s)	products you've
		i. Water Supply Reliability without Fishery or	already seen
		Climate Change	(the Recon
		ii. Impacts of Fishery issues	Report, the June
		iii. Impacts of Climate Change	23 <sup>rd</sup> joint
		iv. Agreed Upon Problem Statement	meeting) to
	b.	Alternatives Identified Evaluated	begin
		i. Generating Alternatives	populating this
		ii. Evaluating Alternatives	part of the
		1. Alternatives Evaluated	document. All
			content will be
			subject to
			review and
			agreement by
	_		the Committee
		2. Alternatives that Proved Technically	
		Infeasible Based on Available	developed
		Information and Analysis – Retain for Possible Future Consideration but No.	
		Viable at the Time	Action on this
			topic at its
		3. Evaluation Criteria	August meeting
		4. Application of Evaluation Criteria –	Rosemary will
		* *	provide first draft based on
		priority criteria, less important criter	work done to
		iii. Scenario Planning and Portfolio Building	date
		iv. Risks and Uncertainties Associated with	Will be
	developed		
		Various Alternatives	following
			further
			Committee
			discussion and
			action on this
			topic (and/or
			the topic will be

		revised or
		deleted as
		needed)
c.	Agreement on solution (approach, content, to be	Will be
	reflected as pull outs that move into the consolidated	developed
	recommendations)	based on further
		Committee
		work
d.	Strategies for Dealing with Risks and Uncertainties	Will be
		developed
		based on further
		Committee
		work
V. Recor	nmendations	Will be
V. Recor	nmendations What	Will be developed
		developed following
	What	developed
	What  i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D)	developed following further Committee
	<ul><li>i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D)</li><li>ii. Performance Measurements/performance</li></ul>	developed following further Committee discussion and
	<ul> <li>What</li> <li>i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D)</li> <li>ii. Performance Measurements/performance requirements (triggers)</li> </ul>	developed following further Committee discussion and action on this
a.	What  i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D)  ii. Performance Measurements/performance requirements (triggers)  iii. Policy direction	developed following further Committee discussion and action on this topic (and/or
a.	i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D) ii. Performance Measurements/performance requirements (triggers) iii. Policy direction How/When/Who	developed following further Committee discussion and action on this topic (and/or the topics will
a.	i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D) ii. Performance Measurements/performance requirements (triggers) iii. Policy direction How/When/Who i. Risk Management Strategy	developed following further Committee discussion and action on this topic (and/or the topics will be revised or
a.	i. Portfolio elements (Plan A and Plan B, C, D)  ii. Performance Measurements/performance requirements (triggers)  iii. Policy direction  How/When/Who  i. Risk Management Strategy  ii. Financing Strategy	developed following further Committee discussion and action on this topic (and/or the topics will