

## Water Supply Advisory Committee

Meeting June 26 – June 27, 2014

Fellowship Hall, Peace United Church of Christ

### 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 co-facilitators will to the best of their abilities note these qualifiers. Where the co-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 co-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 co-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 meeting Summary captioned "Post Script".*

\*\*\*\*\*

This meeting consisted of two consecutive daily sessions. The first lasted 4½ hours, the second last 4 hours. Here is a list of the members of the Committee. All members attended both sessions except as specified

Peter Beckmann, David Green Baskin, Dana Jacobson, Charlie Keutmann, Rick Longinotti, Sarah Mansergh, Rosemary Menard, Mark Mesiti-Miller, Mike Rotkin, Sid Slatter, Erica Stanojevic, Doug Engfer (Attended the first session electronically. Absent from the second session), Greg Pepping (Attended the first session electronically. Absent from the second session), Sue Holt (Absent from both sessions), David Stearns (Absent from both sessions).

## **First Session, Thursday June 26**

### **Public Comment**

- Studies of Santa Cruz's water supply that have been conducted in the past should be easily available while the Committee carries out its work, but appear to be unavailable.

### **Committee member updates**

Members provided the following news of significant communication between them and organizations with significant interest in the development of water policy in Santa Cruz:

Rick announced that Desal Alternatives will hold a meeting on July 18 from 7:00 to 8:30 describing conservation lessons learned in Australia.

### **Agenda Review**

The Committee agreed to move the agenda item "Presenters and Subcontractors" from the first session to the second session and to move the item "Report to the Council and Correspondence from the Community" from the second session to the first.

### **Summary Review**

The Summary of the May meetings was approved with an amendment proposed by Doug.

## **Website and Curated History**

Sarah provided an update of the work of the Website Subcommittee. She expects the Committee's website to be up and running by the end of July. She will provide Committee Members with a link to visit the site during construction.

The Committee reviewed the timeline that is included in the website and raised the following points:

- Some items in the timeline appear to be editorial rather than simply factual and seem out of place in a factual document
- The use of pie charts would effectively illustrate changes to the source of supply over time
- The timeline should specify when the Zayante dam project was considered
- The timeline should include the fisheries HCP
- The timeline does not include every possible relevant document. The website should include a comprehensive catalog of documents. Perhaps there should be a list of relevant documents attached to each period on the timeline.
- Committee Members should review the timeline and tell the Subcommittee of any documents that they believe need to be included.

## **Report to the Council and correspondence from the community**

Mike reported that the Committee's report to the Council was considered at its meeting on June 24. The Council approved it unanimously without much discussion and expressed appreciation for the work that the Committee is doing.

Nicholas reported on requests received for Committee meetings to be held in Live Oak. The committee agreed by consensus to hold at least one meeting in Live Oak.

## Water supply and water demand in Santa Cruz

Rosemary made a presentation about water supply and demand. The Committee agreed by consensus to take on the evolution of these presentation materials as one of its tasks and to get help from Stratus to do this. In this way the presentation materials will become a more useful document that can be used as a source for information during the Committee's work. Rosemary invited Committee Members to send her questions about this document after the meeting.

Facilitator's note: even during the meeting the document was changed, so users of it should be sure that they are using the latest version. You will find the latest version at the following page:

<http://www.cityofsantacruz.com/index.aspx?page=2065>

Scroll to the bottom of the page and click on "Water Supply and Demand Overview."

During the presentation the following questions were raised.

Facilitator's note: Most of these questions will form the starting point for questions to be given to Stratus to provide the Committee with the information needed to improve the document. Committee members may also submit questions to Rosemary by July 7<sup>th</sup> to be included in this round of Stratus work. Be assured, review of this document will be an ongoing activity for the Committee for several months; there will be other opportunities to raise issues about this.

- Can the Committee obtain details from Stratus about the key factors such as the assumptions that are used in the determination of when Loch Lomond will be used?
- Would the City provide parameters of the models used for fish flows such as DFG 5?
- What information is available about increasing incidence of drought resulting from climate change?
- Why does the water in Loch Lomond contain more organic carbon than other sources?
- Storage capacity for treated water has been reduced. Should the Committee consider needs for this storage capacity too?
- Do water users grow accustomed to raised prices and revert to increased water use?

- What is the status of the long-term water conservation plan?
- What can we do to reduce summer water use?
- How could non-residential users pay graduated rates?
- Could we adopt a water-neutral development policy so that developers pay fees to offset the cost of additional water demand?
- Can savings produced by conservation be applied to reduce over-all water consumption rather than to facilitate additional development and increase the number of residents?
- Why does the list of conservation ideas not include the reduction of outdoor water use?
- How does current actual water use compare to the representational data for water demand shown on the early graphs in the presentation?
- How was the water usage survey conducted, and what do we know about the surveyed accounts?

### **Understanding the elements of a decision**

Committee members were joined by members of the public to play a serious game designed to facilitate exploration of the meaning and significance of terms such as Scenario, Alternative and Criterion and the ways that these can fit together in the decision making process.

### **Multi Criteria Decision Support**

Carie made a presentation about MCDS and led a discussion about its use by the Committee. No decision was reached about using MCDS but the Committee was interested in seeing the model work on simplified WSAC issues at its next meeting.

## Independent Review Panel

Committee members considered the paper prepared by Rosemary with input from some other Committee members describing a possible approach to the creation of the IRP and the RFQ also prepared by Rosemary.

The Committee discussed the section describing the required experience and developed alternative wording that emphasized experience commensurate with the experience of the experts whose work they would be reviewing, rather than specifying a number of years' experience.

The Committee also developed wording to make it explicit that the IRP will review information received from staff not just from its technical support team.

The Committee clarified that there was no disagreement about the section of the paper dealing with the scope of the IRP's work, so the IRP's scope of work will not include review of the Committee's work plan.

The Committee agreed by consensus to the paper prepared by Rosemary as amended.

The Committee also agreed by consensus to the formation of an IRP Selection Subcommittee as follows:

- Charge: review IRP applicants and make recommendations to staff
- Duration: short-term
- Members: Sarah, Rick, David B

## Written Evaluation and Wrap Up

Nicholas asked all participants (Committee members and members of the public) to complete evaluation forms and hand them in.

Six participants contributed to the evaluation survey at SurveyMonkey.

- Most reported that the meeting met their needs excellently or satisfactorily. Particular appreciation was reported for Rosemary's presentation on Water Supply and Water Demand.
- Most reported that the meeting was going in the right direction, was a step in the right direction or was fundamentally useful toward achieving the Committee's long-term goal. Specific appreciation was reported for the game about elements of decision-making.
- Regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the meeting, several participants reported dissatisfaction with the microphone set-up, but some appreciated the

substance of the meeting. Some expressed concern about poor time-management and the length of the meeting although others appreciated its pace.

- All respondents rated the meeting as Above Average, Good or Great.
- Requests for future meetings included requests for presentations of former studies, requests for more opportunities to move around during the long meeting, requests for a wider selection of juices and requests for better microphones and a resolution of technical problems.

## **Second Session, Friday June 27**

### **Public Comment**

The Committee agreed to allow the following public comment about an item not on the agenda:

- The Committee should hold at least two of its meetings in Live Oak.

### **Committee correspondence with the public**

Members asked for an opportunity to discuss the correspondence received from the public because this had not been described fully at the first session. The Committee discussed the exchange of correspondence between Bill Tysseling and Rick. They discussed the tensions that exists in a collaborative organization such as this Committee between expressing personal opinions or advocating specific positions and supporting an environment that will lead to consensus building. Several members spoke up to support the importance of expressing personal opinions, some described the importance of some self-censorship when necessary to support the Committee's capacity to build consensus, some explained the importance of subordinating personal anecdotes to the available scientific data so that the Committee's work will be built on a more substantive basis. Members recognized that they must live with the conflict between the urge to share or participate in ongoing correspondences and the need to limit or avoid such correspondence in compliance with the Brown Act or to resist indulging in off-topic discussions during meetings that distract from the current work of the Committee.

## **Presenters and Subcontractors**

The Committee considered whom to recommend for selection as the consultant to provide confluence modeling. All agreed to the quality of Fiske's expertise and agreed by consensus to recommend to the City that Fiske & Associates should be a subcontractor to Stratus to provide confluence modeling.

The Committee considered whom to propose as presenter at the July meeting. They decided to wait until discussion of the July and August agendas later in the session to finalize this, but recognized that John Ricker and Terry Tompkins would be suitable presenters.

## **Scenarios**

Carie led a discussion of the use of scenarios in the Committee's work during Recon. The Committee agreed in concept that using scenarios to handle massive uncertainty is a worthwhile approach. The Committee agreed to ask Stratus to prepare some preliminary materials describing various scenario points

## **Outreach**

The Committee discussed the City's outreach plans and the need for a strong outreach effort so that the community understands the work that the Committee is carrying out and is not surprised by any outcome next year.

The Committee agreed by consensus to create a Recon Outreach Subcommittee as follows:

- Charge: help the public to understand the full complexity of Santa Cruz's water issues by, among other things,
  - monitoring management of the website,
  - informing the public about the activities of the Committee and the agenda of meetings
  - highlighting interesting presenters
  - taking every opportunity to invite public participation at Committee meetings.
- Duration: through the end of Recon



- Members: Charlie, Peter, Erica
- External communication: Communicate with the broadest possible spectrum of the community. Report on the work of the Committee rather than engaging in debate on behalf of the Committee. Invite the community to participate in meetings.

## **Strategies and Alternatives Convention**

The Committee discussed the paper prepared by Rosemary describing the SAC. Members discussed the value of inviting everyone with an interest in this issue to provide a comprehensive list of alternatives to ensure that all who are interested will recognize that their ideas have been appropriately considered. Members also discussed the value of clearly stipulating criteria to ensure that all participants are aware of the major concerns of the Committee and that the Committee will have bases on which to evaluate the proposed alternatives. At least for the first phase, very few constraints will be put on the submissions, but in the second phase the Committee may ask the applicants to consider certain criteria or other limiting issues. Members felt that participants should be able to submit alternatives without having to use the web if they prefer not to. They also noted that the invitation should make it clear that this convention solicits ideas for water conservation as well as for water supply.

The Committee agreed by consensus to create the SAC Subcommittee as follows:

- Charge: work with staff to implement the SAC concept paper with the addition of a non-web method of submitting entries and the explicit inclusion of any alternatives that resolve the problem including conservation, supply and system management alternatives. This includes preparing and issuing the invitation for submission of alternatives.
- Duration: through September
- Members: Sarah and Sid

## **Agendas for July and August**

The Committee discussed the agenda for the next two meetings. They agreed that the Committee needs an opportunity to familiarize itself with those significant alternatives (approximately ten projects) that have already been extensively considered by the City. The Committee agreed to ask Stratus to prepare a presentation summarizing these projects and explaining why each was not implemented. It was agreed that this presentation would be supplemented by commentary from John Ricker, Terry Tompkins

and possibly other staff. In order to fit this into July's schedule the agenda will include less attention to the SAC and to the development of criteria.

The Committee also requested that the July agenda include a plan showing the meetings at which each presenter will appear.

### **Oral Communication**

- Appreciate the Committee's attention to public participation, and enjoyed listening to the Committee at work.

### **Written Evaluation and Wrap Up**

Nicholas asked all participants (Committee members and members of the public) to complete evaluation forms and hand them in.

Members noted that the Committee is now starting to work on the substantial subject matter of its task, is headed in the right direction, that its members are working well together and that they are showing a productive approach to collaboration.

Five participants contributed to the evaluation survey at SurveyMonkey.

- Most reported that the meeting met their needs at least "reasonably well". Others reported dissatisfaction because the location of the meeting was too far from Live Oak or because public comment about items not on the agenda was scheduled for the end of the meeting.
- Most respondents reported that the meeting helped the Committee to work towards its long-term goal. Some reported that the meeting should have emphasized science instead of organizational issues.
- Respondents reported a good process with solid facilitation that permitted consideration and discussion about presentations. Others considered the facilitation to be too directive, constraining and unresponsive to public participants.
- Most respondents gave the meeting an overall rating of at least Average. Ratings were spread from "Poor" to "Could not have gone better."
- Recommendations for future meetings included requests for more discussions about water supply, improvements to the microphones, less direction from the facilitator and less discussion about organizational issues.