## Memorandum

**To:** Water Supply Advisory Committee Members

From: Karen Raucher, Stratus Consulting Inc.

**Date:** 9/19/2014

**Subject:** Evaluation Criteria Definitions – September Iteration

In this document we provide a clean copy of the Evaluation Criteria Definitions. This cleaned-up version is based on the Criteria developed by the Water Supply Advisory Committee (Committee) in August 2014 and the definitions and comments provided by Rosemary and Dana in late August and early September. Any suggested changes to the definitions are noted in italics. This iteration also includes a slightly different sorting of the Criteria into Sub-criteria in order to respond to the many comments concerning how the Criteria work together.

We look forward to the next round of discussions with the Committee in order to further refine the Criteria, Sub-criteria, and definitions.

|                                | From Rosemary and Dana   |
|--------------------------------|--|
|                                | (with suggested additions by Stratus Consulting in italics)  |
| <u>Criteria</u>                | Brief description  |
| Supply                         | Not really a criteria — big versus small is probably not a<br>sorting criteria — but this value is important to WSAC in<br>Alternatives to meet Demands in the different Scenarios   |
| Implementability               | Characteristic of a supply project that relates to the siting and environmental and regulatory review processes associated with a project.   |
| Technically feasible now       | Approaches, technologies and regulations guiding the development and operation of the supply project, particularly related to production, storage and treatment, are known and examples of their application elsewhere provide confidence that they could be applied here.           |
| Technically feasible in future | Approaches, technologies and regulations guiding the development and operation of the supply project, particularly related to storage and treatment, are not firmly established but are under development and likely to be available for implementation within no more than 5 years. |
| Permit/Legally feasible now    |  |
| Permit/Legally feasible in the |  |
| future                         |  |

| Criteria (with sug                               | From Rosemary and Dana ggested additions by Stratus Consulting in italics) |
|--|--|
|  |  |
| Citeria  | Brief description  |
| Fatal flaw What is th                            | e fatal flaw, is it still fatal and what could be done                     |
| to remove  | it   |
| Politically feasible                             |  |
| Effectiveness                                    |  |
| Reliability Characteri                           | stic of a supply project that relates to the                               |
| certainty c                                      | f project yield under a range of foreseeable and                           |
| unforesee  | able conditions. Reliability is mainly related to                          |
| hydrologic                                       | and/or hydrogeological conditions that are                                 |
| variable ov                                      | ver time and under various climatologic                                    |
| conditions                                       |  |
| Curtailments Scale inclu                         | des curtailment size, frequency and duration                               |
| Financial Costs and Benefits of Financial C      | haracteristics of each Alternative.  |
| Water  |  |
| Financial cost effectiveness – Cost This is a su | mmary value developed into a metric.                                       |
| per AF or MG water                               |  |
| Implementation cost Implement                    | tation costs are those required to get a project or                        |
| program u  | p and running.   |
| O & M costs Operating                            | costs are those that result from the day to day                            |
| operation  | of the project or program.   |
| Lifecycle cost Implement                         | tation, planning and O & M costs discounted over                           |
| the project                                      | t life time. This value is used to develop the                             |
| Financial c                                      | ost effectiveness value.   |
| <b>Environmental Well-being</b> This criteri     | on relates to the degree to which a water supply                           |
| or demand  | I management strategy contributes to or impacts                            |
| the quality                                      | and sustainability of the natural environment.                             |
| Sustainability Manages a                         | nd protects natural and water resources so that                            |
| they are su                                      | ustainable at the current level over time.                                 |
| Promote biodiversity and env'l Recognizes        | s and values the contributions that biodiversity                           |
| resilience and enviro                            | nmental resilience play in supporting human                                |
| activity and                                     | d takes steps to protect and enhance the                                   |
| environme  | ent's ability to produce and deliver these benefits.                       |
| Carbon costs Energy cor                          | nsumption and carbon footprint.  |
| Eco-system values Enhance th                     | ne community's ability and capacity to plan and                            |
| operate in                                       | a manner that is sustainable and protects the                              |
| natural en                                       | vironment.   |

| From Pocomary and Dana   |
|--|
| From Rosemary and Dana (with suggested additions by Stratus Consulting in italics) |
|  |
| Brief description  |
| Minimizes impacts on fishery resources and aquatic                                 |
| cosystems.   |
| Designed to minimize or appropriately mitigate the impacts                         |
| of water supply projects and operations on terrestrial                             |
| esources and ecosystems.   |
| ncompasses a range of social and community value issues                            |
| he look and feel of the community as it relates to the                             |
| vailability of and demand for water.   |
| Degree to which the availability of water supports or                              |
| onstrains the creation and sustainability of the local                             |
| economy.   |
| o the degree to which the availability of water supports or                        |
| onstrains the community's social and political stability.                          |
| wailability of water supports or constraints the University's                      |
| bility to create and sustain a level positive activity that                        |
| ontributes to and is supportive of the desired                                     |
| haracteristics of the larger community in Santa Cruz.                              |
| wailability of water supports or constrains the community's                        |
| bility to grow in ways that are established by, for example,                       |
| he City's General Plan.  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| Modified by the large scale elimination of plantings and                           |
| andscaping requiring irrigation during the dry season.                             |
| lightly different than carbon footprint.   |
| laced in Implementability – but could be inserted here                             |
| nstead.  |
| he degree to which water cost increases make water less                            |
| vailable to those with lower incomes or require a                                  |
| lisproportionate amount of a household's income to pay                             |
| or water service.  |
| addresses the degree to which the Alternative affects public                       |
|  |
| ealth. Protection of public health – includes air quality                          |
|  |

|                                  | From Rosemary and Dana  |
|----------------------------------|---|
|                                  | (with suggested additions by Stratus Consulting in italics)     |
| <u>Criteria</u>                  | Brief description   |
| Allows for growth                | The degree to which the availability of water supports or       |
|                                  | constrains the community's ability to grow in ways that are     |
|                                  | established by, for example, the City's General Plan.           |
| Pride in the community's water   | Degree to which the selected strategy would align with the      |
| strategy                         | community's desire to be a leader and to look at issues and     |
|                                  | adopt solutions.  |
| Adaptability                     | Characteristic of a supply project that relates to how well     |
|                                  | the approach can be modified over time to respond to            |
|                                  | changing conditions.  |
| Resilience                       | Ability to effectively operate under a range of foreseeable     |
|                                  | and unforeseeable conditions.                                   |
| Scalable                         | Flexibility to add capacity increments over time (scalability), |
|                                  | or treat water from a variety of sources with different         |
|                                  | quality, would be examples of adaptability.                     |
| Preserves future choices         | Saves options that may be needed if the future looks            |
|                                  | different that the one projected.                               |
| Demand                           | Not really a criteria but this value is important to WSAC in    |
|                                  | developing <u>portfolios</u> of Alternatives to meet Demands in |
|                                  | the different Scenarios.  |
| <b>Supply Demand Alignment</b>   | Supply = Demand ( S mg/y = D mg/y) (D is defined in each        |
|                                  | scenario)   |
|                                  | D = garden needs + baseline                                     |
| Demand-enhanced traditional      | D = non-landscape needs + baseline                              |
| (best-case)                      |   |
|                                  | D = landscape needs + baseline                                  |
|                                  | D = parks & recreation + baseline                               |
| Demand – fish and regulatory     | ·   |
| Demand – sustainable Santa Cruz  |   |
|                                  | The need for the supply to be reliable                          |
|                                  | D = Water for the economy + baseline                            |
| growth as defined in City Vision |   |