

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

**Attendees:** Rosemary, Doug, Nicholas, Bill F (phone), Rick, Sid, Heidi, Erica, Sarah, David B, Mark, Bob R (Phone)

**Apologies:**

Meeting Desired Outcomes:

- Discussion of, and agreement on focus and approach for next two WSAC meeting
- Review and discussion of example agreements – with a focus on how various other groups have dealt with uncertainties, contingencies, and the need for adaptive management.
- Initial discussion of conceptual framework for triggers
- Discussion and resolution of any issues related to protocols
- **Additional items**
  - **QA procedures (covered in Protocol section)**

1) Review draft agenda for July 23-24 meeting and preliminary plan for August meeting:

- a) Early MCDS results
- b) WSAC portfolios for August Meeting
- c) Study Group Sessions
- d) Status of and Plan for Information on Portfolio Building Blocks

- **Rosemary walked through the proposed agenda**
  - **Mitchell presentation**
  - **Demand management approach (substantial report incorporating CAs, Tech Team work, and sub-committee work)**
  - **MCDS and Agreement Framework discussions (focus of the meetings)**
  - **Public comment clarifications**
- **Discussion of July agenda and related items**
  - **MCDS**
    - **Opportunity for individual Q&A with Carie, in order to get any needed clarifications? Email based?**

- Rosemary offered to host some in-person meetings at SCWD, in small groups.
- Electronic distribution later today to full Cmte
- David commented on a number of things:
  - The portfolios differed in structure: some were clearly serialized between Plan A & B; others were more parallel in structure. Cmte needs to have an opportunity to discuss these structures.
  - We had discussed previously creating an opportunity for individual Cmte members to create portfolios, as a tool to look for real convergence / emerging consensus.
  - Need for discussion of risk tolerance at Cmte.
  - Need for clarity in budgeting estimates and any changes,
- Rick observed that the Technical Team needs to report out with answers to questions that have been presented.
- Discussion of when to take public comment, given that the discussion spans 2 days.
- Rosemary talked about analyzing and reporting on the Comments.
  - She will distribute a summary as well as individual comments sorted topically.
- Time allocation for MCDS discussion & Framework discussion
  - Can we use the Framework as a tool to particularize the MCDS discussion in a meaningful way to identify and resolve areas of agreement and disagreement?
  - Move Framework introduction earlier on Friday, to structure and frame the MCDS discussion on that day.
  - Mark suggested that the Tech Team consider building a Straw Framework for the Cmte to consider, discuss, build upon, etc.
  - Carie will provide some focused attention on areas where our ratings / weights most differ (as a means to move the conversation).
- Discussion of how to handle and manage public comments.
  - Individuals limited to x minutes (2 or 3), depending upon total comment time allocated and number of speakers
  - In general, comments will be received during Committee discussion (sequence: Committee discussion, Public Comment, Wrap-up committee discussion)

- **Consideration of whether there are State monies available for portfolios or individual components.**
    - **What money is available and how applicable?**
    - **Some focused time at Committee, with a clear (short) document from the Technical Team would be helpful (whether for July or August meeting)**
  - **Discussion of August meeting**
    - **Committee members will have created individual or small-group portfolios**
    - **August meeting will be about structure and content of a potential agreement, including a proposed framework for the Final report**
- 2) Example agreements – (providing links through google docs to these documents and will highlight specific areas to look at)
- a) Borrego Water Coalition – Groundwater Sustainability Policy Recommendations with phased in reduction in water production to improve groundwater sustainability
  - b) (American River) Water Forum – Section 5.F Assurances and Caveats among the agreeing parties
  - c) Clackamas River Hydro Relicensing Settlement Agreement/Agreement in Principle – Fish Passage Provisions with performance based phased in of fish passage measures
  - d) Owens Lake Dust Control – Section 5 – Framework for Resource Protection Protocols including criteria, monitoring, indicators, triggers, and actions, significant impact thresholds, and mitigation measures
- **Rosemary walked the group through the sample agreements she had shared for consideration at this time. General discussion ensued.**
  - **Agreement to distribute these samples (or, perhaps, excerpts from some of the larger ones) to the Committee as a whole.**
- 3) Initial discussion on conceptual framework for triggers
- **Rosemary introduced the triggers document and her thinking about the structure as well as the particulars.**
  - **For July 31, RM will update the potential triggers based on how the 23/24 Committee meetings**
- 4) Protocol Issues

- **Nicholas introduced the subject and reviewed the email he had sent to the sub-committee.**
    - **Material quality / review**
      - **Discussion of whether there is a need for an enhanced QA process going forward.**
      - **Sub-committee agreed that there has been a Quality issue, and that the Technical Team needs to address it. Some Committee members have offered to be part of the review process, if that would help.**
      - **The Technical Team will meet to decide how to enhance the QA process.**
    - **Sub-contractor tasking**
      - **Include high-level tasking information in packets to Committee**
      - **Continue with WIP reports**
      - **Technical work product (in final format) to be distributed to Committee (with Staff summaries in some cases)**
    - **Committee communications with Technical Team**
      - **Rosemary remains in control of tasking**
      - **Committee members remain free to communicate with the Team (questions, etc.), copying RM.**
    - **Stakeholder-group communications (“collaborative behavior”)**
      - **No discussion on this**
    - **Committee member emails to entire Committee**
      - **Brown Act considerations: serial discussions could ensue, even if not in the context of a “Reply All” situation.**
      - **Committee members should channel such communiqués through RM.**
- 5) Plan for one-on-one meetings between tech team members (Bill and Gary) with Jerry Paul, Scott McGilvray, and Bill Fieberling on the issues they have been raising (one or two reps of WSAC welcome to participate)
- **Rosemary reported that the Staff is organizing these. To take place this week or next (before the week of the next Cmte meeting, in order to allow time for the Technical Team to absorb and, as appropriate, respond to actionable suggestions).**
  - **Subcommittee members can choose to attend and observe.**