



Water Department

**Water Commission
Action Agenda
7:00 p.m. – Monday, December 2, 2013
Council Chambers
809 Center Street Santa Cruz**

Action Agenda prepared on December 18, 2013

Call to Order Chair A. Schiffrin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Present: D. Green Baskin, G. Mead, A. Schiffrin (Chair), D. Stearns, W. Wadlow and L. Wilshusen (arrived at 7:05pm).

Absent: D. Meyers, absent with notice.

Staff: L. Almond, Interim Water Director; T. Goddard, Water Conservation Manager; N. Dennis, Principal Management Analyst; T. Praxel, Acting Principal Management Analyst; G. A. Martin, Environmental Projects Analyst; E. Cross, Communications Specialist; Rudometkin, Administrative Assistant III; R. Coletta, Administrative Assistant II.

Others: 7 members of the public.

Presentation There were no presentations.

Statements of Disqualification There were no statements of disqualification.

Oral Communications

Oral and written communications were made by S. McGilvray. Oral communications were made by P. Pethoe. All written materials provided to the Commission will be included in the official file.

Announcements There were no announcements.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner D. Baskin asked that a minor correction be made; to remove his middle name from the minutes.

Commissioner L. Wilshusen moved approval of the November 4, 2013 Water Commission minutes. Commissioner D. Stearns seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: D. Baskin, G. Mead, D. Stearns, W. Wadlow, and L. Wilshusen.

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: D. Meyers due to absence from the November 4 meeting.

ABSENT: A. Schiffrin

Consent Agenda

Item 1 - Three-month Calendar was pulled for discussion.

Commissioner G. Mead moved for approval of Consent Agenda. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: D. Baskin, G. Mead, D. Meyers, D. Stearns, W. Wadlow, and L. Wilshusen.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: A. Schiffrin

Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

1. Three-month Calendar

Interim Water Director L. Almond responded to Commission questions.

Oral communications were made by S. McGilvray.

Commission Discussion/Comments:

- There was direction provided to the staff about the presentations for the parade of projects.
- Requested an update report on the HCP negotiations at a future meeting.
- Requested a report on Loch Lomond ADA Study at a future meeting. .
- Requested more advertisement and public notice for the Water Conservation Master Plan and Water Transfer Presentation

Commissioner D. Meyers moved for the approval Consent Agenda item 1 - Three-month Calendar. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: D. Baskin, G. Mead, D. Meyers, D. Stearns, W. Wadlow, and L. Wilshusen.

NOES: None.

ABSENT A. Schiffrin

General Business

1. West Side Recreation Feasibility Analysis for Loch Lomond Recreation Area – Scope of Work ~~*Npm~~

Management Analyst L. Rossiter provided the staff report and responded to Commission questions.

Oral communications were made by P. Pethoe.

Commission Discussion/Comments:

- Concern expressed about the environmental impact on the expanded use of Loch Lomond as a Recreation Area

- Requested feasibility criteria regarding the access issue pertaining to the LLRA at a future meeting.

2. Water Commission Work Plan

L. Almond introduced the Water Departments new Deputy Director/Engineering Manager: H. Luckenbach. H. Luckenbach provided an oral report and with L. Almond responded to Commission questions.

Oral communications were made by S. McGilvray.

Commission Discussion/Comments:

- Emphasized the importance of Operations and Maintenance perspective
- Emphasized during the Community Engagement Reset Process the importance of accurate scientific information which needs to come from staff and the committee.
- Requested an explanation of the draft EIR; specifically what is the current timeline for both Santa Cruz and Soquel Creek to report back to City Council and the Board of Directors and instructions on how to proceed at a future meeting..
- Confirmed that members of the public have access to an RFP or an RFQ just by submitting a request.
- Requested an explanation on how the conservation flows effect our system in certain ways under certain conditions (HCP).

3. Community Engagement for Drought Solutions

Interim Water Director L. Almond responded to Commission questions.

Oral communications were made by S. McGilvray.

Commission Discussion/Comments:

- Discussion of composition/membership of the proposed advisory body.
- Consider the Water Department's role or lack of role in this committee structure.
- Requested an actual written plan to understand the objective of this new committee and what it hopes to accomplish so as to engage in the discussion if the Water Commission belongs.
- Discussion of drafting letter to the City Council; concluded not to do so at this time.
- Suggests that receiving a report from Tina Shull is preferred in order to have a more informed discussion.
- Suggests the role of the Commission is to provide realistic input and advise the advisory body and offer some of the infrastructure necessary (staff, technical information, etc.) to support the kind of decisions that this group is going to have to make.
- Confirmed it is important that the Council fund and complete the EIR, it is the government method of fact finding and evaluating alternatives to a project.
- Would like to ensure the work of the Commission and the Water Department's scientific analysis over the last two decades isn't lost during this reset process.

Director's Oral Report No action shall be taken on this item.

1. Monthly Status of Water Supply

Oral Communications were made by T. Goddard, Water Conservation Manager along with photos of Loch Lomond regarding the monthly water supply.

2. Water Supply Project Update

There was no report.

Media Articles No action shall be taken on this item.

1. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 10-29-13 ☆ (Page 33-34)
2. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-2-13 ☆ (Pages 35-37)
3. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-2-13 ☆ (Pages 38-39)
4. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-3-13 ☆ (Pages 40-41)
5. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-5-13 ☆ (Pages 42-43)
6. News Article – Good Times 11-13-13 ☆ (Pages 44-46)
7. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-16-13 ☆ (Pages 47-48)
8. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 11-19-13 ☆ (Pages 49-50)
9. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 10-24-13 ☆ (Pages 51-53)

Documents for Future Meetings There were no documents for future meetings.

Items Initiated by Members for Future Agenda

- Requested more advertisement and public notice for the Water Conservation Master Plan and Water Transfer Presentation.
- Provide definitions of “Replacement Cost of Water” to be part of T. Goddards conservation item at a future meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by 8:40 p.m. until the next meeting of the Water Commission that is scheduled for January 6, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

To the Santa Cruz Water Commission:

November 4, 2013

Revised: 12/2/2013

My name is Scott McGilvray. I live in the Live Oak District of Santa Cruz. I have 3 items in my 3 minutes this evening.

1. My comments last month referred to adding tiered rates as a conservation measure for other sectors of the market than single family residential. 58% of the customers (public, UCSC, commercial, Multi family residential) would be incentivized to conserve if tiered rates were instituted. **Tiered rates for all users as a conservation strategy should be added to the list.**
2. In October we received a presentation by Mr. Goddard and Maddus Associates regarding the cost and benefit study underway to rank conservation projects. I have since met with Mr. Goddard, and discovered from him that no capital costs are included in considering the avoided costs. This table will illustrate the difference:

The cost of Replacement water depends on how you define it.

Options	Per mg	Per HCF
T.Goddard..blend of years, sources, (30% of years, 7 months)	\$1,050	\$0.79

	Per mg	Per HCF
Desal Operating costs	\$4,938	\$3.69

	Annual cost	Per mg	Per HCF
\$115 M. Desal Plant Capital	\$7,408,080	\$10,289	\$7.70
Operating costs	\$3,555,360	\$4,938	\$3.69
Total Cap & Operating costs	\$10,963,440	\$15,227	\$11.39

Of course, if you do not use the desal plant the capital cost is still there to be amortized. \$7.4 Million of amortization cost each year for 30 years will be added to the rate base. \$7.4 million is to be added to a current water department budget of \$24 Million/year...30.8%

3. The last item is an introduction to thinking about our water supply management. The attached spreadsheet tracks the usage of Loch Lomond water for this summer. As you can see, Santa Cruz has overdrawn Loch Lomond by almost 300 million gallons. A question I think the Commission should ask is why has Laguna Creek supplied no water. The 10 year average supply (2002-2011) from Laguna Creek is almost 600 Million gallons. Our water rights are pre-1914. **Why are we drawing no water from Laguna Creek this year? If we had our usual Laguna creek water, Loch Lomond would be at 87% instead of 67%.**

Sincerely yours,

Scott McGilvray, Live Oak area resident
(831)524-0144



WATER DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 2, 2013
TO: Water Commission
FROM: Lydia Rossiter, Management Analyst
SUBJECT: West Side Recreation Feasibility Analysis for Loch Lomond Recreation Area –
Summary of Commission and Council Actions

RECOMMENDATION: Receive information.

At the request of Commissioner Baskin, here is a list of Commission and Council actions on the Loch Lomond Recreation Area use planning in the last year.

Water Commission
November 5, 2012

Action: Commissioner D. Baskin moved that the Water Commission table the Loch Lomond Use Study and ask that staff provide 1) a written response to Commissioner D. Baskin's written communication; 2) request that the Parks and Recreation Department along with ranger staff provide comments; and 3) include a discussion of how a short term ADA compliance plan could be accomplished as a high priority item. Commissioner W. Wadlow seconded.

Water Commission
April 1, 2013

Action: Commissioner D. Baskin moved that the Water Commission accept the Loch Lomond Recreation Area Use Study and recommend that City Council approve the study as the basis for proceeding with the Loch Lomond Use Master Plan, with a specific recommendation for policy approach Option 2, listed on Pages 47-48 of the Study, and to include listed items Water Play Area, Hiking Trails (west side) and Mountain Biking (west side). For the purpose of developing the Master Plan the Hiking Trails (west side) and Mountain Biking (west side) are considered to be a special category to be studied without any commitment being expressed. It was further moved to that ADA access improvements proceed separately and be expedited without waiting for approval of the Master Plan to provide meaningful access to the disabled. Commissioner A. Schiffrin seconded.

City Council
May 28, 2013

Action: Councilmember Terrazas moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Robinson, to accept the Loch Lomond Recreation Area Use Study and direct staff to pursue Option 2: Restoring Balanced Use with the addition of a water play area and motion to refer new hiking and mountain biking trails on the Loch Lomond Recreation Area's west side to feasibility analysis. The motion carried unanimously.