



Water Department

Water Commission
7:00 p.m. – Monday, March 3, 2014
Council Chambers
809 Center Street, Santa Cruz

Minutes of a Water Commission Meeting

Call to Order – Chair Baskin called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Roll Call

Present: D. Baskin, G. Mead, A. Schiffrin, D. Schwarm, D. Stearns, W. Wadlow, and L. Wilshusen.

Absent: None.

Staff: R. Menard, Water Director; T. Goddard, Water Conservation Manager; H. Luckenbach; Deputy Water Director/Engineering Manager; N. Dennis Principal Management Analyst; G. Rudometkin, Administrative Assistant III.

Others: Approximately 17 members of the public.

Presentation – There were no presentations.

Statements of Disqualification – There were no statements of disqualification.

Oral Communications – Oral communications were made by Dan Spoutsel, S. McGilvray, and R. McKillan, Oral and written communications were made by G. Pepping.

Announcements – There were no announcements.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioners A. Schiffrin and D. Baskin made corrections to the minutes.

Commissioner D. Stearns moved approval of February 3, 2013 Water Commission minutes. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE:MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Consent Agenda

1. City Council Items Affecting Water
2. Communications Plan Update
3. WSAC Update
4. Correspondence from N. Sundermeyer date 2/11/2014
5. Correspondence from S. Holt date 2/25/2014

Commissioner G. Mead pulled Item 2 - Communications Plan Update and Item 5 – Correspondence from S. Holt dated 2/25/2014. Commissioner A. Schiffrin pulled Item 3 – WSAC Update and Commissioner D. Stearns pulled Item 4 - Correspondence from N. Sundermeyer dated 2/11/2014.

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved approval of the item. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

Item 2 - Communications Plan Update

Commissioners G. Mead, D. Baskin, and D. Stearns made recommendations to reach out to additional media outlets.

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved approval of the item. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Item 3 – WSAC Update

Water Director R. Menard responded to Commission questions.

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved approval of the item. Commissioner G. Mead seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Item 4 - Correspondence from N. Sundermeyer date 2/11/2014

Water Director R. Menard responded to Commission questions.

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved approval of the item. Commissioner W. Wadlow seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Item 5 - Correspondence from S. Holt date 2/25/2014

Commissioner L. Wilshusen moved approval of the item. Commissioner A. Schiffrin seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

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

NOES: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

General Business

1. Long Term Conservation Master Plan Workshop I – Development of Program Goals and Decision Criteria

Water Director R. Menard gave a brief overview. T. Goddard introduced the presentation given by Bill and Lisa Maddaus, of Maddaus Water Management, Inc.

Summary of Commission Comments/Questions:

- Question asked if there was a recommended program from the four options described at the February 3rd meeting.
- Question asked whether or not the information presented was based on past information and city experience.
- Inquiry was made if this program factors in the Water Department ramp up time to execute various projects.
- Definition of GPCD (gallons per person per day) requested.
- Question asked concerning the concept of demand hardening.

- Question asked concerning if there are different measures that are reserved for drought than what is in a typical long term conservation plan.
- Question asked concerning the most aggressive conservation program and what the City's overall demand would be in 20-30 years with it implemented.
- Question asked that during a drought our annual water supply may be 2.5 billion gallons as opposed to a non-drought period of 3.5 billion gallons, with a conservation program in place what would the per capita demand have to be to accrue enough savings so that a supplemental supply during a drought was not needed.
- Question asked regarding the model being based on annual factors however, would it be possible to engineer the model to address seasonal impacts. For example, could we appropriately value incentives that could impact demand during the higher peak summer months when there is a larger impact on the reservoir.

Public Questions/Comments:

Oral communications made by R. Longinotti, R. Pommerantz, and A. Savage.

Summary of Commissions Brainstorming Session Question/Comments:

- Appeal was made to maximize the following: cost effectiveness of new conservation measures, water pricing strategies, use of peer pressure and consumer choice strategies, partnerships with large water users, other water agencies, local government, educational institutions, use of contemporary public information messaging, adoption of new and proven technologies, use of renewable energy resources, and minimize water loss at all levels and by all user groups.
- Comment was made that messaging consumer use through gallons per person, per day is more easily accessible to people.
- Comment was made to offer people a concept of the amount of water wasted during common practices.
- Comment was made that the maximum practical level of water conservation should be the foundation of a diversified portfolio of water supplies and water efficiency measures.
- Comment was made that conservation efforts should be implementable, which speaks to the practicalities, affordable in terms of cost effective in comparison to other measures and from a community perspective as well, and should be fair and sustainable over time.
- Comment was made that conservation efforts should be customer friendly in terms of understandable and implementable from the individual customer's perspective.
- Comment was made discussing a triple-bottom line model that encompasses a benefit cost analysis against true alternative costs, environmental stewardship as in what we are doing with the water we are not taking and using effectively, and quality of life; how our community benefits from making those changes on how we consume water.

- Comment was made that in terms of conservation and demand projections water rates are the most effective way to achieve behavioral change.
- Comment was made that it would be interesting and informative to see what suite of long term conservation measures would be needed to eliminate the need for an additional water source, including supplying enough water to meet demand during drought conditions.
- Comment was made that a conservation plan that would eliminate the need for an additional water source, including during a drought should be explored.
- Requested the true cost of desalinated water or provide a range of options of how to evaluate so that cost comparisons can be made.

Public Questions/Comments:

Oral communications made by R. Longinotti.

2. Report on Water Transfer/Water Exchange Project by John Ricker, County of Santa Cruz Water Resources Division Director

Deputy Director/Engineering Manager H. Luckenbach introduced the presentation given by J. Ricker.

Summary of Commission Comments/Questions:

- Question was asked if there are water rights issues if Soquel were to send water back to the City of Santa Cruz.
- Comment was made that with the existing intertie to Soquel the City of Santa Cruz could transfer up to 122 million gallons a year to Soquel and what if an agreement was to say that when the City of Santa Cruz needed the water Soquel needed to transfer 60 million gallons back, making Soquel a net gainer in any event.
- Comment was made that the Water Transfer/Water Exchange Project will be helpful to Scotts Valley and Soquel but it is not a solution to Santa Cruz's water issue.
- Question was asked if grants or other funding sources for this project are currently being pursued.
- Question was asked if the City of Santa Cruz, in the Live Oak district where the ground water wells are and the Purisima formation are located currently mix surface water and treated ground water within the same piping structure.
- Comment was made that if in fact the Scotts Valley recycled water pipe runs right by Pasatiempo and wouldn't it be relatively easy to tap into that pipeline.
- Question was asked if the Water Transfer/Water Exchange Project is an indicator if we should be abandoning our pursuit of a desalination plant.
- Comment made that the idea that this program is an exchange more realistically applies to Scotts Valley. The idea that this is an exchange to benefit Santa Cruz City Water District does seem unlikely.
- Question asked pertaining to how much water could be sent back to Santa Cruz from Scotts Valley not annually in terms of a daily rate.

Public Questions/Comments:

Oral communications made by R. Longinotti.

Subcommittee/Advisory Body Oral Reports No items.

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

1. Monthly Status of Water Supply

Information Item (Pages 114-135) No action shall be taken on this item.

Media Articles

1. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 2/4/2014 ☆ (Pages 45-47)
2. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 2/10/2014 ☆ (Pages 48-50)
3. News Article – Good Times 2/12/2014 ☆ (Pages 51-53)
4. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 2/20/2014 ☆ (Pages 54-55)
5. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 2/22/2014 ☆ (Page 56)
6. News Article – Santa Cruz Sentinel 2/23/2014 ☆ (Pages 57-58)

Documents for Future Meetings No action shall be taken on this item.

1. None

Items Initiated by Members for Future Agendas

Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 11:02pm. The next meeting of the Water Commission is scheduled for April, 7 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria
Rudometkin

Digitally signed by Gloria Rudometkin
DN: cn=Gloria Rudometkin, o=City of
Santa Cruz, ou=Water,
email=grudometkin@cityofsantacruz.
com, c=US
Date: 2014.02.10 09:12:05 -08'00'

Staff