



Water Department

Water Commission
7:00 p.m. –November 2, 2015
Council Chambers
809 Center Street, Santa Cruz

Minutes of a Water Commission Meeting

Call to Order: Chair D. Baskin called the meeting to order at 7:01p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Roll Call

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

Absent: G. Mead (with notification)

Staff: R. Menard, Water Director; H. Luckenbach, Deputy Director/Engineering Manager; T. Goddard Multi-Disciplinary Project Manager; A. Poncato, Administrative Assistant III;

Others: 2 members of the public.

Presentation: There were no presentations.

Statement of Disqualification: There were no statements of disqualification.

Oral Communications: Oral communications made by B. Malone.

Announcements: There were no announcements.

Consent Agenda

1. City Council Items Affecting Water

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved the consent agenda. Commissioner D. Stearns seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: All.

NOES: None

ABSENT: G. Mead

Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

2. Approve October 5, 2015 Water Commission Minutes
3. Approve August 24, 2015 Water Commission Minutes

D. Baskin questioned why the corrected language was not updated in the August 24, 2015 minutes and why specific amendment language was not added into the minutes. A. Poncato explained that the language from the May 4, 2015 minutes template was mistakenly left in the August 24, 2015 draft

minutes and it has since been corrected. Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved to accept the August 24, 2015 Water Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: All.

NOES: None

ABSENT: G. Mead

Commissioner A. Schiffrin moved to accept the October 5, 2015 Water Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner L. Wilshusen seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: All.

NOES: None

ABSENT: G. Mead

General Business

1. WSAC Recommendation Report

R. Menard, Water Director provided a presentation summarizing the WSAC recommendations. WSAC member Doug Engfer who was in attendance at the meeting added a few additional comments.

Following the presentation, staff responded to questions from the Commission.

Commission Questions/Comments

Regarding the November 10, 2015 Joint Study Session:

What do you anticipate occurring at the joint work study session?

- Response: There will be a three part presentation covering :
 - What the problem is,
 - What alternatives were identified and evaluated, and
 - What the recommendations are.

The goal of the presentation is to help the public, the City Council and the Water Commissioners understand the main points of the WSAC recommendation. Various members of the WSAC will participate in presenting the WSAC results.

Following the presentation, there will be time for Council and Commission members to ask questions, and then there will be time for public comment. No decisions are expected to be made at the study session. Council action is expected to take place at the Council's November 24th meeting.

Will there be an opportunity for interactive questioning?

- Response: Yes. Regarding the Report Document:

Questions and Comments Regarding the WSAC Report Content

Will the WSAC final report be revised following the study session?

- Response: No.

Regarding the graph at the bottom graph on page 10: it would be easier to understand if all the dates were included (even though the dates are not sequential).

- Response: Understood

Regarding the estimates of UCSC's estimated build-out demand on page 11, what enrollment level was used as the basis for a build out demand of 349 mgy?

- Response: The number came from the work that was done on the University's 2008 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the water supply assessment that was done for the LRDP, which had a projected enrollment of 19,500 students by 2020.

Regarding the information on page 18 about monthly rainfall averages under (f) List of Key Assumptions for Econometric Demand Forecast, was climate change incorporated into the demand forecast in some way?

- Response: No, climate change was looked at on the supply side and evaluated there. In the future, when the demand model is used in future forecasts, we can incorporate climate change information if/when it becomes clear what the trends are.

Regarding the reference on page 24, to a "City Proposal" what is that referring to?

- Response: City Proposal refers to a fish flow regime.

Regarding the paragraph on page 30, that discusses whether or not there had been a thorough evaluation of alternatives at earlier stages of the City's water supply planning efforts, it was suggested that this language be considered for editing to recognize the level of evaluation of alternatives done during this earlier work.

Regarding water conservation savings, a question was raised about how to make sense of the numbers in the second paragraph from the bottom of page 44 and whether or how they were figured into the 1.2 billion gallon gap.

- Response: Ongoing demand management (Program A), plumbing code changes and price elasticity were included as factors reducing demand and incorporated into the demand forecast. Water Conservation Program Crec (170 mgy) was assumed to be in place in the supply model and was figured into the 1.2 bg worst year gap. The incremental additional 30 to 80 mgy of conservation that would come from meeting the goal of 200 to 250 mgy of demand reduction through conservation was not included in the 1.2 by worst year number.

Was it assumed that the savings from the price increases, the plumbing and building codes, Program Crec and existing program would occur and we would still have a 1.2 billion gallon gap?

- Response: Yes.

Regarding the reference on page 54, to a goal of further reducing demand in 2035 by generating an additional 200 to 250 million gallons of demand reduction, is this amount in addition to the 170mgd from Program Crec?

- Response: No

To confirm, there is an estimated 1.2 bg shortfall in the worst case year and in addition to the demand reductions associated with Program Crec, an additional 30 to 80 mgd of demand reduction are expected to be produced by 2035?

- Response: Yes.

Has anyone converted the numbers to figure out how many gallons per day we are saving with our conservation programs?

- Response: System wide gpcd is roughly estimated to be 80 gallons per person per day (compared to about 95 -100 gpcd for system wide demand now).

Regarding the Table 15 on page 49, a clarification would be helpful. It talks about in lieu and ASR and combined in lieu, ASR. Does that mean the city will do one or the other and not both of them? It isn't clear why the ASR figures are the same as the Combined in lieu and ASR figures.

- Response: The in lieu yield figure listed in the table is limited by how much other user can take in the winter time as it is limited by their demand. The in lieu and ASR analysis were done on the assumption that you can do one or the other. The reality is that the most likely outcome is going to be a hybrid of the two because there is more water available to store than can be used for in lieu only.

Referring to page 64, the comment was made expressing concerns about how the WSAC's recommendations include items on how the Water Department, the City Council and the Water Commission would conduct its business and take action on all of the complicated details of the work ahead.

- Response: The Information Sharing section of the report is intended to increase community confidence by laying out how progress reporting about the implementation of the WSAC's recommendations are going and thus to increase transparency and accountability.

A concern was articulated about the apparent aggressiveness of the timelines presented.

Requests for Additional or Follow-Up Information:

- Commissioner Schiffrin requested the website link to the AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast used in developing the demand forecast.

Additional Comments:

- Commissioner Wilshusen comments that she appreciates all the work the committee did and was impressed with the level attention that WSAC members everyone paid to the task.
- Commissioner Schiffrin commented that he felt it was important to have this discussion now because the Commission will have a role in the implementation of the recommendation if the Council decides to move forward with it.

- Commissioner Baskin praised Water Department staff on the final WSAC report.

Commissioner Schiffrin moved to recommend that, based on the wide consensus that the WSAC recommendations we have received thus far, the City Council evaluate the feasibility of putting the recommendations of the Water Supply Advisory Committee on a ballot for a community vote.

Commissioner Schwarm seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION DENIED

AYES: D. Baskin, D. Schwarm, A. Schiffrin

NOES: D. Stearns, W. Wadlow, and L. Wilshusen

ABSENT: G. Mead

Subcommittee/Advisory Body Oral Reports

Directors Oral Report No action shall be taken on this item.

- Loch Lomond reservoir is currently at 68% capacity, which is 10% better than it was this time last year. We are hopeful winter rains will allow us to be able to return to more normal diversions from San Lorenzo River (7-8mgd) without further depleting the reservoir. The near term weather outlook is nothing out of the ordinary, but in light of the experiences of the last few winters, ordinary would be good. The long term weather outlook is calling for a wetter than normal winter for Southern and Central California.
- Water rationing was lifted effective November 1, 2015. Action was taken by the Council on October 27th and the public was notified through publication in the newspaper.
- The San Lorenzo River had been running at around 7-8cfs but recently soared up to 30cfs due to rains today. Typically this kind of increase does not last long, especially under the drought conditions we've been experiencing over the last few years.
- At the end of January we will create a mid-season outlook based on rainfall, runoff, and storage and an initial evaluation of the conditions we may see for the 2016 demand season.
- Public Works and the Santa Cruz Fire Department have been focusing on Winter Storm Preparation. The City is hosting a community Storm Preparedness Workshop scheduled for November 21, 2015.

Questions and Comments Regarding the Director's Oral Report

When does our waiver from the flow releases at Newell Creek and our short term flow agreements on our flowing sources expire and what is our plan for these releases?

- Response: The Newell Creek Dam release is tentatively scheduled for February and the short term flow agreement we have with the Fish Agencies was recently extended until the end of February as well.

What is the status of the work with state and federal fishery agencies about negotiating a long term plan?

- Last April we hosted a site tour for state and federal fishery agency staff and we have been in communication with them since. We are hoping to bring the topic up again after

the first of the year. Discussion topics include dividing the two HCP's, doing the North Coast project separately, and collaborating with public and private partners on the San Lorenzo HCP.

What is the update on the interim water sales to Soquel Creek Water District?

- The proposal was verbally agreed upon by both parties and work is moving forward.

Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 9:16p.m. The next regular meeting of the Water Commission is scheduled for December 7, 2015 at 7:00p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Respectfully submitted,

Staff