BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SPECIAL MEETING – 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2014
LOCATION: Capitola City Council Chambers
420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, California

AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL

2. PUBLIC HEARING – None

3. CONSENT AGENDA – None

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS (items not on the Agenda)

5. INFORMATION ITEMS – None

6. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS
   6.1 Back-Up Supplemental Supply Options – Overview of the Process and Scoring/Ranking Exercise
   6.2 Additional Public Input on the Proposed CONSERVATIONplus Program Ordinance No. 14-02

7. STATUS REPORTS – None

8. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE
   8.1 Letter from Terre and Charles Thomas regarding Conservation Plus Program

9. CLOSED SESSION – None

10. ADJOURNMENT

All information furnished to the Board of Directors with this agenda is provided under Who We Are - Board Meetings on the District’s website www.soquelcreekwater.org. Any additional information provided to the Board prior to the meeting will be made available to the public at the District office. Please observe the following procedures for addressing the Board on agendized items. All those wishing to speak on an item should raise a hand and be recognized by the Board President during the portion of the proceedings set aside for public comment. Each speaker will be limited to a single presentation of up to three minutes per agenda item (time limits may be increased or decreased at the Board President's discretion). After all speakers have addressed the Board, the Board will deliberate and take action. Additional public comment will not be allowed during the Board's deliberation unless the President specifically calls on someone in the audience. Organized groups wishing to make a presentation are asked to contact the Board Clerk prior to the Board Meeting. Disability Access – the meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Please contact Karen Reese, Board Clerk, at (831) 475-8500 ext. 126 if you need assistance in order to participate in a public meeting or if you need the agenda and public documents modified as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
MEMO TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Subject: Agenda Item No. 6.1   Back-Up Supplemental Supply Options – Overview of the Process and Scoring/Ranking Exercise

Attachments:  1. PowerPoint Presentation

Background
Soquel Creek Water District’s mission is to provide water resource management to deliver a safe and reliable supply of high-quality water to meet present and future needs in an environmentally sensitive and economically responsible way. Beginning in the mid-1990’s, Soquel Creek Water District took the first step in responding to evidence of groundwater overdraft with its original roadmap known as the 1999 Draft Integrated Resources Plan. In 2006 and 2012, the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) was revised with updated information and further evaluation of potential water supply alternatives. The IRP is a multi-faced plan that includes water conservation, groundwater management, and supplemental supply.

Since 2007, the District has been evaluating a proposed joint scwd\textsuperscript{2} Regional Seawater Desalination Project with the City of Santa Cruz as the preferred supplemental supply project. In August 2013, the City of Santa Cruz stepped back to get more community input on their water shortage issues. While the District has recognized that the scwd\textsuperscript{2} desalination project has cost-sharing potential and over seven years of evaluation has been invested, back-up options need to be identified should the regional desalination project no longer be considered.

To date, the Board of Directors has conducted several single-topic meetings that address components of the IRP. These meetings have been open to the public and have been well attended by the community. In fact, meetings have been so well attended that the District moved to larger venues to accommodate the community engagement. Meetings have also been filmed by Community TV of Santa Cruz County. The board has also further discussed IRP-related topics during regular administrative board meetings. A dedicated webpage on our website has been maintained for this process: [http://www.soquelcreekwater.org/planning-our-water-future/back-supplemental-supply-options](http://www.soquelcreekwater.org/planning-our-water-future/back-supplemental-supply-options)

- September 17, 2013 Board Meeting: Workshop focused on water supply planning goals and objectives, what’s “changed” since the 2012 Integrated
Resources Plan Update was approved, previous and new alternatives to consider, and screening criteria to use for subsequent alternatives analyses and evaluation.

- October 16, 2013 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion focused on desalination options that included a presentation by representatives from Deep Water Desal on the Moss Landing proposed project and a presentation by District staff on a District-Only desalination project.

- November 5, 2013 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion focused on surface water options that included presentations by Jerry Paul and Bill Smallman (both local citizens engaged in water supply alternatives), and an update presentation by John Ricker on the surface water exchange report. Surface water attorney Peter Kiel and Lisa McCann (Regional Water Board’s water rights liaison) both teleconferenced in.

- January 7, 2014 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion focused on reducing water demands with mandatory water rationing. This option is not a supplemental water supply option but rather a demand reduction alternative should a supplemental supply not be secured. Staff presented a phased approach to water rationing that would allow the District to accelerate water savings while it continues evaluation and pursuit of a supplemental supply.

- February 4, 2014 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion focused on recycled water options that included presentations by Dave Smith (Managing Director of WateReuse Association), Mark Dettle (Public Works Director for the City of Santa Cruz), Todd Reynolds (Kennedy/Jenks Technical Advisor), and Bill Smallman (local citizen and engineer). The alternatives discussed included recycled water for irrigation, seawater barrier, and potable reuse (directly as well as for groundwater replenishment). This meeting also included an overview of the proposed evaluation criteria and scorecard approach for assessing alternatives.

- March 4, 2014 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion focused on groundwater rights and management framework. Presentations were given by Russell McGlothlin (attorney with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck), John Ricker (SC County Water Resources Division Director) and staff. This meeting did not go into groundwater options per se, but rather gave an overview of groundwater law in California, the County’s role and
responsibilities with non-municipal pumping, and the District’s current and future groundwater management activities. There was also discussion on establishing a Groundwater Replenishment District and/or having the functions be part of the existing Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) AB3030 framework, peer review of the District’s hydrological analyses, and declaration of a groundwater emergency.

- March 18, 2014 Board Meeting: Staff requested that the Board provide direction and approve which back-up options that were introduced during the exploratory discussions should be brought back to the board for the evaluations workshop. The options selected were Deep Water Desal, In-District desalination, surface water transfers, and recycled water (for seawater barrier, irrigation, and groundwater injection).

- April 1, 2014 Board Meeting: Exploratory discussion on accelerating conservation with a ‘Water Use Reduction Program’ (previously referred to as Phase 1) aimed at achieving a 500 acre-feet per year water savings within two years. The Board was very interested in moving forward with this type of long-term program.

- April 29 and June 3, 2014 Board Meetings: Focused on establishing a water connection moratorium or expanding the water demand offset program. Public comments were taken on 4/29 to address the aforementioned topics and a public hearing was held on 6/3 on these two issues as well on considering declaration of a groundwater emergency or water shortage declaration. The Board voted to expand the water demand offset program, declare a groundwater emergency, and declare a stage 3 water shortage emergency.

- June 17, 2014 Board Meeting: Focused on the Board adopting the declarations of the groundwater emergency and stage 3 water shortage emergency, adopting the revisions to the existing WDO program, and providing input on the CONSERVATIONplus Program (previously known as the Water Use Reduction Program) components.

- July 15, 2014 Board Meeting: Focused on the peer review of the hydrological studies of the District and next steps to address the basin deficit and basin recovery yield. Also at this meeting, the Board kicked-off the alternatives-based evaluation of the back-up options with a staff memo related to the common criteria and conceptual technical evaluation of the alternatives. The concepts of a mid-county recycled water project
and a regional recycled water project for groundwater replenishment were introduced and approved to be carried through the analysis process. The Board and Todd Reynolds (Kennedy/Jenks) discussed the next steps which included a workshop-style setting to conduct the scoring and ranking of the supply options as well as a “homework” assignment to fill out an evaluation matrix.

- August 12, 2014 Board Meeting: Focused on a public hearing for the CONSERVATIONplus Ordinance 14-02. The Board requested that staff look more into flexibility, the method on how to determine occupancy to set long-term water budgets and also during short periods (such as summer vacations, etc.). The Board also wanted the August 26, 2014 meeting to be an opportunity for the public to comment on the CONSERVATIONplus Program prior to the Ordinance’s second reading on September 2.

IRP Options Identified through this Back-Up Options Process

1. Groundwater Management Efforts (Hydrological Analyses refinement, groundwater model, expansion of the basin implementation group, groundwater stakeholder meetings, and pending CA groundwater legislation)

2. Conservation and Demand Management Efforts (Expanded WDO program and CONSERVATIONplus Program)

3. Supplemental Supply
   a. San Lorenzo River Surface Water Transfers
      i. With existing infrastructure
      ii. With infrastructure upgrades
   b. Desalination
      i. Deep Water Desal
      ii. Mid-County Desalination
   c. Recycled Water for Groundwater Replenishment
      i. Mid-County Recycled Water Project
      ii. Santa Cruz Regional Recycled Water Project

As the Board has already or is planning on moving forward with the groundwater management and conservation efforts (Items 1 and 2 above), this agenda item focuses on the supplemental supply options (Item 3 above) that will be undergoing an alternatives based analysis using a Scorecard Approach.
Assessing and Evaluating the Alternatives

The evaluation of each alternative will be documented using a common template. To aid with comparison, the same methodology will be used for all alternatives since a consistent template allows for efficient analysis and documentation. A “scorecard” approach is an effective way to analyze a range of alternatives across several criteria. This approach helps organize both qualitative and quantitative information to inform decisions.

Criteria used to assess and screen back-up water supply projects in the alternatives based analysis should reflect the District’s goals and objectives of ensuring water reliability for current and future uses, to maintain water quality for current and future uses, and to prevent adverse environmental impacts.

Criteria

1. Water Supply Availability and Quality
2. Supply Impact, Reliability, and Flexibility
3. Environmental Permitting Considerations
4. Legal and Implementation Considerations
5. Customer Stakeholder/Acceptability and Benefit
6. Financial and Funding Considerations
7. Project Costs

The proposed evaluation categories also included related sub-criteria to help make the scoring as specific and objective as possible.

In-depth information on the alternatives evaluation approach was included in the July 15, 2014 Board Packet under Agenda Item 6.11 including the methodology (Kennedy/Jenks Tech Memo #4), the narrative assessments of each back-up option, and the conceptual technical evaluations. A link to this information can be accessed here:


Benefits of Scorecard Approach Alternatives Based Analysis

- Alternatives can be analyzed using a common criteria set that organizes both qualitative and quantitative information.
- The Board can establish a weighting system based on its goals and objectives.
- Sensitivity analysis can be performed to weigh other criteria more heavily (such as cost, water supply availability, customer acceptability, etc.) to evaluate the effects of the alternative’s overall total score and ranking.
• Will help the District in develop several different portfolios of options that could include one alternative or several alternatives to meet the District’s goals and objectives.

**Tonight: Evaluation of Back-Up Options Using Scorecard Approach**

Todd Reynolds from Kennedy/Jenks Consultants will be leading the evaluation exercise to score and rank the back-up options. Ann Sansevero from URS will be attending the meeting and Peter Kiel from Ellison, Schneider & Harris will be calling in to answer questions related to environmental review, general permitting, and water rights.

The evaluation exercise will include reviewing the scoring that was submitted by the Board as their “homework assignment” as well as several sensitivity analyses to analyze the rankings and address the various priorities and perspectives of the different criteria and factors that could be regarded as “more important”. Sensitivity analysis could focus on cost, water supply availability and reliability, or customer acceptability as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Proposed Weighting Range</th>
<th>Recommended Weighting</th>
<th>Sensitivity Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply Availability and Quality</td>
<td>15 to 25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Impact, Reliability and Flexibility</td>
<td>10 to 20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Permitting Considerations</td>
<td>10 to 15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Implementation Considerations</td>
<td>10 to 15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer/Stakeholder Acceptability and Benefit</td>
<td>5 to 15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Funding Considerations</td>
<td>10 to 20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs</td>
<td>15 to 25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Cost Focused 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability Focused 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Reliability Focused 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 100% 100% 100% 100%
POSSIBLE BOARD ACTION

1. By MOTION, rank the three sensitivity analysis categories in order of importance.

2. By MOTION, select a supplemental supply option or options to be further evaluated through a more detailed feasibility study and direct staff to prepare an RFQ for the study or studies.

3. By MOTION, provide staff with further direction regarding additional information requested prior to finalizing selection at a later date.

4. No action taken.

By ______________________________
Melanie Mow Schumacher
Special Projects Engineer

By ______________________________
Kim Adamson
General Manager
Evaluation of Water Supply Alternatives

August 26, 2014

Agenda

• Staff Presentation of District’s Back-Up Options Process (September 2013-Present)

• Alternatives Scoring and Ranking Exercise: Todd Reynolds, Kennedy/Jenks

Back-Up Supplemental Supply Options: Overview of the Process & Scoring/Ranking Exercise
Soquel Creek Water District's Fundamental Purpose

Mission Statement

Soquel Creek Water District is a nonprofit, local government agency that provides water resource management to deliver a safe and reliable supply of high-quality water to meet present and future needs in an environmentally sensitive and economically responsible way.

Soquel Creek Water District's Desired Outcomes

Groundwater Management Goals

1. Ensure water supply reliability for current and future beneficial uses

2. Maintain water quality to meet current and future beneficial uses

3. Prevent adverse environmental impacts
Soquel Creek Water District’s Desired Outcomes

Water Supply Planning Objectives

1. Limit groundwater pumping to 2,900 acre-feet per year (afy) by 2018-2020 to restore the groundwater basin.

2. Continue to limit groundwater pumping to 2,900 afy for approximately 20 years (year-in, year-out).

3. Once groundwater basin has achieved sustainability, limit groundwater pumping to no more than 4,000 afy.

4. Modify based on adaptive management and observed water levels.

Timeline

Public Process for Strategic Water Planning

1999 Draft Integrated Resources Plan

2006 Integrated Resources Plan Update

2008 Joint Desalination Program with City of Santa Cruz

2011 Well Master Plan

2012 Updated Integrated Resources Plan
2012 Integrated Resources Plan Update

Alternatives and Diversified Portfolio

2012 Integrated Resources Plan Approach:

1. Water Conservation
2. Proactive Groundwater Management
3. scwd\(^2\) Desalination
4. Recycled Water, as feasible
5. Surface Water Exchange
6. If scwd\(^2\) is no longer pursued - evaluate:
   - District-only Desalination
   - Long Term Mandatory Water Rationing

District Activities related to Long-Term Planning, and Development

Timeline

2006
Updated IRP with new information on supply and demand.

2011
Completed Well Master Plan to redistribute pumping away from the coast.

2012
Updated IRP with newer information on supply and demand and re-evaluated 10 different supply alternatives.

2008
Joined with the City of Santa to evaluate a shared desalination plant.

2013
• City and District complete technical evaluation and release draft EIR for desal project.
• City puts desalination project on hold.
• District launches evaluation for back-up options.

1999
Developed Integrated Water Plan (IRP) with Public Advisory Committee of more than 20 individuals.
Review of Past Public Meetings

Looking Closer at Supply Options

🔹 Review of IRP Goals/Objectives. Brainstorm Alternatives to Consider (September 17, 2013)
  • Board Workshop
    – Open Public Discussion

🔹 Exploring Desalination (October 15, 2013)
  • Deep Water Desal
    – Presentation by Brent Constanz and David Armanasco, Deep Water Desal
  • District-only Desal
    – Presentation by Taj Dufour, SqCWD Engineering Manager

Review of Past Public Meetings

Looking Closer at Supply Options

🔹 Exploring Surface Water (November 5, 2013)
  • SC County Water Transfer Study Update
    – Presentation by John Ricker, County of SC
  • Surface Water Rights Discussion
    – Led by Peter Kiel
  • Lochquifer and 5 Other Water Project Alternatives & 15 Strategies
    – Presentation Jerry Paul, MSEE
  • Recycled Water & Storm/Surface Water Collection (“Storm Aquarries”)
    – Presentation by Bill Smallman, PE
**Recycled Water Options (February 4 and July 15)**

- Recycled Water for Irrigation, Seawater Intrusion Barrier, and Groundwater Replenishment (Feb. 4)
  - Presentation by Todd Reynolds, Kennedy/Jenks
- Indirect Potable Reuse and Creative (Feb. 4)
  - Presentation by Bill Smallman, PE
- Mid-County Groundwater Replenishment Project (July 15)
  - Presentation by Todd Reynolds, Kennedy/Jenks
- Santa Cruz Regional Groundwater Replenishment Project (July 15)
  - Presentation by Todd Reynolds, Kennedy/Jenks

**Groundwater Law and Mid-County Management (March 4)**

- California Groundwater Law
  - Presentation by Russ McGlothlin, Water Rights Attorney
- Management of Non-Municipal Pumping in SC County
  - Presentation by John Ricker, SC County
- Current and Future Groundwater Mgmt. by SqCWD
  - Presentation by Melanie Schumacher, SqCWD
Review of Past Public Meetings

Looking Closer at Demand Management

📍 Mandatory Water Rationing (January 7 & April 1)

- Phased Approach to Water Use Reduction (January 7)
  - Presentation by Ron Duncan and Shelley Flock, SqCWD
- CONSERVATIONplus Program (April 1)
  - Presentation by Ron Duncan and Shelley Flock, SqCWD

📍 Water Use Associated with Growth (June 3)

- Moratorium or Expanded Water Demand Offset Program
  - Presentation by Kim Adamson, SqCWD

Board Directed Options to Further Evaluate

Summary of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Project/Program Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>CONSERVATIONplus and Water Demand Offset</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Groundwater Management Efforts</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid-County Desalination Project</td>
<td>Supply: Desalination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deep Water Desalination Project</td>
<td>Supply: Desalination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mid-County Groundwater Replenishment Project</td>
<td>Supply: Recycled Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Regional Groundwater Replenishment Project</td>
<td>Supply: Recycled Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Surface Water Transfer with City of Santa Cruz - existing infrastructure</td>
<td>Supply: Surface Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Surface Water Transfer with City of Santa Cruz - infrastructure upgrades</td>
<td>Supply: Surface Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of a Common Set of Criteria to Evaluate the Back-Up Options

Criteria

- Availability and Quality
- Impact, Reliability, and Flexibility
- Environmental Permitting
- Legal and Implementation
- Customer and Stakeholder Acceptability and Benefit
- Finance and Funding
- Project Costs

Tonight’s Workshop

Scoring and Ranking Exercise

Sensitivity Analyses

- Cost Focused
- Customer/Community Acceptability Focused
- Supply & Reliability Focused

Score and Rank Back-Up Options

Recycled Water
Surface Water
Desalination
Timeline

District Activities related to Long-Term Planning, and Development

Supply Efforts

2008
Joined with the City of Santa to evaluate a shared desalination plant

1999
Developed Integrated Water Plan (IRP) with Public Advisory Committee of more than 20 individuals

2006
Updated IRP with new information on supply and demand

2008
Updated IRP with new information on supply and demand

2011
Completed Well Master Plan to redistribute pumping away from the coast

2012
Updated IRP with newer information on supply and demand and re-evaluated 10 different supply alternatives

2013
City and District release draft EIR for scwd2 desal project. City puts desalination project on hold. District launches evaluation for back-up options

2014
Shortlist and Select Back-Up Water Supply Option to further evaluate

2014
Completed Peer Review on District’s Groundwater Hydrology Data and Analysis. Evaluate recommendations.

2014
Approve CONSERVATIONPLUS program and revise WDO Program

2015
Launch CONSERVATIONPLUS and mandatory water budgets and BMPs

2015
Feasibility Studies On selected shortlisted project(s)

Conservation and Groundwater Efforts

1999
Developed Integrated Water Plan (IRP) with Public Advisory Committee of more than 20 individuals

2013
City and District release draft EIR for scwd2 desal project. City puts desalination project on hold. District launches evaluation for back-up options

2014
Shortlist and Select Back-Up Water Supply Option to further evaluate

2014
Completed Peer Review on District’s Groundwater Hydrology Data and Analysis. Evaluate recommendations.

2014
Approve CONSERVATIONPLUS program and revise WDO Program

2015
Launch CONSERVATIONPLUS and mandatory water budgets and BMPs

2015
Feasibility Studies On selected shortlisted project(s)
MEMO TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Subject: Agenda Item No. 6.2 Additional Public Input on the Proposed CONSERVATIONplus Program Ordinance No. 14-02

The purpose of this memo is to provide an additional opportunity for the public to provide input regarding the CONSERVATIONplus program before the second reading of the related draft Ordinance 14-02. Staff is also developing other mechanisms for ongoing community feedback to continually improve the program. CONSERVATIONplus is designed to solve a significant portion (i.e. one-third) of the District’s water shortage issue via additional conservation measures. The program is composed of three main components: (1) water budgets/best management practices (BMPs), (2) customer support programs, and (3) communication.

The first reading and the public hearing for the draft CONSERVATIONplus program Ordinance 14-02 was presented on August 12, 2014 and the second reading is scheduled for September 2, 2014. The following link contains the Board memo and draft Ordinance 14-02 presented at the August 12, 2014 meeting. http://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/packets/08-12-14_board_packet_secured.pdf

As a result of the August 12th Board meeting, staff is evaluating the following four potential modifications related to the CONSERVATIONplus program:
1. If residential customers can meet the necessary legal requirements by just signing the budget allocation document and not having to provide the proof of residence documentation.
2. If more flexibility can be introduced to the number of times a customer can adjust their household occupancy value (which determines their water budget).
3. If it is appropriate to modify the language in the draft Ordinance pertaining to “economically infeasible” (under section Variance VII. B.).
4. If the behavior BMPs for businesses should be eliminated, reduced or made voluntary.

POSSIBLE BOARD ACTIONS
1. Receive public comment on the CONSERVATIONplus program and draft Ordinance No. 14-02.
2. By MOTION, provide direction to staff.
3. Take no action.

By ______________________________
Ron Duncan
Conservation and Customer Service Field Manager
Item 8.0 Written Communications & Correspondence
July 6, 2014

To:
Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors

From:
Terre and Charles Thomas
516 Park Avenue, Capitola

Subject:
Recommended Inclusions Regarding the Conservation Plus Program

Action:
Submittal of this Letter Under Written Communications for the July 15th Meeting
Review and Consideration by the Board Prior to the next Public Hearing
Reading into the Record the Following Points at the Public Hearing August 12, 2014

Gentlemen,

My husband and I are forty year residents on our acre of land, which is currently subdivided into two parcels, one with our primary residence, the other with a tool shed and our orchard.

Let me first say that I applaud your efforts to find ways to prevent salt water intrusion that keep our aquifer in a healthy state. Though we may not be pleased with your solution, we welcome the opportunity to contribute to an equitable resolution. Unfortunately, it was very disconcerting to be told at your office Friday that the July 15th public hearing had been postponed until August 12th, as we will be out of town, and unable to attend. Glad I asked.

Consequently, let this letter stand as our input to that public hearing in our absence, as we respectfully request that the below numbered points be read into the record at the meeting for all to hear. I am delivering it early, at a staff member’s suggestion, so that you can have time to address these concerns during the public hearing process, and incorporate your responses into the program.

We have been “practicing” water rationing for the last two months, and want to make it known that, though we are making significant progress, what we are doing on a daily basis is turning out to be what consider a “hardship”, like a 20 year bummer.

Our concerns, and suggestions for you to consider as remediation, are as follows:

1. There seems to be no consideration in the calculations for the size of any given parcel. There are not many acre sites in the areas covered by water hookups, so this is not a one size fits all situation. We would like to see that large parcels, with legitimate use needs, be given special consideration, and I just found out about separate metered irrigation.
2. There is little information regarding how those on wells will be expected to do their part. Are the residences and commercial/business enterprises on hookups expected to bear the burden and cost of this program alone? What provisions will you be incorporating to make this conservation effort equitable? What is being done about those large consumers, such as Cabrillo College, golf courses, agricultural business to conserve the water we all use? Again, do those on hookups have to bear the burden?
3. It would not be easy to tell how much water we use each day, as “units” on our meters are not easily converted. In order to be fair, there must be a way to provide us with a means to keep track of our daily use so we can tell if we are on or off track. Otherwise, it will be a shock when we get our bill saying we are over, with penalties applied. Monitoring capabilities are critical, and only fair.

4. Also in the interest of fairness, I would like to be given the option to take the year’s total GPD and ration it out according to seasonal need. It is more logical to be using 100 gallons per day in the summer, sharing them with the plants, and 50 gallons per day in the winter when it rains. The end result is the same, but this flexibility is vital and much more realistic. We are willing to do the math for you, if need be.

5. Along similar lines, the other option is to give customers credit for their underused months’ rations to be used in subsequent months. If we use only 65 gallons per day one month, then we want to be able to use the extra 15 gallons per day the following or future months. One or the other of these options needs to be part of this program. The end result remains the same number GPY, but this way it is more reality based.

6. What happens, as I have been told it will, when the sewer lines become clogged because there is no longer a sufficient amount of water flowing through the line? This could end up costing the customer a considerable sum over time, especially if the line running to the street is quite long. Will there be a “sewer cleaning” fund set aside for such situations? We won’t be the ones creating these sludgy conditions.

7. As for the future of our communities, what is this 20 year program going to do to our property values? If we are being rationed this severely, who is going to want to purchase our homes with that kind of restriction? Will you be applying to the county for tax relief on our behalf? This will surely devalue our otherwise prime real estate.

8. Is there any provision for an appeal process? SCWD is an entity unto itself which sets the rules, makes policy, establishes the cost to consumers etc. Where does the public go to make changes in the program if it doesn’t seem fair or equitable? We need a voice.

9. At what intervals will you be assessing the replenishment of the aquifer? If it is recharging at a more rapid rate than anticipated, will there be adjustments made to the length of this program? Is there any provision for annual review of the success or failure of this program, based on findings and customer feedback, and adjustments to it accordingly?

We received a water rate increase on July 1st. How many more do you anticipate as revenue drops due to less water being used? It says it is for administrative costs. Hiring new staff, monthly billing, extra monitoring, outreach, hiring of consultants. This is becoming a very expensive program that I am sure you expect your customers to pay, so will the fines imposed be put in a special fund to defray the cost of this program? We would like you to make available to us how these added funds are going to be spent. We would like to see some of the money go to making the rationing allotments more flexible over the course of a year.

You can hire all the consultants you want to say it in the friendliest terms you can think of, “Conservation Plus Program” or “Water Use Reduction Program”, but the bottom line is that this is a “Mandatory Water Rationing Program”, pure and simple.

We sincerely hope that you will incorporate these requests into the final presentation of this program to the public at your next meeting.

Thank you,