

DRAFT 4-2-15

Tri-Valley Water Roundtable Held February 5, 2015 Discussion Notes

On Thursday, February 5, 2015, the Tri-Valley Water Policy Roundtable met from 5:00 – 7:00 pm at the City of Pleasanton Operations Center at 3333 Busch Road in Pleasanton.

Agencies represented included the Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon and Dublin; Zone 7 Water Agency; Dublin San Ramon Services District (DSRSD); and the California Water Service Company. Pat O’Keeffe and Brittany Gabel of Management Partners served as the facilitator and recorder respectively. The following is a write up of the discussion ideas that were captured on flip charts.

Four objectives were established for the session, as follows:

- Understand existing policies governing reliable quality water supply
- Discuss of an acceptable level of reliability
- Recommend elements of reliability that should be pursued immediately
- Understand current efforts for recycling water

Participants

Elected/Designated Representatives

- Mayor John Marchand, Livermore
- Council Member Doug Horner, Livermore
- Council Member Karla Brown, Pleasanton
- Council Member Kathy Narum, Pleasanton
- Council Member Harry Sachs, San Ramon
- President Georgean Vonheeder-Leopold, DSRSD
- Director Richard Halket, DSRSD
- Director Jim McGrail, Zone 7
- Director Dick Quigley, Zone 7
- Frank Vallejo, General Manager Cal Water

Staff

- Daniel Smith, Operations Services Director, Pleasanton
- Bert Michalczyk, General Manager, DSRSD
- Dan Gallagher, Operations Manager, DSRSD
- Brian Bornstein, City Engineer, San Ramon
- Roger Bradley, Assistant to the City Manager, Dublin
- Dan McIntyre, Public Works Director, Livermore
- Darren Greenwood, Assistant Public Works Director (Operations Manager), Livermore
- Jill Duerig, General Manager, Zone 7
- Nelson Fialho, City Manager, Pleasanton

Setting the Context for Workshop Discussion

In order to set the context for the workshop presentations and group discussions, facilitator Pat O’Keeffe reviewed the list of six policy issues, summarized below, that the group settled on during the last session on November 17, 2014.

- A. Improved reliability through diversification of supply, storage, and facilities
- B. Increased use of recycled water
- C. Increased “structural” conservation
- D. Planned growth to proceed when reliability criteria are being met
- E. Coordinated legislative and regulatory outreach and lobbying to enhance valley water
- F. Governance changes that lead to or are needed for implementation of the above policy points

The group was reminded that this workshop session was designed to focus on the first two policy issues: improved reliability and increased use of recycled water.

Presentation of Zone 7 Reliability Policy

On behalf of the Zone 7 Water Agency, Brad Ledesma, an Associate Engineer in the Integrated Planning Section, delivered a presentation on the existing reliability standard and discussed how it relates to current drought conditions and the potential effects of various water supply portfolios. Attachment A includes the slides from this presentation. Workshop participants were invited to provide comments and ask clarifying questions about the presentation.

Comments and clarifications included:

- The \$469 million portfolio cost, as cited in the presentation, includes all water supply and infrastructure costs, but relies on assumptions based on 2011 conditions (not severe drought conditions).
- State water is relied upon in all three 2011 portfolios presented; all portfolios moving forward will include some reliance on state water project.
- Zone 7 is currently looking at a combination of the three portfolios presented; they expect to complete this analysis in June 2015 and will prepare an amendment to propose portfolio alternatives that better handle water level uncertainties that the



region is currently experiencing.

- There was agreement that it is important to look at a combination of the three portfolios, with particular emphasis on water supply sources that are under local control.
- The state water project will take decades; decisions will be made outside of the Tri-Valley; the Tri-Valley has more decision making power for the back-up portfolios presented.
- There was concern over the reliability of state water project entitlements; should we try to minimize our reliance on this source? Could reducing our reliance on state water generate capital for Tri-Valley specific water projects?

Discussion of Reliability Elements and Priorities

In order to facilitate workshop discussion, participants were asked to address two issues in small groups. First, participants were asked to discuss the current reliability standard of 85% reliability for 99% of the time and reach consensus on whether to recommend a different standard. Second, participants were asked to discuss water reliability elements from last meeting. Comments made during workshop discussions included:

Current reliability standard (85% for 99% of the time)

- It is a moving target
- 2014 has tested the assumptions
- If the climate is changing, it is more and more difficult to meet the standard; we may need to lower the standard
- How comfortable are we with running out of water?
- Are people willing to spend more to increase reliability? Comments ranged from its OK to go dry/brown lawns periodically to it should never happen, especially if its not happening to neighboring districts (e.g. EBMUD, etc)
- How much more customers can or will pay is unknown, and probably varies by community/retailer
- The current reliability standard is “OK” but requires another level of detail; it should delineate between state reliability versus local reliability
- The standard itself is not the important part; we should be asking ourselves what portfolios are in our control? We need less variability in our water supply; we need portfolios that reduce volatility
- In large swings (severe drought conditions) reliability standards are not meaningful; we need more supply and more storage

Elements of water reliability

- We have local control over recycling
- Who would pay for Recycled Water (RW) improvements?
- Delta fix won't happen quickly
- Pick choices we can control



- Need to educate customers
- Irrigation versus indirect potable reuse (IPR): water quality concerns
- A portfolio approach with many different elements will reduce volatility; we need to diversify our portfolio
- How can we capitalize on interties with East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)? Will water be available?
- Vaqueros holds much promise, (many upsides, with some drawbacks as well); and yet groundwater recharge storage is much larger storage capacity than Vaqueros
- Expanded use of Lake Del Valle (although it is controlled by the state)
- Chain of Lake(s) for surface storage (although it is not happening until 2058, it will make a big difference)
- Recycled water is preferred over state water
- Need to have maximum conservation in extreme outlier events; our portfolio needs to set us up to survive outlier events; some level of conservation is “OK” for one year in a single decade
- Extreme volatility in ability to meet standard hurts the economy
- We cannot continue to conserve at 25% for multiple years
- There needs to be some recognition that it will cost to diversify the portfolio
- Is it possible to pull water from state water project for ground water basin?
- All water supply sources are interrelated; as state water availability decreases, it becomes more difficult to store water in our locally controlled storage facilities, as all excess water currently goes into the groundwater basin
- Should we focus our infrastructure investments in expanding our capacity to recharge?

Presentation by the Santa Clara Valley Water District

A presentation was delivered by Jim Fiedler, the Chief Operating Officer of the Santa Clara Valley Water District about recent efforts in Santa Clara County to develop the infrastructure to support expanding the use of recycled and purified water. Attachment B includes the presentation slides. Afterwards, the City of Livermore, DSRDS, and the City of Pleasanton reviewed their existing recycled water programs and services. Comments that were generated by these presentations included:

- The Silicon Valley Advanced Water Purification Center (SVAWPC) facility took approximately 4 years to build; it was paid for primarily through local funds from the Santa Clara Valley Water District (\$52 million); City of San Jose (\$8.5 million) and funds from federal and California State Department of Water Resources (DWR) (\$13.5 million)
- There is currently no state regulation to treat wastewater for a potable system; direct potable reuse standards are currently being looked at by the State.
- Groundwater basin in South Bay is being impacted by current drought; they are looking at injection and surface spreading of advanced purified water from a future facility similar to the technology being used at the SVAWPC.



Wrap Up Discussion

To conclude the roundtable discussions, facilitator Pat O’Keeffe asked participants to identify what they liked about the meeting. Comments included:

- Good discussion; narrowed options (local)
- Good water
- Good discussion of path moving forward
- Focused discussion on reliability and portfolio of sources
- Consensus building; diversity of supply (no conflicts)
- Santa Clara information was helpful
- Water = Quality of life / economy

Presentation Attachments:

1. Attachment A -Zone 7 power point slides re: reliability standards and water portfolios
2. Attachment B – Santa Clara Valley Water District power point slides re: Purification Center

