



Tri-Valley Water Roundtable Held July 22, 2015 Discussion Notes 8-13-15

On Wednesday, July 22, 2015, the Tri-Valley Water Policy Roundtable met from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm at the Robert Livermore Community Center at 4444 East Avenue, Livermore, California.

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 summary of the discussion that was captured on flip charts.

Four objectives were established for the session:

- Understanding preliminary findings of Zone 7 water supply evaluation update related to the need to pursue desalination and/or indirect potable reuse (IPR);
- Understanding and supporting a preliminary Zone 7 study to evaluate regional desalination and indirect potable reuse;
- Receive a presentation on a successful community engagement effort to support a large-scale advanced water treatment and recycling project; and,
- Discussion of potential community engagement efforts necessary to support a Tri-Valley IPR project.

Participants

Elected/Designated Representatives

- Mayor John Marchand, Livermore
- Council Member Bob Woerner, Livermore
- Council Member Karla Brown, Pleasanton
- Council Member Kathy Narum, Pleasanton
- Director Vonheeder-Leopold, DSRSD
- Director Richard Halket, DSRSD
- Director Bill Stevens, Zone 7
- Director Dick Quigley, Zone 7
- Frank Vallejo, General Manager Cal Water

Staff

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

Presentation by Jill Duerig and Darren Greenwood

The General Manager of Zone 7, Jill Duerig, and the Livermore Public Works Director, Darren Greenwood, delivered a presentation on the preliminary findings of the water supply evaluation update and the phased study on desalination and indirect potable reuse being conducted by Zone 7. Attachment A includes the slides from this presentation. Workshop participants were invited to provide comments and ask clarifying questions about the presentation. Comments and responses to questions included:

- Currently our reliability threshold aims to go below 85% reliability less than 1% of the time. A revised threshold hasn't been agreed upon.
- How will the bottom line (cost per acre foot) cited in the study affect retail prices?
Response: We expect roughly that every 1% increase in cost of production (per acre foot) for Zone 7 will translate into a 2/3% increase in retail rates, although these are very preliminary numbers.
- Are these price increases feasible for the consumer? *Response: This is a policy question, but we believe these price increases could be feasible.*
- Have we engaged in any public outreach yet about indirect potable reuse or desalination options? *Response: We think that many people (perhaps 40%) are not familiar with reverse osmosis.*
- Neighboring agencies such as the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission have had significant rate increases, sometimes in the double digits. These types of increases may become the norm.
- Do we need another portfolio option that drops the Delta fix and the chain of lakes, as these are fairly uncertain and we should factor in the possibility that they could take longer than anticipated? *Response: We account for some of that uncertainty in the study's scenarios, although the costs associated with the Delta fix are included in all scenarios, regardless of the completion date.*
- Have we incorporated 2014 data? If not, can we legitimately ignore 2014 given how big of an impact it has made on the industry? *Response: It is difficult for the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to incorporate data quickly; we build risk into our model with our own analysis. The bottom line is that higher levels of reliability comes at a cost.*
- Can we use more recycled water than what is currently incorporated into the study's portfolio options, because isn't recycled water less expensive than desalination?
Response: There is only so much waste water generated that can be recycled. Although this is



still being evaluated, it appears that 8,700 acre feet is a reliable estimate. In our analysis, we are identifying options that will not dramatically increase the cost of water.

- Desalination is a regional project; we would share the costs as well as the eventual supply for desalinated water. The desalinated water would not come from the ocean directly, but from the Bay estuary which will have less expensive operations costs.
- One limitation of desalination is that it is not a locally controlled water source (the broader region would invest in this alternative together).
- Cost estimates for the analysis likely do not include inflation.
- What would happen if the Delta Fix was never completed? How would that affect our reliability projections, given our current plan? *Response: We would expect reliability to drop to 46-51% (at or below health and safety levels). Short-term solutions need to be explored, but the study does have a scenario where the Delta Fix is not completed until 2048.*
- There is grant money available (potentially \$7.5 million) for collaborative projects; if we developed a regional project, we could get some attention. We should come together as a group for the Phase 2 effort.
- What is the best approach for elected officials to take towards these issues? *Response: Even with El Niño, we're not out of the drought; let's move now and collaborate as partners; local control is a key concern.*
- The state is already giving money away and eager to show they are doing something tangible; we should move jointly to apply for these funds.
- Part of our job is to make sure the byproducts of the IPR process are not harmful.

Presentation by the West Basin Water District

A presentation was delivered by Ron Rildermuth, the Manager of Public Information and Conservation of the West Basin Water District about recent efforts to gain community support for recycled water and indirect potable reuse. Attachment B includes the slides from this presentation. Workshop participants were invited to provide comments and ask clarifying questions about the presentation. Comments and clarifications included:

- Is there is a difference in the public perception of injection versus replenishment (augmentation)? *Response: The latter is easier.*
- Would you suggest preparing a survey before sharing information with the community? *Response: Initial survey can be done now and another can be done in two years; staff and elected officials can begin communicating with the public about the concept now.*
- How did you get the environmental community on your side? *Response: We actually could have done a lot more in this area.*
- Would you expect even stronger community support now for these projects (given the drought)? *Response: Absolutely.*
- Could national laboratories be a potential partner and supporter? *Response: It really depends.*
- For its public outreach, West Basin Water District reached out to elected officials, the business community (Chamber of Commerce), community groups, and other formal and informal leaders in the community.
- It is important to build trust and reliability within our communities; West Basin was lucky to have high trust even before public outreach began; they had relatively good



relations with the media, routinely responded to questions, and was proactive in making sure the media had the correct information.

Group Discussion on Public Outreach

In order to facilitate workshop discussion, participants were asked to answer the following four questions in small groups:

1. Should the agencies agree to jointly participate in an active public outreach effort, and how might this effort be structured?
2. If the need for IPR is confirmed by the Zone 7 water supply evaluation, should public outreach begin in the fall, or wait until a further study is completed and why?
3. List the key political, business and community leaders or organizations that should be the focus of early outreach efforts.
4. How should elected officials support the public outreach effort?

A summary of the overall discussion that occurred in relation to each individual question is presented below.

Discussion of Question 1: Should the agencies agree to jointly participate in an active public outreach effort, and how might this effort be structured?

Responses from participants were as follow:

- We should use the communication strategy we utilized for the drought as our model for organizing public outreach efforts for these projects.
- We should move together, but have a lead agency who contracts for services and is committed to steering the effort; joint funding is important to keep us all committed.
- We should move as a group and have an administrative lead agency (similar to the reciprocal service agreement) to help coordinate messaging and delivery.
- We should have joint outreach and a unified message (but the solution can be tailored to our distinct communities).

Discussion of Question 2: If the need for IPR is confirmed by the water supply evaluation, should public outreach begin in the fall, or wait until a further study is completed and why?

Responses from participants were as follow:

- There seems to be support for this already, given the nature of media articles.
- Yes; public outreach should begin in the fall and we should start with a survey.
- We should start now, rather than waiting for the water supply evaluation to be complete; there are some basic elements we could start and we need to take advantage of current community awareness of these issues.
- Outreach is practically starting already with last two roundtables; existing use of recycled water is a potential springboard (e.g., fill stations).

Discussion of Question 3: List the key political, business and community leaders or organizations that should be the focus of early outreach efforts?

Responses from participants were as follow:

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| • Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) | • “No growth” groups | • Senior centers |
| | • Friends of Livermore | • Large home owner’s |



- Sierra Club
- Friends of Alameda Creek
- Hospitals
- Chamber of Commerce and other business leaders (Oracle, Workday)
- Rotary
- Lions
- Shriners
- National Research Council
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
- Sandia National Laboratories
- PleasantonVoters.com
- Town hall
- American Association of University Women (AAUW)
- Unions (SEIU, employees)
- City employees
- City committees and commissions
- Stockmen's and wine grower associations; ranchers associations
- Pacific Gas & Electric
- Wineries
- associations
- Water agencies
- City Councils and other elected officials (state, federal, county)
- Nongovernment organizations (NGO) leaders
- Real estate associations
- School districts
- Service groups
- East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)
- Livermore Area Recreation and Park District

Some additional comments on the nature of outreach included:

- We should incorporate testimonials for other water agencies who are further along in implementing indirect potable reuse.
- It is important for us to stay on the message; this is about a preference for locally sourced water; indirect potable reuse decreases necessity for large Delta facilities.

Discussion of Question 4: How should elected officials support the public outreach effort?

Responses from participants about ideas to be explored were as follow:

- Take photos of elected officials "tasting" the water (possibly at a community wine tasting event).
- Have a booth for outreach at public events and farmers market.
- Contact supporters about indirect potable reuse specifically.
- Support staff at events.
- Have recycled water dunk tanks at events.
- Build consensus on talking points and work in unison.
- Develop a resolution that supports indirect potable reuse; engage community to define project before we go too far.
- Build reliability from the bottom (so we are less dependent on the Delta fix); the tunnels may be less of a necessity if indirect potable reuse is widespread.
- We have to have consistent messaging about the twin tunnels and keep in mind that we are 80% dependent on water conveyed through the South Bay Aqueduct and the Delta, which is our cheapest source of water; it is not possible for us to make up the difference with desalination and indirect potable reuse; nevertheless, our 80% dependency could be reduced.



Wrap Up Discussion

To conclude the roundtable discussions, participants reviewed shared observations and desired next steps. Comments included:

- The City of Pleasanton offered to begin developing a plan for a joint effort regarding public outreach and take the plan to Council for funding, if everyone agrees to do the same. A number of agencies expressed support for this idea, including Zone 7 and DSRSD, but it was expressed that we should sort out some details and conduct a joint survey before moving too quickly.
- Another option is to have the elected officials commit to supporting the represented agencies in the development of a community survey; we can have some preliminary outreach about the importance of having a diverse water portfolio and the importance of reliability.
- We need to get started and move as a group (people are tired of waiting for us).
- *Next Step: Staff will start working on plans for outreach and a survey; staff will develop a joint plan for immediate outreach in the fall.*

Attachments

- A. Presentation by Jill Duerig and Darren Greenwood
- B. Presentation by the West Basin Water District

