



**Desalination Task Force  
Regular Meeting  
7:00 p.m. – Wednesday, July 20, 2011  
Soquel Creek Water District Board Room  
5180 Soquel Drive Soquel, CA 95073**

**Minutes**

*The Desalination Task Force consists of two members of the Soquel Creek Water District Board and two members of the City of Santa Cruz City Council.*

**Call to Order** Councilmember D. Lane (Chair) called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**Roll Call**

**Present:** Director B. Jaffe, Director D. Kriege, Councilmember D. Lane and Councilmember D. Terrazas.

**Staff:** General Manager L. Brown, Water Director B. Kocher, Desalination Program Coordinator H. Luckenbach, Desalination Public Outreach Coordinator M. Schumacher and Assistant Engineer S. O’Hara.

**Others:** Sixteen member of the public.

**Presentation** There were no presentations.

**Statements of Disqualification** There were no statements of disqualifications.

**Oral Communications**

Oral communications were made by P. Gratz, B. Lamonica and K. Cook.

Mr. Gratz requested that the minutes reflect that no Task Force member chose to act upon the Santa Cruz Desal Alternatives June 15, 2011 proposal and include it as an item of business on this agenda.

**Announcements** There were no announcements.

**Approval of Minutes**

P. Gratz provided written comments regarding the June 15, 2011 minutes and requested that they be included in the public record.

Councilmember D. Terrazas moved to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2011 Desalination Task Force meeting as submitted. Director D. Kriege seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: B. Jaffe, D. Lane, D. Kriege and D. Terrazas.

NOES: None.

**Information Items** No action was taken on this item.

1. Correspondence from P. Gratz 06/09/11
2. Oral Communication Statement from Santa Cruz Desal Alternatives 06/15/11

### **General Business**

1. Entrainment Study and Impact Assessment – Tenera Environmental, Inc. Contract Amendment No. 5

Desalination Program Coordinator Luckenbach provided the staff report and answered Task Force questions on this item.

Director B. Jaffe moved approval of a request for additional funds for Tenera Environmental, Inc. in the amount of \$7,000 for the Entrainment Study and Impact Assessment. Councilmember D. Terrazas seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: B. Jaffe, D. Lane, D. Kriege and D. Terrazas.

NOES: None.

2. CEQA/NEPA Services – URS Corporation Americas Contract Amendment No. 1

Desalination Program Coordinator Luckenbach provided the staff report and answered Task Force questions on this item.

Public Comments were made by S. Pleich, J. Brocklebank (written comments), B. Lamonica and P. Gratz.

### **Task Force Comments**

Councilmember D. Lane spoke to the members of the public and explained that the scwd2 Desalination Task Force has been tasked to represent two independent agencies that have previously determined the need for a desalination facility. The specific job of the task force is to develop the best desalination plan possible for the community and our two agencies. Members of the public who have recently started to attend these meetings may think that the task force has the authority to stop or cancel the desalination project and this is not correct. Only the Soquel Creek Water District Board and the City of Santa Cruz Council have such authority. Other alternatives that are being brought up in public comment periods such as the water exchange idea are not the business of this task force and will not be discussed.

Director D. Kriege moved approval of a request for additional funds for URS Corporation Americas (URS) in the amount of \$291,000 for CEQA/NEPA Services. Councilmember D. Lane seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: B. Jaffe, D. Lane, D. Kriege and D. Terrazas.

NOES: None.

### 3. Energy Study Status Report, Project Shortlist & Sensitivity Analysis Process

Assistant Engineer S. O'Hara provided the staff report and answered Task Force questions on this item.

Public Comments were made by J. Brocklebank, P. Pethoe and K. Cook.

#### Task Force Comments

More information may be required for the sensitivity analysis to have meaningful results. Rather than just a score it would be useful to have an explanation for each criteria/rating. An estimate of the amount of energy mitigation should be included in the evaluation.

Energy use is the most significant environmental impact, and it is important that the energy study provided accurate information.

Sustainability should be included as an evaluation criterion.

The results of the evaluation criteria and sensitivity analysis will be presented at a future meeting.

Councilmember D. Terrazas moved to include Use Recovered CO<sub>2</sub> for RO Permeate Post-Treatment to the list of projects to evaluate further and approve the list of projects to evaluate further, and approve the proposed evaluation criteria and weighting sensitivity analysis with the comment above noted and request that the TWG make recommendations to the Task Force on changes as deemed necessary. Director B. Jaffe seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

AYES: B. Jaffe, D. Lane, D. Kriege and D. Terrazas.

NOES: None.

### 4. Public Outreach Efforts for Desalination Program

Desalination Public Outreach Coordinator M. Schumacher provided the staff report and answered task force questions. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation will be included in the original papers.

Public Comments were made by P. Gratz, K. Cook, J. Heyse, B. Lamonica, J. Alford and P. Pethoe.

At 9:31 p.m., Chair Lane temporarily recessed the meeting because a member of the public refused the options Chair Lane set forth to either observe the meeting rules of order or leave the meeting. At 9:35 p.m. the meeting reconvened, and the public member apologized and was permitted to remain in the meeting.

#### Task Force Comments

Director Jaffe commented that he requested that this item be on the agenda and would like to discuss the Public Outreach goals, approach and the metrics being used to assess whether the goals are being met. He thinks that the topic of raised a concern about public outreach efforts including why we need desalination should be communicated and decided by the individual agencies and their constituencies. The scwd2 outreach should in no way advocate desalination.. The outreach approach must be totally objective and non-polarizing, focusing on identifying the potential impacts and, after information gathering and analysis, weigh the impacts against the benefits. He also cautioned that materials should not be too “glitzy”, which sends a message to some that they are not to be trusted.

Director Kriege commented that the District has determined that it needs additional water supply. It has taken many years of effort and a tremendous amount of money to reach the selection of desalination as the preferred alternative to be evaluated. People are coming late to oppose this project with ideas that have already been explored.

Councilmember Terrazas commented that this is a complicated partnership between two agencies and our goal needs to be to educate the public. The approach outlined in the presentation addresses that goal: 750 people receiving monthly emails and the number of events staffed are examples of tangible results.

Councilmember Lane commented that the content of the Public Outreach materials is not a concern to him, but staff should carefully examine all presentations to make sure that they focus on why desalination is being looked at by our agencies and avoid defending desalination in general.

M. Milan, Data Instincts commented that CEQA law is very clear that the key objective of public outreach is to educate the public on the project in order to assist them to make educated, informed and intelligent comments during the EIR process.

The Task Force requested that the Program Managers’ Report includes public outreach statistics such as website hits, meetings attended, presentations made, etc. The website should include a search function, a list of presentations that have been done and a place to request a presentation. The task force will consider developing a policy on linking to the website at a future meeting.

#### **Program Managers’ Report**

- A. Work Schedule
- B. Upcoming Tasks
- C. Additional or Amended Tasks
- D. Contacts with Regulatory Agencies/Requests from Regulatory Agencies
- E. Contracts

- F. Public Outreach Program
- G. Budget
- H. Report of Findings

Desalination Program Coordinator Luckenbach provided an abbreviated report due to the late hour. She reported that support of the EIR work continues on the following: Energy Study, Hydraulic Modeling, Intertie Alternatives, Pipeline Corridors, Tank Sites, Intake Alternatives, Offshore and Onshore structures.

Water Director Kocher reported that CalDesal has spent considerable time with the State Water Resource Control Board's triennial update of its Ocean Plan.

**Media Articles**            No action was taken on this item.


1. News Article – SC Sentinel 06/01/11
2. News Article – SC Good Times 06/14/1
3. News Article – SC Sentinel 06/16/1
4. News Article – SC Sentinel 06/22/11

**Items Initiated by Members for Future Agendas**

**Adjournment**

By Consensus, the Task Force cancelled the regular meeting scheduled for August 17, 2011. The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m. until the next regular meeting of the Desalination Task Force scheduled for Wednesday, September 21, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the Soquel Creek Water District Board Room, 5180 Soquel Drive. Soquel, California.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Staff