

SUMMARY of PUBLIC OUTREACH ASPECTS of the DRAFT PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY

GOALS - These should be highlighted often as they remind us of our original vision and keeps us on track.

PROCESS - Readers should see how this Draft fits in and leads us into the final FS and EIS process. Key to securing needed \$.

APPROACH - The approach used by HDR and the WISE PAC was to first offer a wide range of alternatives which were then refined by the PAC into categories of a) improved conveyance, b) increased storage, c) use of reclaimed water, d) management and operational changes, and e) on-farm conservation.

EVALUATION CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT - Table ES-1 Screening level criteria were applied, including water supply reliability, irrigation system efficiency, effluent reuse, environmental, water quality, cost allocation, aesthetics, institutional/legal/regulatory, recreation, financial, and technical - all w/explanation.

Results :

Level 1 with PAC input, Table ES-2 lists those not viable (just lining canals), fixed (implemented under any scenario) and variable (probable benefit, separable as add-ons).

Level 2 - with PAC input, Table ES-3 = IMPORTANT!

Application of variables into discrete conveyance (C1-C3), storage (S1-S5) and reuse options (RW1) as well as assumptions as to on-farm conservation (D) and keeping or elimination Bear Creek diversions (the latter allowing pressure in the system)

METHODS APPLIED IN OPTION EVALUATION - Question asked, "How would options differ from historical conditions?"

Use of a modeling simulator (MODSIM)

Table ES-4 lists each of 20 options and combinations modeled.

RESULTS -

Table ES-5 shows resultant benefits using a conservative "10th percentile" approach. = KEY CHART!

(Note: I'm suggesting this might be too conservative as the % benefits appear very small)

Conserved water is assumed to be represented by increased storage, not more water for ag use. Actual distribution to be worked out among ag and instream interests in the future.

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION - Table ES-6 Key public interest issues here!

Includes : fisheries, wetlands & vernal pools, shallow wells cultural & historic impacts, storm drain capabilities.

(I think recreation issues may come up as well here.)

Note: No fatal flaws were found in preliminary assessment of these environmental issues.

COST -

Table ES-7 Planning level estimates.

A. Cost by option with +50% and -30% listed

Conveyance has highest costs but has most benefits. Storage least cost with limited benefits

B. Cost/benefit - Findings:

C1b - (pipe lower valley MID and RRVID canals = most cost effective.

S1 - (increase Agate Reservoir storage) = most cost effective and ONLY viable storage option.

RW1 - (reclaimed water) = viable when connected to others (but not listed alone?)

CONCLUSIONS - Page ES 10 = CRITICAL!

Most viable options listed and explained. Those to make it to Level 3 are listed to be added to Fixed elements (givens):

Retain C2 (pipe all, retain BC diversions; prioritize C1b (pipe MID & RRVID only); omit C1a and C1c.

Retain C3 (pipe all canals w/pressure potential) = but expected to be expensive

Retain S1 (increase Agate storage)

Retain RW1 - (use of reclaimed water)

Omit S2 - S5

NEXT STEPS - Another KEY public outreach aspect!

A. Project activities:

- * work out distribution of conserved water (ag vs. instream)
- * formalize elements for Level 3 review
- * review water right issues
- * refine engineering
- * assess climate change effects

B. Process:

- * develop/implement a funding plan
- * continue and expand (?) public outreach
- * complete FS/EIS
- * support structure of on-going WISE PAC so momentum is not lost (again).
- * expand on water quality assessment

Note: The main report Appendices also include many WISE Project "Fact Sheets" that I do not remember seeing before. I have not reviewed them . . .

Eric

8/26/09