



MEETING NOTES
SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 11, 2007
8:00 AM – 3:30 PM

Members Attending

Gary Arant	Ron Morrison
Jim Bond	Mark Muir
Jim Bowersox	Dr. Joe Parker
Gary Croucher	Hershell Price
Marilyn Daily	Javier Saunders
Frank Hilliker	Richard Smith
Michael Hogan	Fern Steiner
John Johnson	Fred Thompson
Keith Lewinger	Yen Tu
Bud Lewis	Howard Williams
John Linden	Kenneth Williams
Daniel Lizzul	Tom Wornham

Staff Attending

Maureen Stapleton
 Paul Lanspery
 Frank Belock
 Dan Hentschke
 Ken Weinberg
 Cheryll Stewart
 Kelly Cole
 Trudy Robideau

*Facilitation by Lance Decker
Summary by Teresa Makinen*

"Planning without action is futile... but action without planning may be fatal."

Anonymous

"Getting caught short by a strategic issue... it's like getting run over by a glacier."

Anonymous

"On the road to the future, you will meet 1000 people appointed to guard the past."

Old Chinese Proverb

"I have thought that a man of tolerable abilities may work great changes if he first forms a good plan and makes the execution of that same plan his whole study and business."

Ben Franklin

"Planning is . . . attending to the goals we ought to be thinking about and never do, the facts we do not like to face, and the questions we lack the courage to ask."

John Gardner

"You've got to come up with a plan. You can't wish things will get better."

Jack Welch, President, G. E.

***Definition of Planning:
Doing things today to make us better tomorrow. The future belongs to those who make the hard decisions today.***

Anonymous

WELCOME & OPENING COMMENTS

Chair of the Board of Directors, Fern Steiner welcomed the group. She stated that in 1995 the Board created a strategic plan and it is now time to stand back and take a look at that plan, our mission, our vision, our values and our policy direction. Earlier this year she appointed a nine-member committee which set about updating the Board strategic plan. They met several time and selected a consulting company, LL Decker & Associates, to help facilitate the process. They've met twice since then and it's now time for the whole board to look at what they've come up with.

Today we want to step back and focus in on what we're doing now and what we'll be doing for the next 5-10-25 years, our mission, what we should be doing to ensure the citizens in our area have water and how we'll support the region as it keeps moving forward.

Fern then introduced Jim Bowersox, Ad Hoc Committee Chair, who thanked the participants for attending. Jim provided a background briefing on the Committee's work and introduced the Ad Hoc group including Keith Lewinger, Dan McMillan, Joseph Parker, Yen Tu, Gary Arant, Barry Martin, Mark Muir, Hershell Price, and Mark Watton. Jim then introduced Lance Decker, facilitator for the session.

STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSION

Lance Decker stated that the 1995 plan had served the Water Authority well and it was time for the update. He discussed the subordinate planning documents that still support the Board's 1995 plan, but indicated today's discussion would focus on the umbrella that holds all these policies and implementation plans together. Our job is to assess the current and future environment, and then give the committee the direction and information they need to assemble the updated plan.

Throughout this document, comments or questions provided by participants at the meeting are preceded with a bullet point. Unless there is a specific reason to do so, speakers will not be individually identified in the balance of this report.

Lance reviewed the meeting's objectives as follows:

- Discuss critical issues facing the water authority over the next 20-25 years
 - Review the materials developed to date by the strategic plan ad hoc committee
 - Recommend strategic direction the committee will use to update the strategic plan.
-
- When I look around the room, most of this board will have a total shift, and most of the staff members will retire, so to me the plan should be 10-15 years, and that's a long time. But the idea being if you go too far out, it becomes a bit unrealistic because of those things.

- This came up at Ad Hoc Committee; my thought was 5 years, otherwise it's so conceptual. But we decided to go ahead and do it for the longer period and keep reviewing it over time.

Lance then reviewed the day's agenda.

Three things will be used as discussion vehicles today. They provide the broad coverage that will cover most everything the Water Authority does:

- Growth
- Water acquisition and pricing
- Weather, climate and anticipated changes

If that doesn't cover it all, please use the cards. By the way, the last question of the day is "what are the three things on which this group needs to focus?"

Lance then reviewed the meeting rules and administrivia, and the strategic planning model. He then reviewed the committee's work to date.

Mission: The mission of the SDCWA is to provide a safe and reliable supply of water to its member agencies serving the San Diego region.

Vision: In partnership with member agencies and stakeholders, meet the region's water supply needs by

1. Providing a safe and reliable water supply,
2. Diversifying the region's water supply sources, and
3. Building, maintaining and operating critical water facilities in a cost effective manner.

Lance asked if the Ad Hoc Committee members had any comments about the mission or vision. He asked the other participants to place any comments they might have about mission or vision statements on the data cards that were provided.

- We have a new mission which is to control demand by conservation, and that's not in there at all.
- I humbly put forward the idea that it's <the mission of SDCWA to> perhaps educate the population or citizens in affected areas of water issues.
- If you look at Number 1 – there's nothing in there with regard to making water affordable. We're getting into areas that... as the cost goes up, we're ruining some businesses if we don't make it affordable.
- By definition, the Water Authority has a component of conservation. Dan McMillan was quite a champion of being cost effective, which led to the last sentence which says in a cost effective manner.
- In the mission or vision statements, if you start adding in conservation and environment, it can really get large. So the idea was to try and condense some of that.

- The value statement may incorporate some of that.
- I agree with the statement on education. It's <the vision> very Water Authority – centric. If it's a vision, we need to figure out how the Water Authority will affect the culture here in Southern California and is the public even thinking about it.

Lance explained that the value statements establish filters through which your decisions flow, assures consistent organizational direction, and guarantees decisions reflect agency policy. He then read the values from the 1995 plan and asked the group to respond with comments or changes.

Values: We will:

- consider our partner agencies' and stakeholder's interests in our decisions.
 - do our work in the most cost-effective way.
 - have open communications with the partner agencies and the public.
 - have an open and inclusive policy development process.
 - value diversity in the water supply.
 - value long-range planning.
-
- Where is "education" in that, which is different than open communication. I think one of our values has to be to educate the public in what we face here in providing water to them and what they have to do to make sure there is water tomorrow.
 - We see less use of water so we make less money, but if we don't conserve today, there's only so much out there. We have to make sure the public changes their lifestyle. They're used to pulling on the faucet and water comes out. They need to recognize they have to do something to make sure it comes out tomorrow.
 - Maybe we should think internally and value employees and contributions to get us to where we need to go. We're not looking internally.
 - I agree with that. I want to support what was said, the entire water community in California is coming to the realization that the public has no idea where water comes from and how it gets there. We need to make public education and awareness something you do all the time.
 - Education is the right answer – that's too limiting, education is part of cultural change. We've had a cultural change over last 30-40 years, cigarettes, racial, women in work place, and that same thing that needs to happen here in Southern California with water.
 - Include in the value statement regarding the value of employees, and the value of the environment.
 - I was part of the committee, and the one thing I'd like to add is the key importance of cost of water. Most of our water problems can be solved by increasing cost. Education is needed to get people to realize they'll have to pay more. It doesn't become a political hazard for people who deal in water now. Water supply can be controlled by how much we pay for it.

Lance asked, so you believe if you raise the price, water use will go down?

- That should happen. There is one problem – water is the cheapest thing we buy, all other things, gas, electric, cable, are much higher.
- As you raise the cost, and we need to look at all our customers, we push some out, like agriculture, and are we taking that into consideration. We need to take our entire customer base into the equation.
- I'd like to see if we can start adding people as a competitive advantage. We've got a great team here, and we need to keep the caliber of people here and start to consider adding people in our values – state that we do value the employees.
- I spoke to a group of about 60 business people on the water situation, and during the question period, not once with all the publicity of increasing rates did the price of water come up. That's an interesting thing. I'd suggest all these other issues are much more in the minds of people.
- Do you want to come talk to my farmers?
- It's much more a cultural thing to what he said, the Water Authority has been going back for decades, so maybe we need to think outside the box of how we do that...we're doing the same thing over and over.
- I didn't want to get off the point of agriculture, that's very important to San Diego County. I want to reiterate education, I was at a City Council hearing the other day, and I have seen an appreciable understanding about water, the interest has just spiked immeasurably and I think education must be a part of any value system.

Lance stated that one of your education groups is sponsoring a lot of information.

- That group is called ACWA – that's a \$6-9 million media effort, it's not PSAs.
- A lot has to do with crisis; the water awareness is probably because of the drought.
- Regarding education, I think the trend we want to change is primarily residential outdoor water use, that's where we can save most of the water, that's where it's being wasted in this region and where educational efforts are needed. And on pricing, just a point, cost effective is not the same as affordable...end of comment.

Lance then discussed trends. He stated that they provide a vessel for agency intuition about the future, assumptions test for individual and collective traction on which direction will be based, and "cause/effect" statements that provide for alternative futures. "Actions" provide alternative scenarios. Are there any comments on trends statements in your handout?

- Under climate change, would it be appropriate to say future forecasting will fail us? Historical perspective is much more accurate than the future.
- One trend out there we need to change is the impression that we're a retail agency. We're wholesale to retailers.
- The more successful the agencies are in conservation, the more they are penalized financially. We need to change that trend. How do we reward agencies that are successful in what we're asking them to do?
- The trend came from you all and when our committee discussed this. There was some reluctance to combine and condense, but at the same time it could be expanded upon, so please use the cards.

- Regarding conservation, the State tells us we need to be planning for 1 million more people in the next 20 years, so it's not a frozen in time thing, it's not only more consuming, but more conserving.
- Can I go back to the values statements? We've been dealing with integrated regional water management plan in that we need to consider environment, and I don't remember seeing the environment anywhere in anything that we're looking at. We've got environmental issues to energy and as to watersheds, so I wonder if in the value statement there needs to be something about environment.
- I think we addressed that, because we ended up bringing that somewhere into the process.
- My recollection is that's included when we say that we will consider stakeholder interests in our decisions, but it may need to be more obvious.

Lance explained that as he was conducting the research interviews, a number of provocative questions came to his mind. As a way of initiating conversations, he shared these questions with the group, including:

Provocative Questions

- How do we control the price of water? How should we price water?
- Should the Water Authority's role in reclamation and other local supplies be expanded?
- How should integration of water resources and infrastructure in the region be accomplished?
- Do we want to get involved in the energy business? If yes, in what way do we want to be involved?
- Should there be more interagency cooperation?
How will we improve our collaboration?
Do we see IRWMP as a planning and governance structure in the future?
- How will the current business model of local/regional partnerships change in the future?
What role, if any, will the Water Authority play in land-use planning?
- How do we improve the Region's public education, public relations and public communication?
- What legislative authority do we need to change to get to where we want to be in 2035?

DRIVING QUESTION DISCUSSION

Lance explained the issue development model for driving questions. He then began the discussion of driving questions. Lance introduced the driving question, asked one of the participants to provide a brief discussion of the topic, and then opened the floor to the participants to react or provide additional information.

What's the relationship between growth and water?

The San Diego County Water Authority service area is the context for the question. The State of California dictates to this region how many will be living here, and if the region doesn't like that they lose lots of funding for transportation, housing, etc., so it's dictated to them. We don't have a whole bunch of choices. They tell us how many people will be living here and we have to tell them if we can develop enough water to serve that many people. I've said for many years there is not a water supply shortage in California and there never will be. There is a shortage of inexpensive water, but not water. For a price we can have as much as we need. The issue of growth and water is one of price, and when do we or the public or politicians say it's too expensive and therefore, we don't have enough water we can afford? We've priced ourselves out of the market – we can't afford to have these people here, it's too expensive. The issue is not water or people, but whether politicians or land use planners are willing to pay that price. Our job, our mission is to make sure that water is available for people who are going to be here when they come. We can't react to short term decisions by judges, etc. In the long term we have to be prepared to meet the demands that land use planners and politicians say we have to meet. There's something called the Pacific Ocean out there – that factors in somewhere.

Lance asked the group if the information provided was accurate, and if there is anything that was missed. The following responses were provided:

- I agree it's all about are we willing to pay the price to get what we need. And that has a lot to do with our politicians.
- There is a relationship between people, land, water and money, and one of them has to give. There's a limit out there where you can't put that many people in a square foot.
- He's got it right. He's placed the question within a paradigm by adding the element of price and cost.
- I agree. In fact in the past I've been in planning and on the City Council, so I understand the political aspects. In reality if we're going to provide water, it's going to cost.
- You're changing your customer base if it's based on cost; it all depends what our mission and goals are.
- I agree, he framed it well. The other part of the component is priority; existing shareholders or new people coming in.
- I don't hear anyone talking about the business community and economic situation; controlling this can have repercussions on the whole economics of San Diego County. Now construction is the driving thing in San Diego County, it's driving up the economy and if you cut that off, you'll have repercussions. You have to consider that as well. You've got to have business to keep the economy up, and that's what brings the money in. If you take away their water, they go away.
- The tough question is, is it okay for farmers to lose their occupation in order to get new growth?

Lance stated – so pricing would drive agriculture out, and pricing is an issue. Could we price agriculture at a level they can stay in business?

- I agree with pricing, but in terms of agriculture, I don't think we would actually take agriculture out, because it will also change. The pricing of agriculture will increase because of water costs. So, in some way it relates back to the question of is there a sustainable amount?
- The agencies are represented in SANDAG and it's our responsibility to meet that growth. But I don't sense there is a strong relationship between price and growth. There are a lot of other economic factors besides water facing agriculture. If you look out 30 years, I think our fruit will be coming in big large container ships from other parts of the world. I think there are a lot of other factors along with that.

Lance repeated, so with development and growth, water is one component of a much larger set of circumstances.

- I think we're not anywhere close to where the price of water is very cheap. But with agriculture, if you're going to preserve agriculture in the region, it has to be a conscious decision to price water to preserve agriculture. It will have to be a conscious effort. With foreign competition the notion that avocados will go up, is about the price of our avocados here will be higher, so they will be forced out of business.
- When you talk about the planning agencies setting populations we have to meet, we need to focus on all those barriers and hurdles that are in front of us. How do we implement these and create the urgency to recognize what kind of authority this agency needs to move into alternative ways of getting alternate water sources?

Lance asked the group if agriculture is the "tail wagging the dog?"

- I think the industrial community will always be the overriding economic engine. I think agriculture is an important element. What was said is true, there is no shortage of water. All that ocean out there is a lot of water – are we willing to pay for it?

Lance stated, but I hear people saying that sea water is off limits for you.

- There are those that say that. We need this water for human growth too, and we can't always consider the environmental factors in the preeminent position.
- He was right about a conscious decision about agriculture staying in business. But that drives cost, if environmental groups throw hurdles in front of us, that means we spend more money, and makes it more expensive. And there are limits, as to how many per square foot can be included, but water is not one of those limits as long as we're willing to pay the price.
- I want to get back to the idea of price and money; they have some social implications. You can talk about limiting population, and those without money will not be able to live here. But others can, so there are very many social implications.

- The true factor is that as we raise rates you'll be here doing another strategic planning next year. We'll all be replaced, I guarantee it. You'll have a big election next year and there will be a whole bunch of new people here, so this may as well be a one-year strategic plan.
- Education should be an important part of the equation.
- There is a relationship between growth and water pricing. I focus on agriculture since it's a great part of our economy and it's being priced out of market. But agencies have to look at annexing future growth into water supply, that'll affect agriculture even more. So what policy do we make with regard to keeping the price for ag water, even if it has to be put on the M&I part of supply?
- An area that is not currently served by one of our agencies is being annexed to a water district, so they will supply water where previously they didn't supply water for ag.
- Much of the ag land within the north County will not convert to residential. The other thing with ag is there needs to be a paradigm shift, ag receives surplus water. So the first time there's a shortage, ag gets cut, and we need to shift that so they're not considered a surplus user but a firm user at a retail price.
- What resonated with me is that I always believe the laws of economics will drive the situation and society's pressure groups will do things along the way to try and stop that. Ultimately, the laws of economics will drive the whole thing.
- I think price obviously is an issue – that is, how much we're willing to pay, we know the price of desalinated water is very expensive, but I don't agree we don't have a limit to how much water we have. I don't see our whole coastline being filled with desalination plants to meet the water needs with the theory of just going out to the ocean. So somewhere there is balance but sustainability of our water supply is an issue right now. I think we have a limited number of molecules of water we can deal with. This is a tough issue and that's because growth is looked at in 20 year vision versus what's driving most of the conversation right now which is a short term issue.

Lance asked, "So in development and growth, do you have any role in helping shape that, or do you simply have a role in providing, as your mission says, safe and reliable water supply?" The group took a short break. When they returned Lance asked, "What blinding flashes of insight they had while on break?" The following comments were provided:

- We have to be ready – what does that mean? We have to be ready to supply the people that come. If you read the Sunday paper and news on Monday, the price of heating oil in the east is going up 32%, so guys back east are saying wait a minute, I'm going to California. That's a plain economic fact. Are we going to concentrate on groundwater, desalination, buy transfers, toilet to tap, what are we going to do? How will we be ready?

Lance asked the group, "What's your answer to authorities in land use planning and growth when they tell you the population will increase and you have to serve them?"

- If I were king, I'd tell all these people who want to be annexed "No". I know that's a NIMBY attitude, but today government says they'll get water, but where will that really come from? I hate to see us dilute our efforts for today and projected responsibility for next 20 years to come.
- My memory from 91-92, in context of price of water, what I remember is don't let this happen again, and people were willing to pay more. And here we are on the verge of that again. We're nowhere near the limit where price is an issue.
- Is it up to this group to determine policy? I'd say no. But it is up to this group to ensure the region has an ample water supply for those who make decisions to make good choices. People making choices for growth and no growth, planners, etc, water should not be a factor in those decisions. We should be able to bring enough water to the valley to make those decisions. We should not be trying to dictate/ coordinate growth in this agency.

Lance stated, "So whatever local policy makers in member communities decide on the issues of growth, you'll provide water to support that?"

- I agree. That's our job as we see it.
- I agree to a point. We also have a responsibility to let land use planners know implications of their decisions. If you approve 4,000 homes on ½ acre lots, that'll use a lot more water than if you approve condominiums on a transportation corridor where we won't need as much water. They need to understand the implications of their decisions.
- In talking about education, you have to educate policymakers, their council, mayors, and attorneys. If they make a bad decision, they can be fired the next day, so it's important to educate the elected officials. Don't leave the policymakers out.
- I want to clarify what's been said. The provocative question is "What role do we play in land use planning?" They described what should happen, but there is no name to that. Would the Water Authority accept itself as an advisor to politicians or government, or would they be a non-entity? How would we describe that?
- When we look at this question, we tend to think in terms of "if" or "whether" questions. What they're pointing out, is not if or whether, but how. The fact is water is wasted a lot on landscaping, so how do we build those homes?

Lance asked the group, "I heard someone say there are practical limits to water supply. Is that true?"

- I disagree.
- I think the Water Authority has been and should take a more proactive role in influencing policy decisions with lot sizes, etc. Statutorily we don't have that authority, but we have the summit tomorrow...to continue to play that role and shape the way it's being used to preserve our water supply.
- Our role is to have a safe and adequate supply of water, but that's not really true. If those ag users were paying full price for water, would we have the water to provide them. We have ag users in our district that pay full price for water. They will be handled like all other full price users.

- Maintain our customer base through controlled cost so we do not lose our ag customers regionally.
- Use every effort at the State level to implement the necessary infrastructure to convey water to this region!
- Don't price out ag. Food grows where water flows!
- Develop more transfers with agriculture.
- Agriculture transfers by conserving with our money.
- Someone started out with "we have to comply with SANDAG." What about a "will serve" letter? In other words, a lot of cost in water is in delays, construction, environmental, so forth. I would suggest we should be dealing with politicians saying if you want this growth, here's what we need, and we need your help to get there. I'd suggest that we're not acting in a leadership position if we let them tell us, in the water business, how much we have to provide them. I think we should tell them, "here is our limitation unless you do A,B,C,and D." Help us get there and we'll provide it. If someone gets a request, and you can't serve them, don't we control the water?

Lance reiterated, "So your point is here is what we can supply without additional resources. If you want more than that, you have to help us get there. So we can get water, make water, do whatever it takes to get there. It's an iterative process."

- We should also let them know the consequences, if we don't arrive at that 10 percent savings, there will be required reductions.
- SANDAG doesn't set that policy. We're on that board as an advisory member. It would be LAFCO or someone else. We're in constant communication. They do not do land use in the context you're talking about here.
- Yes, it's like an impact fee, but we have to go further than that. We have to get elected officials in the city and state to cut through this red tape and fast track some of this stuff or else it'll be so expensive. Projects now are coming in 20-30% more than we expected.
- My first thought is that I resent being told how much water we have to provide without having any voice in that. We serve the same base of constituents or tax payers. We need to integrate water into transportation and housing planning they're being mandated to do. Smart growth is good for water as well as making water systems more effective. We need to be at the table with a voice and a vote.
- Of course there is a relationship between growth and water, because we live in a desert. SANDAG does have a lot to do with setting growth patterns, but the state says this is how many houses have to go in the San Diego area. The only thing SANDAG does is say how you distribute that and how do you deal with it. Up to this point the Water Authority has always said yes. When you say control growth, 60% of that will be our own children, not people coming from somewhere else. And when you look at cost of real estate here, people won't come out here from the east coast because of heating oil costs. If they come out here they'll pay significant real estate costs. It's our own kids we'll have to deal with. How do we deal with the water?

- We're talking about shifting responsibility to state or city or whatever. We do have a responsibility? If we don't provide meters, we don't provide for growth. We do, in a sense, control growth.
- When SANDAG says we need to provide this water, we don't tell them at what price.

Lance asked, "So we all agree that the variable is pricing?"

- There is another variable. It's the regulatory structure of the State of California. We can be well intentioned, but we have to go to the Coastal Commission, the legislature and the voters to do a lot of these things.
- When Carlsbad put in a school financial plan, we also brought in the water element. MWD came down and they said as long as we could supply water that could not be used. If they say they can provide water, we couldn't put it in segment of the growth factor. If they said there was a restriction, then we could have put it in, but they did not make that statement.

Lance asked, "Can you just not provide meters?"

- I don't think you can do that.
- Our city passed a proposition some years ago and San Marcos is trying to do the same thing. That's where the citizens vote for any new thing in the city and they're slowing growth themselves.

Lance asked the group, "What were their concerns?"

- I'm really concerned ag will be eliminated from the region.
- I'm not concerned ag will be eliminated, and I'm a farmer. Granted, in our operation we don't use hardly the water they do in an avocado operation. Farmers are the most resourceful people out there and will adapt to change. There will be some who can't make it and will go away, and some farms will buy out others and just get bigger. I'm worried about produce from foreign countries. You have users or ag people now buying water at regular rates – a few. They'll make it, but we have to find a way to help them out.
- Infrastructure. In our cities the infrastructure is going down hill in a bad way and has to be maintained. We used to have a 2 –story limit, but now it's 4 and 5-stories.
- If the wholesale price of water goes up, that'll create pressure on retail agencies to keep their add-on price down. There is only so much you can charge people.

Lance asked the group, "How does infrastructure relate to the Water Authority?"

- Our pipes getting it here are bad, and they need to be replaced. And aren't we only talking about an average of \$5 increase for average user, how much will that go up?
- I think there's a lot of potential out there, and I'm a strong advocate of desalting, and if you need 4-5 plants out there, then that's an absolute necessity.

Lance stated, "It takes a tremendous amount of energy and it has a waste stream to do desal. Will the Water Authority get in the energy business to pay for the cost of the electricity? It takes a lot of energy to desalt a pound of water.

- We're looking at the private sector and they say they can do it. We're getting help from Metro and the Water Authority, but the price of water is going to go up and there's nothing we can do about it.

Lance asked the group about desalination. "I heard someone say that if people want water bad enough, let the private sector provide it to them. They'll pay the price. What do you think?"

- It's nice to say private sector will do it, but there are so many public policy issues that get involved, that it'll have to be moved out of private sector to have it happen.
- Your question limited it to private sector. How about partnership? Desalination – just do it, I don't care if it's private or public.
- The private sector should be doing it, with open discussions with the public.
- The private sector will do it, they realize the need. The public sector is getting in the way, and as long as we continue. Look at two water bills coming forward now....both don't have conveyance. Politics gets in the way.

Lance summarized, "So if politics weren't involved in the process and it were market driven, it would take care of itself?"

- Maybe some sort of public private partnership. If the private sector could build relationships with Sacramento or D.C., or advocate groups, whatever it is.
- The real problem isn't price... it's energy.
- The big emphasis has been on privatization in federal government in recent years. I don't think this paradigm works for everything we do when it comes to society and human behavior. There are some things we need to do.
- I support a private desalination project. But for it to work in the region, it needs to be a regional project for the conveyance. When it gets down to reality, we have a big issue of conveyance that needs to be addressed.
- I think the private sector has a role, they've taken the initiative, but it won't be successful without public involvement and ultimately the Water Authority.
- I support the desalination project. Ultimately I think a regional project is the best way to go.
- Looking at equating it to energy, it should be a private thing. Where would we come into it with the private sector, how much influence would we or they have?
- Water is an element of life. I don't think private sector should have exclusive control over things that affect the general public.
- I think this is a good example of long term planning. Who was it that captured the lease on the property...the private sector. Now the issue I have is if we'd had long term planning then, when the Encina Plant came up, the Board would have jumped on that and gotten a lease, but they didn't. It takes a long time for a public agency to get anything done and there's good and bad in that. I'm from the private sector but I

appreciate and respect the public sector. There's an example that I have that we could have had and controlled that whole thing. But I think the public sector should be in the water business, everywhere in the private sector the rates have gone up and infrastructure gone bad.

Lance asked the group, "So what will give us the impetus to do something about it? Do you have the political will and ability to make it happen?"

- Until we have a completely independent board elected by the public that can make decisions for the public and not for other politicians, we won't have the political will. They have to show leadership in that role. We have no real political and policy leaders that will stand up for what they know should be done. It's not popular.
- Leadership? This agency has shown the leadership, after that last drought we diversified our water supply and did a bunch of things. This shortage again will create more leadership and more process to make other changes.
- As it relates to the private-public sector, a perfect world would be to provide a good project, but there comes a point in time if you can't provide that, then you need to embrace the private sector. We're sitting back here and watching the private sector do it.

Lance asked, "Do you think you can get environmental interests to bond with you in using salt water in your desalination plants?"

- No. It's more difficult to defend an environmental position if it's not a time of crisis.
- This agency has had a good track record of being proactive to solving internal problems. Now we're faced with this desalination thing, and some of us hope the Water Authority continues to be active to get over the hurdle to get this desalination plant up.
- Maybe we're too short sighted. A lot of the things in our water system now were thought of by people who thought further out than 20-30 years. He was talking about the facility at San Onofre and that would be a good place. We won't all be on the Board when it comes to pass, but it's an opportunity and I hope we don't let it pass.

Lance asked, "What do you need to do to get ahead of next water crisis? Should you buy a power plant? Should you be building and owning desalination plants? Are there any final concerns? Does this Board have the political will to have the desalination plant become a public entity?"

- We need to get rid of the political "won't." If we can't do that as a Board, we've got a problem. Politically if we can't lead, then we're in trouble.
- I spent a career managing services the public sector didn't want to. I truly believe the private sector should have a shot at building plant first, if they can't, we should be ready to go. I don't recall the Coastal Commission approving any plants at this point in time. That's a good question, there's another agency not approving anything. They said their policy was not to approve a privately run plant, and with

that kind of mindset, how in the world will we ever get anything done. We've got the best site in the county locked up by a private company, we've got them saying we won't approve a public plant. But, approve something. It's getting through these stupid hoops. Ultimately I see us dealing with the issue of our traditional role of a blind water supplier, you tell us what you need and we get it, versus participating in how the water supply is used and where we get it. Political will is a major concern.

- Political will vs political won't. You asked a question about environmental groups and can we work with them. The issue I see there is environmental groups have the political will to get other organizations to have the political won't. They want to turn my paradigm on its head, and they don't want unlimited water supply based on price. They want to limit water supply based on growth. They have the political will to fight that battle, we've got to figure out how to get the political will to counter that. And they have a unified voice.
- I think we need to have more discussion, and bring them into our camp.

Lance asked the group, "What common interests to you share with the environmental groups?"

- The end goal is different. Their goal to have conservation and stop development.
- We see conservation as one of the tools, and they see it as the only tool.
- I don't think it's our role to stop growth, we can work on mandatory conservation ordinance, second is we need a seat at the table to encourage smart growth rather than stupid growth. I think we can have our cake and eat it too, but do it in a responsible manner.

Lance asked the group if there are any alternatives you want to put on table that haven't been discussed yet?

- Stopping the selling of water meters will not stop growth – but water usage will go up per meter.

Lance then asked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee if they had any questions of this group before we get off this topic for the morning.

- Reemphasize idea of public relations. When we were working on getting reclaimed water we did a terrible job of public relations and we don't want to do that too many times.
- One of the things I heard was develop better relationships with land use planning agencies to try and effect change. So, is that SANDAG or the individual cities and county? Or both?

The group replied, that you'd have to do both.

- I would rephrase the question – Does the group have reservations about the strategic plan including some reference to seeking a voice to land use planning in this county as it reflects to the usage of water?

Lance stated, "I didn't hear anyone say you shouldn't try to influence land use decisions based upon your influence in water. But I also didn't hear anybody say you need to have some legitimate statutory way or cutting off water other than what you have."

- We need to be at the decision making table with a voice.
- No, we don't want a seat at that table. My fear is we will get embedded in SANDAG or we will have 3 FTEs that will be chasing permit offices all over the county. Another box that needs to get checked on a form, and we've already got a slow process now. It would screw up economic development and everyone's life.
- I don't know what we'd really do. A lot of it is local agency flow. So a chair at the table would not benefit us.
- If that outcome were the same with what he's projecting, I'd agree. But if we're making decisions like smart growth, etc, high level involvement, we should be there.
- We have someone representing us at SANDAG so they are already hearing from us. Where we play it is that we will bring water to the region in a sufficient amount to make their decisions on how they want to grow. We should be in a position to educate them to how much water is coming to the region, what our water looks like, and if there will be any interruption.
- We also need to educate and work with the cities and county to help them, before they make land use decisions, let them know the implications of those decisions. Not tell them what to do, but let them know here's the water demand for this and this, and they are different.
- Cities and the county are involved in those issues, and they have a process through master planning and we need to be at the table.
- It needs to be consensus as to who presents information, whether it's our Director or Chairman of the Board - who represents the agency for that? And what are the messages we present?

The group then took a lunch break while Maureen provided a presentation on climate change and the possible effects on the Water Authority. Lance then asked one of the Ad Hoc Committee members to address the following driving question.

Where will we get future water supplies? What are we willing to pay?

Where will we get future water supply, that's a pretty easy answer, we have the same water today as when the dinosaurs were here. So it's the same water. The only solution, from my perspective, is reusing our current supplies, expansion of recycled water, and the other is possibly harvesting desalinated water from the ocean. Otherwise, we're reliant upon the region, such as the Bay Delta or the Colorado River. We want to have full control, then it's recycle or desalinate. The next question is what are we willing to pay? It's simple economics, supply and demand, the answer is based upon the level of reliability we're willing to guarantee our stakeholders.

Lance then asked the group “What was said that was portrayed correctly, what was wrong, and what wasn’t mentioned that needed to be said?”

- Both of these areas are good areas to look at. Reliability is the big thing, are we willing to pay more? We pay more for water in our Authority, we’ve got brine water desalinated, wells, reservoirs, but in good times, we’re paying extra because you want the reliability. So it costs more. Is it just supply and demand, or do we need to bite the bullet and say reliability will cost us something, whether we need it or not, but at least we’re prepared. It would be interesting to answer if all the water was cut off from the Colorado River how many days water supply would we have?
- I agree, I don’t think he got anything wrong, but maybe things could be expanded. What are we willing to pay? It’s all supply and demand if people need it – that will depend on what they’re willing to pay, and at our agency we’re pretty happy we have some low rates, and we still get complaints that rates are too high, but people still pay for it.
- How many days supply – 10 percent water comes out of wells we have. If we were cut off, we have 187 days of supply if cut off.
- Where would we get our supply – it’s a crime for the water to come out of this plant <the reclamation plant> to use for irrigation or dump back into the bay. We need to utilize every drop of water. So reservoir augmentation is important to providing more storage. It goes from this plant to the reservoir.
- There is a limited amount of water, but it’s how we use it and how wisely.
- If he talked about desalination and reclaimed, those are the two items that are drought proof, doesn’t matter what happens, and also immune to political variations we get that tend to cut water off. As time passes, we get to depend more and more on more reliable supplies even though it may cost more because price of water will go up no matter what. It’s a lot easier to increase prices if it’s done incrementally, and that’s how it’s being done now.
- Carryover storage in San Vicente to carry more water, raising the dam. Beyond that the practicality is we need a peripheral canal, save the delta, bring more water to us and be more reliable. Now through these interconnections of all the pipelines, we can deliver better and that’s something we’ve worked for years.

Lance asked, “Do we have connectivity with all the connections being made to trade water as needed?” Most participants agreed there was connectivity, however, some comments were made as follows:

- I totally concur but I think water is available as long as there is a price. It’s there as long as you want to pay the price.
- That’s in case of an emergency, but I think we’re looking at new water.
- I think we’re in a situation where you pull the car into a garage, so the guy says pay me a little now or a lot later, so the object is we’ll pay whatever we have to. There are no more good deals, we have to get the best deal we can, and that doesn’t mean it will be a great deal.....it’s a seller’s market.
- To piggyback on the idea of water transfers and future water supply, I believe whether in 10, 20 or 40 years from now, there will be another opportunity with the

Imperial Valley to talk about additional water supplies. The Valley is looking to diversify, there are over 10,000 units of houses going in. It's just a matter of time. How many days supply do I have? Six-tenths of a year is emergency supply for the City of San Diego.

- How much would the people on Mongo be willing to pay for water? That's a reference to Flash Gordon. Where will it come from, wherever it's available....what will we pay, whatever it costs. I'd like to put something on the table. Do we pay more attention to, or pay a premium for those things we can do locally, versus going out of our region. How many days supply for me? Fallbrook has six months if the water gets shut off.
- This Board is courageous. When push comes to shove, we do unite. I agree completely that at the end of the day, our customers will want water and won't care what it costs.
- The social aspect is there. It is an expectation that lower socio-economic groups in society have a certain need and they should not be charged too much. But going back to the economics thing, people will respond to higher prices, and they will respond by using less. At some point that will probably carry the day and these other sources of water all have a cost, and it will get passed on.
- I don't know whether I'm right or not, but I think I was told the group building the plant in Carlsbad would not be under PUC so they could charge whatever they want. It's purely market driven.
- Unless we were to buy it later down the line, then would it be? A participant replied, "No". How many days supply for me...a month.
- I agree that with water supply, desalination and reclaimed are obvious sources. I also like the statement about dinosaurs <drinking the same water we are drinking today>. Which goes back to this morning: You've got to have a change in thought about how water is used. For years we were guilty of not thinking about the environment, but now we're not thinking of human beings enough.
- Possibly left out the thought of future water transfers. Especially when ag has about 2/3 of water in the valley from Colorado River.
- I agree that the only truly new source of water is desalination. How many days supply? We would have enough water to pack up and drive to Helix.
- Most of us understand the whole water portfolio of options includes. As long as I decide to live here, I'll pay whatever I have to pay. How many days supply? We'd be at 41% all the time.
- Somebody mentioned conveyance in the Delta as a solution. Conveyance around the Delta doesn't provide us with any more water. It would just keep delivering the amount of water we already have. No new water from the Delta would be coming in.

Lance asked, "Is there any unobligated water in this state, except for the ocean?" The group replied, "No."

- We were given some minutes of an MWD meeting from back in the 50s. The exact same conversations we're having right now were in those minutes, literally word for word for word. The fact this is a half century ago, and struggling with the same issues, we've got to pay the freight for whatever it takes, to have it available.

Includes infrastructure and all the stuff that goes with it. You can't just put it in once and then walk away.

- Our collaboration has served us well, because of our Director and her staff. This Board has also collaborated and worked very well together.
- We need to look out farther than 30 years to nuclear and get desalination going. If we're going to get a plant we can own or half own. I think we can't look at that now, I think the future generations look differently at technology and those things.

Lance stated, "I'm hearing that without nuclear, you really can't have practical desalination. Is that true?"

- I think Poseidon is trying, but they want to tear down the power plant and do their own in the back. So the power plants that are now in existence will probably be scrapped.

Lance noted that a comparison of nuclear plants was made earlier in the day. The cost of other types of power plants would drive the cost of desalination so high, the public would not be able to pay or accept it. How long would it take to get this area to tell the public and give them a vision, and the impact on their lives and the changes they need to make? How long before they gave you the political and social capital to build a nuclear plant and companion desalination plants along the coast so you wouldn't have to worry about MWD or the Colorado?

- I'd like to say 25 years, but I think it'll be longer.

Lance stated that desalination sounds like where the group is headed, but a cheap power source is needed.

- The cost of power is a consideration, but it's not the critical factor. Analysis shows for an acre-foot of desalination, it costs more than to bring it in. One way to solve that is to back up and look at total water supply, and because of water supply getting into energy business. It costs 25% more to deliver desalinated water into the system than to pump it over the mountains from the river.
- The public is already sold on desalination. Every person I speak to wonders why we haven't done it. I don't agree with your premise that you have to have nuclear. And regarding new water, we cut a deal with IID to trade conservation for water, and I think there are a lot more of those deals to be made. When you think about the facts that about 80-85% of water in California is used for ag. 15% of developed water is used for M&I, if you can get ag to conserve 10%, you can increase supply to M&I by 50%. If we can get ag to use water more efficiently, then all the M&I in California has increased by 50%.
- That would save, statewide, about 300,000 acre feet.

Lance stated, "So you're saying if you could get ag to save by 10% statewide and invest in them, that water could be transferred to you."

- At the same time in return, agreeing to incorporate conservation measures, you take them off the interruptible program and put them on a firm program so they don't get interrupted.
- Our growers are efficient already, so the only way to reduce is to reduce their production.
- I've heard water coming down from northern California into the Delta, 70% of that fresh water goes into the ocean. Can that be recaptured to some extent?
- Yes, that's what's on the table. That's why they want more surface storage up north.
- I think there are finite ways of which to get new water. Can't we control evaporation in our reservoirs, or can't we have scientists address the problem of bathing, maybe use oil instead of water....maybe use chemicals to wash cars. Would that be a way to get new water?
- And you've got to get people over the whole toilet to tap thing. If we get our water from the end of a river, it's already reclaimed.

Lance asked the group, "Are there any concerns about what's been discussed so far?"

- The concern I have is that the one true new source of water is desalination. But there's a whole line of regulatory agencies and environmentalists lined up to keep us from doing it. Then they <environmental interests> won't be able to control growth through water supply.
- We talked about water conservation being a real new supply, but we also talked earlier about in San Diego County, the biggest opportunity to conserve water is outdoor landscaping in single family homes. I don't think we have a water conservation garden in this county that many people visit. This organization only contributes \$100,000 to that effort. If we're serious about changing our mantra on outdoor water conservation, we need to be serious about supporting that garden and the staff of that garden educating the public for them to replicate the Conservation Garden and the exhibits. We're trying to get long-term behavioral change.

Lance stated, "So behavior change is a strategic issue?"

- The low lying fruit is gone.....that's our biggest challenge. It won't get any easier.
- 60-70% of residential usage is outdoors. So if we can change their concept of how they use water, anywhere from 10-20% reduction in usage would reduce the demand. It would be about 20 gpd reduction.
- In Tijuana, the average consumption is 30 gpd, because houses have no lawns.
- I think you go to the kids, Escondido Children's Museum put in a conservation garden. The girl scout troop in town did something else. Remember the litter campaign and no smoking campaign that worked. We need to get the next generation, and build it into them.
- I'd just like to make an observation as to my community and special events. Those beaches are filthy after events. I notice San Diego and Oceanside have the same problem. These are teenagers and adults, and they are slob on the beach. And they don't listen, and it's getting worse. We talk about it but unless there's a fine placed on them, it's difficult for people to adhere to it.

- I believe we need to educate the kids, but we can't rely on them to make our tough decisions. We need to make decisions today that we don't want to address. Don't know how many times I've heard the Board people talk about rate increases. We have a difficult time ourselves justifying rate increases. Do we have the political will to do increases, and are we willing to do toilet to tap, and do we have the willpower to, other than watch a private company, do desalination. We're not doing anything, but identify the problem and lack the courage to find a solution.
- We talk about xeriscape, etc, but at the same time 15% of use is M&I, and the other is over 80% which is ag, so our big push is to say let's save at the other side. This is not making sense.
- Let's do something – not just identify problems.
- Let me carve out a reality. I think toilet to tap will get no legs until after the next election. If we agree that makes sense, we start figuring out how to put that in place. We need to be in a position with after the election we have a plan in place.
- The same thing with I don't want to raise rates next year, I'm up for reelection, let's wait until the next election....same thing.
- We have brine desalination and went ahead on a study to open up more of them. We know it's doable, so why not make that a priority and start pushing on that so we can actually start producing water here. What other areas do we have to produce water in the relatively short term?

Lance asked, "What other alternatives would you like to pursue?"

- Could we agree to not call it toilet to tap, let's call it indirect potable reuse.

One of the participants stated to Lance, "You had it in your driving questions. What is the appropriate role of the Water Authority in promoting reuse? The recycling projects are our member agencies projects, not our specific projects here at the Water Authority. What is the role of the Authority in reclaimed water?"

Should the Water Authority's role in reclamation and other local supplies be expanded?

- This should be action central, promote and educate
- Lead the way in pointing out there is a significant hole in our water portfolio and member agencies may want to explore that as an alternative, and we can help them in that process.
- I'm inclined to say it should be restricted to providing the facts. That's a little less aggressive than promoting reclamation.
- What is the single greatest barrier to widespread water reuse? In my opinion, it's public acceptance.
- The question has already been raised about election of 2008. I don't think we should pursue it until after that, and the politicians jump on that. Think we should do it after election.
- I think the Authority's role should be education of the public.

- Our loss the last time is because we did a poor job in educating the public as to what was going to happen.
- When we were working on it, we found there were several small groups that were really intense in their opposition because they didn't know any better. We just didn't go a good job of informing people in the technical matters.
- The biggest thing about it was people were convinced that reuse water was only going to be used in southeast San Diego. We can try and give the facts all day and that won't work – we have to sell it and let them know how good it is.
- The agency needs to get information out.
- We have a great vehicle at the Water Authority; people revere the agency. It is positive and if they come out positively for recycling and reclamation, I think it would make a difference. If someone like the Water Authority could offset some of that, then we could make it work.
- I wouldn't wait, I'd say let's do it now.
- There are constant elections, so our timing is now. Decisions are made because of emergencies. We need to use this to our advantage. I agree that we need to sell that we're doing a quality product, we're doing a great job of cleaning up Nevada's pharmaceuticals and sewage and people don't realize that.
- I don't see why we need to wait for an election. And actually we're being proactive if we get started today.
- Our role should be educating cities and get them on the track of educating. And get our lobbyist going up in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. to get legislation done.
- Demonstrate it all the time.
- We should be teaching the 4 R's - reading, writing, 'rithmetic, and reuse.
- I think the Water Authority needs to look at their incentive program and the cost and benefits that this region gets through recycling, and then there will be more projects.
- Help people promote wastewater, and caution the shaking public's concern over our imported water supply.
- Concentrate on larger untapped recycled market such as this city's plant. We have existing facilities that are recycling water either for financing or expanding facilities.
- You've got to get the old slogan out of the people's mind and that's hard because we were using the old reclaimed, reuse, and it keeps coming up. You've got to find new ways to talk about it, new ways to sell it.

Lance stated, "We're talking about community pride. When you build those new plants - facilities that the community can feel good about – put some parks, community rooms, and other amenities in them so you talk about how they are in the forefront of environmental concerns. Give people a sense of pride about doing the right things."

- We need to educate the paper as well – it's one thing to educate the kids, it's another to educate the paper.

Lance asked, "So what did this group agree on?"

- Reclamation and desalination will be our future source of water. We should think of the Water Authority and this plant as being an extension of the Colorado River. If the Water Authority bought water from this plant and put it into the raw water aqueduct, then it gets disbursed everywhere.

Lance then asked the group to summarize their thoughts for the day and focus on the strategic issues for the Water Authority over the next 20-25 years. He asked the following driving questions to the group:

What themes did you hear today? What do you believe are the strategic issues that the Water Authority faces over the next 20-25 years?

Lance asked the participants to complete card and summarized the cards into common themes as follows:

DESALINATION –

- Greed killed desal ‘til now
- Desal
- Water Authority needs to move forward with desal in addition to Carlsbad and focus on other sites.
- Desalination of sea water is a need for future water.
- Desal: Whenever, wherever, however – Must!
- Reliability – brine water desal; desal; storage
- Desal

EDUCATION –

- Utilize the already-existing alternative water sources: Exercise the political will; Get the children involved to cause cultural change.
- Educate (young & old) – cost; reliability; quality; conservation
- Accept: The need for education; the need for reuse; get out of the way of private industry.
- Need to educate local city planning commissions of the impacts of growth on water availability issues.
- Education of public on where water comes from, the cost and value of water and that reclamation is good. Smart growth is good. Conservation needs to be a way of life.
- Education of the public that <they should accept> “reuse” water – again hit hard at school children, too, in ways of the future.
- Education to change lifestyles and the way of doing business as to water.
- Education should definitely extend to elementary school level – the future of citizens. Think back what started with kids calling on their parents to be “responsible” (litter campaign, smoking, conservation).

CONSERVATION –

- Conservation
- Increasing the public's awareness of the need to always save water for the present and future!

HUMAN RESOURCES –

- People as a competitive advantage. Recruit, promote and retain the best people possible to replace those who are about to retire.

LEADERSHIP –

- Leadership
- Political influence

REUSE –

- Economy of scale
- Resource sharing

NEW WATER SUPPLY –

- Need agreement on sources of new water and the priority of those sources.
- Transfers – wherever available!
- Opportunity to transfer agriculture water to Authority as a result of improving irrigation techniques.
- Conveyance

Lance stated that there was no cluster <place> for the following two cards, so he suggested they go into a “parking lot” so we don’t forget the words.

- We cannot allow us to get run over by a glacier
- Nuke is the answer

Lance asked if there were any additional comments.

- At this point in time, facilities are getting done. We have plans in place to get them done, so it doesn’t need to be part of strategic plan.
- We’ve got a problem right now...we’re not connected. We’re paying for the treatment plant, but we’re not connected.
- Our city treatment plant is 30 years old and we’re running out of capacity, and it’ll either have to be enlarged or find a way to get more treated water. We are paying for a treatment plant for treated water, but we have no connection to it.
- Maybe we’re not directly connected, but it helps the region as a whole.
- Regional partnerships are missing as relates to cost efficiencies. We need to let the public know we’re efficient and we miss opportunities to regionally do that.

Lance stated that in the discussion, you mixed collaboration and rates. He asked if collaboration is a strategic issue. Is there a county-wide association of water utilities?

- You asked “what is the agency’s role?” All of us coming together so we have a consistent message going back to our agencies.
- We’re talking about sharing/blending of resources.

Lance then asked the group, “Over the next 30 years, what should the Board do?”

HUMAN RESOURCES – Over the next 30 years – internship. Identify the people who are headed out on retirement, figure out if anyone within is automatic replacement and make sure you are the employer of choice. Put that together as well as career path for those who enter the organization as to how they can proceed up through the organization. We have a plan in place called the human workforce plan. I think we still need that as a strategic plan, we need to make sure we continue to be attractive to those coming in.

CONSERVATION – Over next 30 years – educate through conservation gardens, model landscape ordinances, create opportunities for local jurisdictions to establish conservation in their codes.

- It’s a way of life.
- The Water Authority should be able to help all agencies come up to a standard that the Water Authority has set.
- I agree with the way of life that only pertains to people here in our service area. The bigger opportunity for me for a big chunk of water is promoting ag transfers by paying them to conserve.

LEADERSHIP –

- Us getting together and talking, then being leaders at our own agencies to discuss those issues and strategies.
- It’s making the tough decisions, doing the right thing for the long term and getting in front of the train.
- Making the tough decisions based on the information we have through the decision process and sticking with it and going forward.
- It also means getting whatever needs to be done in Sacramento to accomplish that....getting other decision makers on board so that what we’ve decided is the right way to go.
- Not only working on thing, but seeing that it’s adopted because this is what we need.

Lance then asked the participants for any advice for the ad hoc committee as they worked through the information from today’s session. The following were provided by the group:

- Work hard.
- Come up with something and apply the “KISS” principal, but consolidate all these ideas into one simple statement.
- This was a great session and I think we’re headed in the right direction.

- One question – the thought of recycled water, what rules would apply to that in terms of who gets to use it and what uses have priority. The same issues apply to desalinated water.
- Put it together so that we can use it – a usable document.
- We’ve given them some good direction they can grab it and run.
- The committee has already considered it, but the challenge of strategic plans is keeping them alive, and making them live and breathe over time - have formats of continually bringing them up in one way or another.

Lance asked, “How often would you have the Board look at this plan?”

- We need to get the plan into the day to day activities. That’s the challenge.

Lance suggested that if the Water Authority doesn’t have the Plan tied to the budget, it doesn’t help. Also, include the Board’s strategic plan in the HR plan for managers and staff. That way they know what’s in there and their performance appraisals are tied to your goals and objectives. Also, put the Plan in the communication/marketing plan. This will be a good marketing tool to get to constituencies, whether members, policymakers or citizens/ users.

- Be brave and do the right thing – no agenda.
- The committee’s been given focus today, we have our plates full, but we’ve identified the issues.
- As we go through this process, there are some opportunities in time. When I say that we have a drought or dry situation, with a need for time. That allows us to push on a button and talk more engaging with environmentalists on desalination, or with developers on requirements on landscaping, etc.

Lance then asked the committee members and staff if they had any thoughts for the group. They commended the participants on the great job, and for everyone being so engaged and vocal, that it’s very helpful to staff.

MEETING EVALUATION

Lance then asked the group what they did well today (+) and what would they change for future meetings (▲). The following were provided:

Plus (+)	Delta (▲)
+ Everybody had a chance to speak – very good	▲ Shorter periods of time and more frequently
+ Participation was great	▲ Shorter time periods
+ This forum was terrific – great to get together like this with someone that can expedite the process	▲ Half day might be better
	▲ Would have liked a little more time to think of some of the priorities before putting them up there.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">+ This is great+ Very productive – I was a little skeptical based on agenda+ Compliments to the committee – and their hard work+ Did everything right – participation was great+ Subjects important – well covered+ Facilitated everything very effectively+ You did a great job facilitating the conversation+ I like this as a format for continuation of our workshops – I like this process+ We discussed all the issues – debated – everyone spoke up and participated+ I was impressed with the three issues we focused on and discussions and how you got everyone involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▲ Half day better starting at noon – so we can get something done during the morning▲ I think we need to get more into action items – but maybe the group will come back with that.▲ I think this format was great, but I think a 4-hour session might be better.▲ I'd recommend after the sub-committee gets done, we reconvene in this format rather than a formal board meeting.
--	--

CLOSING COMMENTS AND ADJOURN

Participants gave a series of “thank you’s” to the City of San Diego and staff for the tour and their hosting of the workshop. They also thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for the many hours spent working through the information, and appreciation for each of the participants for their preparation and hard work.

We’ll get back together with the board in this format in a couple of months.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Makinen, Makinen Professional Services

Lance Decker, LL Decker & Associates, Inc.