

**Citizens Advisory Panel  
April 11, 2006  
Meeting Summary**

**Attendance:**

Howard Peak	Joe Fulton	Evelyn Bonavita
Gene Dawson Jr.	Steven Schauer	Dr. Ed Roy
Orlando Cisneros	Dr. Weldon Hammond	Ben Youngblood
Rene Cortez	Susan Wright	
Jerry Green	Richard Araujo	
Nettie Hinton	Eiginio Rodriguez	Andy Johnston
Tony Navarrete	Dave Barton	Eddie Gonzalez

**Excused:**

Gerald Mullin  
Marianne Kestenbaum

**Absent:**

Jack C. Jordan  
Luci Cockrell

**SAWS Staff:**

Calvin Finch	Joseph Rippole
Rene Gonzalez	Kenneth Brooks
Karen Guz	Janelle Okorie
Gloria Puente	Kelley Neumann

**Board Member:**

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Howard Peak at 6:03 p.m.

**Introductions**

Mr. Peak welcomed all of the members.

**Drought Management Plan (Karen Guz)**

Ms. Karen Guz provided a presentation on Conservation's Drought Management Plan, DMP. The topics discussed in the presentation included:

- Predicted vs. actual pumpage for 2006
- Stage restrictions and the percentage reduction in supply per stage
- SAWS Conservation action plan at various stages 665', 650' and 640'
- SAWS Drought Declaration Process
- City of San Antonio ordinance on discretionary water use

**Comments & Responses**

**Mr. Navarrete** asked if the predicted pumpage graph was a typical cycle.

**Ms. Guz** stated the predicted trend line was based on historical J-17 levels, Edwards pumpage and San Antonio rainfall.

**Mr. Green** stated he felt that the System was in worse shape now than it was in 2000 because of the weather patterns that San Antonio has had for the past year and a half.

**Ms. Guz** reminded the group that the 1996 drought was actually more similar that the 2000 drought because of the similar weather patterns that took place.

**Mr. Finch** also mentioned the per capita usage has decreased over the years which help with the overall usage.

**Mr. Dawson** asked when SAWS hits the mandatory junior rights reductions, how does SAWS bank the rights and use them thru the period, and also is there a percent reduction SAWS sees automatically when the junior right reductions go into place.

**Ms. Guz** told Mr. Dawson that he should request a junior rights analysis from the water resource department.

**Ms. Okorie** answered Mr. Dawson's question, by telling him that SAWS would receive an eighteen percent reduction once the junior rights.

**Mr. Rodriguez** asked the question if the junior rights were given from SAWS or the EAA.

**Mr. Finch** clarified the law that the EAA has implemented which describes the percentage of water that is considered junior and senior.

**Mr. Dawson** commented that the constant media attention to drought conditions was not a positive aspect when it comes to selling San Antonio to other companies thinking of coming to this city.

**Mr. Finch** responded that communities of San Antonio have done their best when it comes to dealing with water issues that this city has, and that it would be easier if we had plenty of water.

**Mr. Dawson** stated that after the Toyota acquisition SAWS had adopted the water master plan and that the city could make everyone feel good because we were claiming that we had solved our water problems. He also asked if SAWS had the empirical data that states what stage 1 restrictions actually reduce consumption and by how much.

**Ms. Guz** replied SAWS had done that analysis after 2000 to do our best to answer that question.

**Mr. Dawson** asked if we got more than a 5% reduction.

**Ms. Guz** stated that we got more than a 5% reduction and that we actually get up to a 15% reduction right off the bat. She also said that San Antonio is not the only city that is affected by droughts, according to a recent Texas AWWA conference; a number of individuals at the conference were also concerned with the potential of a drought.

**Mr. Green** replied that he does not have a problem telling the truth. He said that San Antonio is in a semi-arid region, which is some of the time dry. He also said the individuals that are pushing for growth at any cost are not welcome from his perspective. He said that the individuals that come to San Antonio need to realize that this is a semi-arid region.

**Ms. Hinton** stated that most of the people in this region are aware of our water situation and they understand what we are dealing with right now.

### **Benchmarking Process (Rene' Gonzalez Jr.)**

Mr. Rene' Gonzalez provided a presentation which discussed the changes in the benchmarking process. The topics discussed were:

- History of the Benchmarking Criteria
- CAP past and current role in benchmarking projects
- Past and present criteria to be utilized in benchmarking projects
- Future benchmarking needs

### **Comments & Responses**

**Mr. Peak** made the comment that the felt that the committee should as quickly as possible to accomplish their charge. He requested that staff provide background material so the committee can get some sense of what was done in the past so they can accomplish what they need to do in the future. He also added if there are projects that the committee needs to be looking at, that staff needs to bring them to the committee along with tight presentations so the committee can ask the questions that they need to get the job accomplished.

**Mr. Navarrete** said that he had talked to Dr. Roy in the past about the benchmarking process, and he had made some recommendations that were incorporated in the new process. He also stated he mentioned to Dr. Roy that this is a large group and that it was going to be a cumbersome process to be effective for evaluating the projects.

**Mr. Finch** stated he was scheduled to give an orientation presentation, but that Karen's presentation did a good job of explaining the issues; and it might be best to move to the next presentation that Joseph Rippole is going to give over the LCRA project.

**Mr. Dawson** asked if there had been a schedule given to the committee on the benchmarking of projects.

**Mr. Finch** stated that Mr. Peak had asked for a schedule that would look at the projects.

**Mr. Dawson** asked the committee historically how long it takes to benchmark a project.

**Mr. Hinton** stated presentations would be made over a period of time and that the committee would benchmark a project when staff wanted to either bring a new project or an updated project to the board of trustees. She also stated that the committee would provide a consensus statement in bullet form and that the board of trustees responded to that format well.

### **LCRA-SAWS Water Project (Joseph Rippole)**

Mr. Joseph Rippole briefed the CAP on the most recent developments on the LCRA-SAWS Water Supply Project. Briefing points included:

- Study Period Cost Overview
- State Legislative Requirements
- Project Timeline
- Current Technical Studies being pursued.
  - Matagorda Bay Health Evaluation
  - Colorado River & Off-stream Reservoir Water Quality
  - Colorado River flow Relationships to Aquatic Habitat
  - State Threatened Species: Blue Sucker
  - Facility Site Development, Design and Affected Environment
  - Surface Water Availability Assessment
  - Agriculture Conservation in Key Irrigation Districts
  - Groundwater for Agriculture During Drought
- 2005 Study Period Accomplishments
- 2006 Study Period Activities

### **Comments & Responses**

**Mr. Dawson** asked who was responsible for paying for the studies of the project.

**Mr. Rippole** replied that SAWS is responsible for the total cost of the studies.

**Mr. Peak** asked if SAWS and Region L would have to share the water.

**Mr. Rippole** stated that the full amount would go to San Antonio.

**Mr. Green** asked if there were junior rights associated to the project.

**Mr. Rippole** replied that there are no junior or senior rights associated with the project. He stated that the yield is firm for the life of the contract except in a time of a worse drought of the 1950's.

**Mr. Dawson** asked the question about the Blue Sucker and if that is what LCRA called SAWS.

**Mr. Rippole** had no comment.

**Mr. Dawson** asked if the projected \$957 - \$1,135 dollars was an annual cost or total cost for the project.

**Mr. Rippole** stated it was an annual cost.

**Mr. Dawson** stated SAWS needed to be careful with the reporting of these numbers because sometimes they are stated as annual and sometimes total costs.

**Mr. Finch** made the comment that this is a complex project and at any time SAWS feels there is a fatal flaw within the project; SAWS has the option of discontinuing the project and receiving half of the total amount paid into the project paid back to SAWS from LCRA.

**Mr. Peak** stated that if this was the next project to be benchmarked then the committee needed background information for the project.

**Ms. Hinton** asked if there were any new updates from the studies.

**Mr. Rippole** stated there is some new information in the Project Viability Assessment Report.

**Ms. Hinton** asked if there were any mitigation requirements SAWS would be responsible for in their area.

**Mr. Rippole** said that would be up to discussion.

**Mr. Finch** reminded everyone that the project is in the feasibility study so SAWS may look at all the possibilities.

**Mr. Dawson** asked if we were paying for all of their staff time until 2010.

**Mr. Rippole** said yes to the question.

**Mr. Peak** stated the schedule for next month would include background information for LCRA briefing on benchmarking from Dr. Roy.

#### **Citizens to be Heard**

**Mr. Finger** discussed issues with the LCRA-SAWS Water Project and accountability issues.

**Schedule Next Meeting:** May 9, 2006.

**Adjournment:** With no further business to discuss, the Citizens Advisory Panel Meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m., by Mr. Howard Peak.