

SUMMARY OF SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY AGENCIES' STAFF DISCUSSION REGARDING MWDOC'S DRAFT BUDGET FY 2014-15

Agencies in attendance:

- ETWD
- IRWD
- San Clemente
- SCWD
- SMWD
- TCWD
- MNWD

1. SLCF and conjunctive use should be noted as separate matters within the budget process. SLCF should remain CHOICE as the participants do not see a need for this project at this time given discussions with MET. Following the meeting at IRWD, the participating agencies along with MWDOC all agreed that SLCF is a project that should be put to rest for now. Conjunctive use, on the other hand, is an initiative (not a project) that should be considered now and should be included within the budgeted line items relative to planning and MET issues, which are considered CORE.
2. Both Doheny and Poseidon desalination projects should remain CHOICE. Any MWDOC staff time related to administration of the MET Foundational Action Program for Doheny should be minimal and therefore, not requiring all member agencies to subsidize this project. Additionally, Doheny and Poseidon are currently undergoing some significant transition in management and participation, and until these fundamental issues are further resolved, they should not be considered CORE. It should be noted that any efforts/projects that require MWDOC's support in terms of LRP funding should be included under the planning and MET issues line items, which are and should continue to be considered CORE.
3. We would first like to see MWDOC articulate problems and/or challenges associated with WEROC in terms of member agency participation before expanding the program and increasing the budget. Member agencies are willing and prepared to dedicate the necessary resources.
4. We would like more clarity and specificity regarding MWDOC's reliability planning efforts as described in page 9 of the draft budget. We want to understand what MWDOC will offer to its member agencies to facilitate their decision-making process related to reliability efforts/projects and how MWDOC plans to interface with its member agencies throughout the process. We would like to see a specific scope and cost as to what MWDOC is envisioning.
5. We would like to see a specific scope related to what MWDOC is proposing with its communications and legislative plans for FY 2014-15. We need further detail to better understand the deliverables/expectations so we can identify what elements of both efforts should be considered CORE versus CHOICE. We would also like to meet the newly acquired consultant that is responsible for the communications plan.
6. We would also like to see a specific scope of what MWDOC is proposing as part of its "engineering outside services" (p. 27 of the draft budget) as the budget has doubled compared to last fiscal year.
7. We would also like to see and discuss the justifications for the various memberships (existing and new) and conferences that are being proposed for the FY 2014-15 budget.