



Member Agency Managers Meeting —

2020 IRP Report and Findings Discussion on Feedback

March 11, 2022

We appreciate and considered all **feedback**

Approach:

- Feedback consistent with and substantiated by the Phase 1 - Regional Needs Assessment analysis will be incorporated
- Feedback pertaining to One Water Implementation activities were documented for evaluation in Phase 2

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —
**All Feedback
Considered**

Feedback grouped into *five categories*



Findings



Analysis



Report



Process



Phase 2

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

All Feedback Considered

Feedback response *directory*



Feedback
Incorporated



Point of
clarification



Different
Perspective



Addressed in
Phase 2

Findings reflect many of the “redlined” comments received



Revise how we characterize effectiveness of distribution system improvements



Storage focus area should reference distribution system investments



Highlight the importance of storage put/take capabilities



More accurately reflect that new or expanded storage capacity can reduce core supply needs

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Findings





Revised description of how **imported water supplies are interrelated**



Both imported water supplies are equally important to the region's reliability and have unique challenges and opportunities

- The Colorado River supplies are more constant and, therefore, more predictable
- The SWP supplies vary from year to year and within the year



Colorado River supplies baseload while SWP supplies in excess of SWP Dependent Area demands can either be stored or meet blended area demands – **allowing water to be stored in the Colorado River System**

New Finding to highlight demands and water use efficiency



“Variability in retail demand largely comes from changes in outdoor water use. Outdoor water use behavior is complex, influenced by weather and climate and by awareness of water scarcity and other conservation measures.”

- Reflects a comment suggesting that the greatest demand variability comes from outdoor water use
- Added text in the report to reflect how the analysis substantiates this point

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Director Feedback Findings





The portfolio category analysis methodology explained



Set flexible supply to not exceed 100 TAF

- Represents a realistic supply that can be secured in dry years
- The flexible need does vary by scenario, by the additional modeled storage level and by forecast year



Analyzed a range of additional storage

- Used 0, 100, 250 and 500 TAF



Determined the core supply need by testing the range of additional storage while not exceeding the flexible supply threshold

- The core supply is not static and may increase throughout the forecast in order to ensure that the maximum flexible supply target is not surpassed

The high level portfolio category analysis will help **guide Phase 2**



Feedback: The analysis is limited to a “resource mix” that only includes core, flexible and storage supplies and does not analyze how distribution system improvements can help close the gap

- The analysis conducted in the **Regional Needs Assessment** was designed to provide high level information to guide Phase 2 – One Water Implementation
- Phase 2 will examine specific actions that will include possible distribution system improvements
- Distribution system improvements can increase access to existing or new core, flex, and storage supplies

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Analysis



Relationship between drought actions and portfolio category sub-elements



Feedback: Metropolitan's Board is considering approving several actions to close the gap. The final assessment should incorporate these actions

- Metropolitan's Board is considering and approving actions to address challenges brought on by the current drought
- Any long-term benefits of the drought actions will be factored into the Phase 2 analysis and other future planning analyses
- The Phase 2 analysis will evaluate the effectiveness of portfolio category sub-elements given the latest "tools" available to Metropolitan
- For expediency, system configuration leading up to 2020 was used for the assessment. Appropriate modeling updates will be performed for Phase 2.

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Analysis



Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Analysis



SWP Dependent Area findings



Feedback: Delineate SWP Dependent Areas and create a chart that illustrates the limitations

- In combination with system constraints the total region's year-to-year consumption of imported supplies and storage lead to shortages



Feedback: Show reliability without system constraints

- The analysis suggests that distribution system investments could resolve the net shortages in Scenarios B and C, but not in Scenario D



Feedback: How SWP Dependent analysis finding came up?

- The modeling results revealed that all net shortages involved the SWP Dependent Areas. Only in Scenario D after 2035 do we see non-SWP Dependent Areas experience net shortages.

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Analysis



Clarifications regarding the **analysis**



Feedback: Are the storage put/take ratios used reasonable?

- Yes, for a planning assumption. We used a generic storage take capability that is reflective of a range of historical take capacity (surface and groundwater).
- Additional analysis on other desired storage parameters can be investigated in Phase 2 as specific actions are identified for evaluation.



Feedback: Why do larger volumes of storage not reduce core supply needs?

- In Scenario D there is insufficient supply to store in years leading up to shortages. In Scenarios B and C net shortages are satisfied with relatively smaller core supply needs in combination with the additional storage capacity.

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Report



The report will reflect many of the **comments received**



Feedback: More thorough explanation of the challenges facing the SWP Dependent Area is needed

- Will incorporate and include earlier in the report



Feedback: Why does the report indicate all scenarios experience shortages, yet interventions are not needed in Scenario A

- Will incorporate
 - No intervention needed for Scenario A
 - Will revise text to better explain gross vs. net shortages



Feedback: Include stormwater and desalination as sub-elements in figures ES-3 and 4-16

- Will incorporate

The report will reflect many of the **comments received**

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Report



Feedback: Remove reference to ensuring financial sustainability

- **Will incorporate**



Feedback: Should acknowledge that Metropolitan supports member agencies' development of local supplies

- **Will incorporate**



Feedback: To ensure system wide reliability, Metropolitan should strive to create a diverse and balanced portfolio approach

- **Will incorporate**

The report will reflect many of the **comments received**



Feedback: Provide emphasis regarding the need to maintain and preserve our SWP deliveries

- **Will incorporate**



Feedback: Include the Retrospective Report and other supporting documents as appendices

- **Will incorporate**



Feedback: Improve the narrative to describe the data and analysis supporting the reports conclusions

- **The narrative will be improved based on the comments received.**

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Report



Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Director Feedback Process



Process related comments



Feedback: A baseline should be included in the analysis

- Selecting a baseline would limit the value the IRP scenario assessment provides
- The IRP scenarios launch from the same conditions leading up to 2020



Feedback: Not enough work/analysis has been done with limited opportunities for engagement

- Metropolitan staff have conducted several IRP related meetings since February 2020:
 - 16 IRP Special Committee Meetings
 - 12 Member Agency Technical Workgroup Meetings
 - 18 Member Agency Manager Meetings
 - 2 Public Workshops
 - Other IRP related meetings

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Process



Process related **comments**



Feedback: Compile and distribute comments to all

- All written comments have been posted



Feedback: Need more time and want more meetings

- Board approval of findings postponed from November 2021 to March 2022 to allow for more time and discussion
- Three additional MAMMs were scheduled to specifically discuss the Regional Needs Assessment Findings
- One-on-One meetings offered to interested Member Agencies



Feedback: Want to see the revised report before going to Board

- The revised report will be distributed before the March 17 Board posting date

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Process



Process related comments



Feedback: What will be the recommendation to the Board

- March 22: Seeking IRP Special Committee recommendation to adopt the 2020 IRP Regional Needs Assessment
- April 12: Seeking Board adoption of the 2020 IRP Regional Needs Assessment



Feedback: Ready to move on to Phase 2

- We concur!

A fair amount of feedback pertinent to Phase 2 - One Water Implementation



The following types of feedback will be addressed in Phase 2:

- Suggestions for specific actions
- Prioritization of elements and sub-elements
- Identification of evaluation criteria such as water quality, affordability, financial impacts, effectiveness of distribution system improvements
- Specific determinations based on system analysis
- Assertions requiring policy discussions and direction

Member Agency
Managers Meeting —

Member Agency Feedback Phase 2



Next Steps

- Coming days: Incorporate feedback as discussed and distribute Draft Final Regional Needs Assessment Report
- March 22: Seeking IRP Special Committee recommendation to adopt the 2020 IRP Regional Needs Assessment.
- April 12: Seeking Board adoption of the 2020 IRP Regional Needs Assessment

