Questions for the Committee’s decision:

1. **Recommend** that the consultant team prepare a general project description for the Municipal Water Conservation augmentation method that could be adapted to any municipality in Arizona. Then recommend Municipal Water Conservation as a water augmentation project in addition to the 3-5 water augmentation projects that will be recommended by the end of this project. Municipal Water Conservation could still receive a score through the Category 1, 2, 3 process to document the relative benefit of this augmentation method. (Yes/No).

   **Justification:** The steps to implement and the benefits of water conservation are well established, so a water conservation program does not need to be defined in this project. Specifics of a water conservation program depend on the needs of each community. Therefore, it is not the best use of time in this project to define a conservation program for a single municipality without involving that municipality.

2. **Recommend** that the consultant team prepare a general project description for the Aquifer Recharge - Treated Recycled Water augmentation method that could be adapted to any municipality in Arizona with a wastewater treatment plant. Then recommend Aquifer Recharge - Treated Recycled Water as a water augmentation project in addition to the 3-5 water augmentation projects that will be recommended by the end of this project. Aquifer Recharge - Treated Recycled Water could still receive a score through the Category 1, 2, 3 process to document the relative benefit of this augmentation method. (Yes/No).

   **Justification:** The application and benefits of using treated recycled water for aquifer storage and recovery for municipalities are well established. Each municipality would need to determine if the highest and best use of recycled water is a non-potable use, indirect potable use, or direct potable use. Therefore, it is not the best use of time in this project to define an aquifer recharge and recovery project for a single municipality without involving that community.

3. **Recommend** preparing a general project description for the Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water augmentation method that could be adapted to any municipality in Arizona with a wastewater treatment plant. Then recommend Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water as a water augmentation project in addition to the 3-5 water augmentation projects that will be recommended by the end of this project. Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water could still receive a score through the Category 1, 2, 3 process to document the relative benefit of this augmentation method. (Yes/No).

   **Justification:** The application and benefits of using treated recycled water for aquifer storage and recovery for municipalities are well established. Each municipality would need to determine if the highest and best use of recycled water is a non-potable use, indirect potable use, or direct potable use. Therefore, it is not the best use of time in this project to define a potable reuse project for a single municipality without involving that community.
4. **Recommend** preparing a general project description for the Non-Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water augmentation method that could be adapted to any municipality in Arizona with a wastewater treatment plant. Then recommend Non-Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water as a water augmentation project in addition to the 3-5 water augmentation projects that will be recommended by the end of this project. Non-Potable Reuse - Treated Recycled Water could still receive a score through the Category 1, 2, 3 process to document the relative benefit of this augmentation method. (Yes/No).

**Justification:** The application and benefits of using treated recycled water for aquifer storage and recovery for municipalities are well established. Each municipality would need to determine if the highest and best use of recycled water is a non-potable use, indirect potable use, or direct potable use. Therefore, it is not the best use of time in this project to define a non-potable reuse project for a single municipality without involving that community.

5. **Recommend** documenting the characteristics of Weather Modification as an augmentation method without running this method through the Evaluation Criteria. (Yes/No)

**Justification:** The Weather Modification augmentation option is different from most other water augmentation projects because:
   a. The additional water supply cannot be easily measured,
   b. The area where additional water supply could be provided may not be explicitly defined,
   c. Municipalities, farmers, and industries cannot rely on this water augmentation method for designations of adequate or assured water supply and therefore are not likely to provide funding.

6. **Recommend** documenting the characteristics of Forest Restoration as an augmentation method without running this method through the Evaluation Criteria. (Yes/No)

**Justification:** The Forest Restoration augmentation option is different from most other water augmentation projects because:
   a. The additional water supply cannot be easily measured,
   b. The area where additional water supply could be provided may not be explicitly defined,
   c. Municipalities, farmers, and industries cannot rely on this water augmentation method for designations of adequate or assured water supply and therefore are not likely to provide funding.

7. **Apply** the budget of Task 2 to developing water augmentation project descriptions for each of the planning areas individually and for groups of planning areas. Use the Task 3 budget to evaluate the relative viability of projects using the Category 1 and Category 2 evaluation criteria. (Yes/No)

**Justification:** Water augmentation projects need sufficient definition to make it possible to evaluate relative viability. Without more detailed project descriptions, the Category 1 and
8. **Revisit** the Category 1 through 3 evaluation criteria, scoring, and weighting at the end of Task 2. The Committee will be asked for feedback on Category 1 through 3 evaluations at the workshop at the conclusion of Task 2. (Yes/No)

**Justification:** The process of creating augmentation project descriptions will likely provide additional insights into meaningful revisions to the evaluation criteria, scoring, and weighting.

9. **Recommend** the following approaches for identifying water augmentation projects: (Yes/No; and input from the Committee)
   a. The project team would like to know if beneficial augmentation projects that the Committee may have in mind.
   b. The project team will look at each planning area and identify 1-3 water augmentation projects that may be the most likely to be viable. Then prepare descriptions for each of these projects that will enable a meaningful evaluation.
   c. The project team will look at groups of planning areas that could benefit from a water augmentation project and create water augmentation project descriptions that would enable these augmentation projects to be evaluated.

10. **Recommend** the following changes to where the Evaluation Factors will be applied in the Category 1, 2, and 3 evaluations (yes/no):
   a. Reduced Energy Impact moves from Category 1 to Category 3
   b. Yield is moved from Category 2 to Category 1
   c. Levelized Cost per Acre Foot is moved from Category 2 to Category 3
   d. Land Ownership Affecting Transmission Potential is moved from Category 2 to Category 3
   e. Milestones is removed from Category 1 and is not perceived to be an evaluation factor

**Justification:** Evaluation Factors are moved to the Category where the information is more likely to be available to complete the evaluation.

11. **Recommend** the following evaluation factor name changes (yes/no):
   a. Renewability is changed to Adaptability
   b. Cost Efficiency is changed to Economic Viability

**Justification:** Name change more effectively reflects the evaluation to take place.

12. **Recommend** Technical Memorandum No. 1 remain a draft document for now. Any portions of Technical Memorandum No. 1 that will be incorporated into the Final Report will be finalized when the report is prepared. (yes/no)

**Justification:** The high level evaluation is likely to be superseded in Task 2 work, and the Category 1, 2, 3 evaluation criteria is likely to also change as part of the Task 2 work. Proceeding with the Task 2 work will help to maintain the project schedule.