

**Agenda Questions/Responses
February 26, 2004**

2. Does this contemplate interbasin transfers? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

Yes, please see answer below.

Is it primarily Colorado River water that would be transferred? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

Yes. The feasibility assessment is for a regional water treatment plant that would consider use of Colorado River water as its raw water source. Such an interbasin transfer would require authorization by the State (Texas Commission on Environmental Quality).

Such a transfer would be consistent with an approved State Water Plan, which includes an option for meeting San Antonio's long-term water needs via a "Water Sharing Plan". The plan was approved by the Senate Bill 1 Region K water planning group (Lower Colorado River Basin) and includes an option to transfer Colorado River basin water to San Antonio (SB 1 Region L) subject to certain conditions. LCRA and SAWS have entered into a contract for a transfer of up to 150,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River basin. LCRA and SAWS plan to conduct a six to seven-year study to determine if 330,000 AF/yr, including on-farm conservation, can be made available within the Lower Colorado Basin to meet both San Antonio's needs and projected Colorado basin irrigation shortages. The Central Texas Regional Water Treatment Plant study is a related study to determine the feasibility of siting a large-scale water treatment plant in a central location to serve both Austin and San Antonio through the same facility.

Why is the City being asked to pay the largest share? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The proposal is for the two municipalities, San Antonio and Austin, to equally pay the lion's share. The two cities would be the primary potential recipients of the water from the facility.

9. When will construction on the project begin? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

A typical contract is executed in approximately 6 weeks. However, staff will work closely with the contractor to ensure that once required contract elements, such as bonding, have been provided by the contractor, the City will expedite the contract. At the same time, staff will be setting necessary meetings and working towards installation of erosion controls at the work site.

18. Was the addition of this access road considered when awarding the RFP for the operation of the propane-dispensing facility? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The requirement for this access road was unknown at the time of the award of the RFP. Fleet Services was involved in the design of the facility and, based on their past experience, believed the original design had adequate space for delivery truck access. The size of the truck and the difficulties in safely entering and exiting the propane delivery area of the facility were discovered when a small amount of propane was delivered for testing purposes. The vendor can transfer the propane to a smaller delivery truck but will increase the cost of the propane fuel to account for this additional step. Fleet Services has determined that it is more economical to construct a separate access road for propane delivery than to pay an increased propane fuel cost.

Would the other vendors who responded to the RFP for the operation of the propane-dispensing facility have required this access road? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

Only one vendor responded to the RFP. It is unknown if other vendors would have had similar requirements.

If not, is the added cost of this road being considered against the other bids? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

Only one vendor responded to the RFP.

26. At the last Council Meeting, Council Member Alvarez requested a summary of unpaid leave for Judge Castro for the past 2 years. Please provide that summary. (Council Member Raul Alvarez)

This summary was sent via e-mail attachment to Council Members' Offices on 2/11/04.