

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop Summary
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

OVERVIEW

The 2009 Regional Workshops for the California Water Plan featured the Public Review Draft of the Highlights document, as well as an overview of current conditions for the respective hydrologic region or area of special interest. Each workshop also included a presentation on the scenario planning approach used to consider future uncertainty for water management. In the agenda, several hours were dedicated to small group review and comment of the draft Highlights and Regional Report for that region or area. Based on suggestions made during the 2007 and 2008 workshops, time was also provided for updates on related planning processes.

A workshop for the Sacramento River hydrologic region was held on May 14, 2009 in Oroville, CA. Copies of the workshop presentations, handouts, and materials are available on the Water Plan website at www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials. A brief recap of the presentations is provided in the following paragraphs and the remainder of this document provides a summary of the small group discussions. Flip charts and worksheets were used to record ideas generated during the discussions and transcripts of the recorded results are incorporated into the summary.

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Chief of Department of Planning and Local Assistance, made the first presentation and outlined the planning process and status of major 2009 Update activities, culminating in the release of the Public Review Draft. Paul described the sections of the Highlights booklet, which serves as an Executive Summary for Update 2009. The Highlights begins with a description of existing water conditions in California that require urgent attention and response. The following pages outline the range and variation in water resources throughout the State.

The Highlights also discusses Climate Change and the existing framework for Integrated Water Management, which links to the Resource Management Strategies outlined in Volume Two and Regional Management Strategies provided in Volume 3. Other features of the Highlights include a discussion on scenarios and a fold-out section describing the Strategic Plan for Update 2009, including key objectives. The concluding recommendations represent “policies, strategies, and approaches that will help reduce and remove impediments, and leverage resources and opportunities” to implement Water Plans goals, objectives, and related actions.

In the second presentation, Glen Pearson, DWR, retiring Northern District Chief, reviewed the key characteristics of the Sacramento River hydrologic region. The overview included items contained in the Regional Report, with special focus on local and regional issues, and management and planning activities. Paul Dabbs presented a third focus on the scenario approach being developed for future water planning. Work is currently underway to quantify potential water demands, with a subsequent phase to evaluate water resource management strategies.

Workshop attendees reviewed, discussed, and provided suggestions for each section, as recorded on the following pages. The agenda ended with several updates on related statewide water and planning initiatives: Richard Hinrichs with the California Department of Public Health described the department’s Drinking Water Program, and Chris Dallas spoke about the Sierra Nevada Conservancy’s programs.

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

Discussion A – Public Review Draft: Highlights and Table of Contents

- need a purpose statement for Update 2009 – what it does, doesn't do
- there needs to be co-equal objectives for the environment and economics
- Delta-centric focus doesn't adequately discuss upstream impacts of solutions
 - discuss community impacts, within areas of origin, from water management solutions (especially regarding the Delta)
 - how do we get funding into ecosystems that provide source water
- Props 50 and 84 – didn't see ARRA funds
 - where is ARRA money going? which projects are being funded?
 - o needs to be transparent
 - o is BOR handing ARRA funding?
- groundwater management:
 - need a comprehensive, statewide approach
 - would prefer regional groundwater management
 - look to other states?
- tie financial incentives to areas where water efficiency is verified; set conditions on use prior to delivering financial incentive
- address limitations of CWP with respect to ability to implement
- "flood" must be addressed with initiatives and foundational actions
- address on-going actions for the identified challenges (e.g. Central Valley Flood Plan, BDCP)
 - highlight what the State is doing currently or since last Water Plan
 - present the positives (State has invested well in programs, good foundation to build on)
- water portfolios: need definitions of water categories (applied, consumptive, depletion)
- explore strategy of locks on Delta
- page 4: need to show benefits of floods in summary prior to page 10 (integrated flood management)
- plan should regionally identify the water resource limitations and guidelines on how to manage resources
 - what is the maximum level of water use? and what happens when use exceeds supply?
- CWP should provide guidance and incentives for how to address resource limits
- CWP should include a good description of existing water systems (e.g. SWP and CVP) and how they operate, and how system operations are changing due to laws, regulations, and litigation
- describe how California has a very limited (yet variable) water supply – so we need to focus on managing existing supplies more efficiently
 - state that the State is in drought conditions about 30% of the time
- CWP should state that all IRWMs must have equitable and balanced participation by those within area
- CWP should recommend more independent (e.g. USGS is good) research to identify and quantify all of California's groundwater – how much there is and its water quality
- page 10c: item 3: define tools available for conjunctive use tool box and benefits associated with tools including drawbacks
 - note the possible need to expand the definitions and application of conjunctive use; conjunctive use is more than transfers, e.g. :
 - o reservoir re-operation
 - o surface/groundwater exchanges
 - o protection of recharge areas

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

- page 10c, item 4: Protect surface water and groundwater quality (add) and supply for sustainable use
- page 10d, item 13: area of origin needs must be met before transfers
 - definition of area of origin
 - priority for meeting those area needs before meeting other the needs of other areas
- demand is a dynamic value that needs to be addressed further
 - mention the effects of population growth on demand and regional sustainability
 - “water demand” is constantly changing over time; for agricultural cropping patterns change from annual to permanent crops; environmental needs are increasing and urban population needs are increasing – increasing the water supply to meet this dynamic demand will require new technology, new approaches to conservation and recycling, and new dams. The current supply is not sufficient to meet predicted future demands.
- include more text on definitions for resource management strategies
- address the importance of balancing the conflicts and identifying the IRWM goals
- page 14, RMS:
 - discuss energy costs/benefits
 - provide a scale or range of importance so people can gage the value or hit the low hanging fruit
 - need to include sense of costs (just putting in benefits makes the document seem more promotional)
- need to identify new storagee as a goal or strategy
- provide more information on water rights
 - area of origin and other water rights related to those regions of California (including Sacramento) that provide water for other Southern regions
 - beneficial use
 - pre-1914 water rights
- page 11, sustainability:
 - remove vagueness
 - mention paleo-climate
 - climate drought v. regulatory/operational drought
 - include groundwater pumping levels, along with groundwater quality issues
- address need for “science” in addressing “risks” not “issues”

Other Comments

- no pictures of children drinking from fountains (show octogenarians instead)
- provide fold-out glossary for highlights
- this is a good format: short, concise, and reader-friendly
- graphics: include the graphic in regional inter-relationships
 - arrows proportioned to volume of flow
 - add colors to improve the visual representation of water movement by “type” and “quantity” (just showing the amount doesn’t work) – e.g. add light blue arrow that dhows total water (beyond developed water)
 - need graphic to show the concept and detail
- for final, on-line version – provide links to further information (that people can go to if interested)
- environmental considerations require new approaches; typically these change a project, rather than blocking a project

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

- need a short summary of who are the stakeholders and major water users (by % of total supply)
 - also, highlight major issues and stakeholder interests that govern water use
 - who are the interest groups and how are they being represented?
- add section to describe role/relationship between water planning and local land-use planning (County general plans) generally
 - need restrictions on development over recharge/possible recharge zones
 - It should be the policy of county government to zone out areas of recharge. It should be the policy of State government to help the counties locate these recharge areas and protect them from development.
- increase urban water supplies by updating state graywater regulations to allow use of graywater (like Arizona laws)
- need agricultural incentives to encourage more agricultural water conservation and water use efficiency
- CVP water contract process needs updating – uses are not regulated to restrict water losses (wasteful)
- water transfers should not allow sellers to receive huge profits for selling water
 - set a maximum monetary limit as to the value of the water (or)
 - require value above that amount go to funding regional resource management strategies
- Chapter 3, governance:
 - provide a map showing different regional boundaries for the various agencies
 - provide a description of the regulatory process in managing pesticides and water quality impacts
- provide definitions for:
 - conjunctive use
 - area of origin
 - sustainability of groundwater pumping levels
- how does artificial recharge affect groundwater law?

Discussion B – Regional Report (Issues)

- more detailed data from multiple sources
 - water portfolio data
 - data for models and decision-making
 - aquifer characterization
- flood governance:
 - needs to discuss risks of increased sub-division development within the floodplains
 - should discuss ways to limit government (and taxpayer) liability for this
- watersheds/ecosystems:
 - have broader discussion on Feather River, Bear, Yuba
 - section is disjointed, need to combine and expand
- page 6-8, Phase 8 Hearings: need to identify that this agreement affects a larger group than the people who were included in the negotiations
- page 6-21, regional challenges: add
 - groundwater management and overdraft
 - maintain adequate spawning and rearing habitat for anadromous fish (especially relative to climate change impacts such as flows and temperature)

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

- salmon smolt stranding in streams from Cascades when surface water flows dry out due to groundwater use and effect on streamflow (Mud Creek, Rock Creek)
- important to distinguish different needs of the four species of salmon (fall, winter, spring) for upstream habitat and temperatures
- ag drainage
- salinity
- surface and groundwater uses and tensions
- IRWM planning not inclusive of all interests (Sacramento Valley IRWM is dominated by water users; CABY's IRWM is inclusive) – what happens when the door is shut to engagement? need equity and balance
- role of Central Valley ag waivers (from Water Boards) on water quality and waste discharge into streams
 - waivers should be discontinued, they are not effective
 - data is not made publicly available (or to Water Boards) and discharges continue
- the foothill areas are primarily on wells for residential supply
 - will run out of groundwater if drought continues – need to address this (Mountain Counties have similar issue)
- regional report data gaps must be addressed
 - identify losing stream reaches
 - declining valley groundwater aquifer levels (groundwater is in overdraft)
- need better sources of information (than EPA 2005) on primary sources of water for counties
 - e.g. Battle Creek, DWR
- page 6-14, water governance
 - needs additional information, more clarity
 - overlay regional map with governance/jurisdictional boundaries and IRWMs (counties, IRWMs, and local groups/water districts)
 - cover all jurisdictions
 - Williams, Willows, Shasta and other counties
- water supplies: add language regarding Tuscan and other groundwater basins
- add effects of water use on soils (such as agricultural use of groundwater)
- page 6-5: what is the source of the Tribal classification (Federal, State)?
 - check on Mechoopda
 - table 6-2, typo – says San Joaquin instead of Sacramento
 - verify list of Tribes
 - check numbers: do we really have 15% of the State's federally recognized tribes?
 - Shasta "Indian" nation
- demographics: this is a very limited write up
 - need to discuss more than population numbers, need to describe disadvantaged communities
- discuss hydroelectric facilities
- page 6-9, water supplies: discuss timing and runoff of snowpack
- page 6-21, challenges (or) 6-11, groundwater management:
 - include text to stress the need to protect groundwater recharge (or possible recharge) zones; possibly create a section or bullet of its own
 - It should be the policy of county government to zone out areas of recharge. It should be the policy of State government to help the counties locate these recharge areas and protect them from development.
 - the discussion on groundwater is too general and paints a rosy picture

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

- should identify areas with issues (Chico and Durham have declining levels)
- the discussion on challenges as is, is too brief
 - need to talk about protecting groundwater resources and recharge areas
- page 6-11, last sentence: not exactly true – development of deep turbine pump has allowed development of groundwater supply in areas where there historically was not supply
- need to provide description of the various aquifer systems:
 - shallow alluvial
 - hard-rock/fractured-rock aquifer
 - lower, confined aquifer
 - recharge areas and discharge areas
- Perhaps cross-reference the issue of “subsidence” from the Highlights to the details in the regional reports. It is my understanding that in the Sacramento River Region, due to the soil structure of the underlying aquifer, we probably will not experience soil subsidence. Nevertheless, I continue to hear the issue of subsidence being raised as an objection to groundwater pumping.
- address the issue of saltwater intrusion in our groundwater
- Yuba City: has arsenic in groundwater, is expanding its use of surface water (from the Feather River) – this also reduces hardness issues
 - are there water softening options besides salts?
- provide historical perspective: who has switched from surface to groundwater and why (and vice versa – for Woodland and Davis)

Discussion B: Regional Reports (Management, Planning)

- add section to describe role/relationship between water planning and local land-use planning (County general plans)
 - Butte County’s General Plan Update includes a new section on water; the prior General Plan did not
- provide a description of the regulatory process in managing pesticides and water quality impacts
- discuss variation in IRWMPs: use the internet and websites to drill down
- baseline surface water elevation for recreation on Lake Oroville to be unimpaired
 - e.g. boats have access to ramps, etc.
 - lake levels/operations and effects on recreation and economy
- there is concern for projects in planning, such as the Stoney Creek Fan Project to study the area for recharge → pumping, as part of the study, during a drought is a possible time bomb in the public’s view (possibly)
- discuss restoration of Upper Feather River meadows as an aspect of capture and release of precipitation (page 6-11?)

Discussion – Regional Reports (overall)

- for Regional Map – provide an overlay of governance/jurisdictional boundaries and IRWMPs (counties, IRWMPs, and local groups/water districts)
- demographics: need to discuss more than population numbers, need to describe disadvantaged communities
- discuss hydroelectric facilities
- more detailed data
 - water portfolio data
 - data for models
 - aquifer characterization

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

Discussion C – Scenarios

- would be good to see supply/demand curves
- please to see this type of planning/modeling happening
- would like to see what the entire state looks like under “blueprint” conditions (response: about 2 million acre feet of additional demand) – is it possible to get to that?
- how can State incentivize “blueprint” (or lower) water demand?
- what are the assumptions that lay out these plausible scenarios? (would like to see)
- As a retired farmer of both tree crops and of rice, my personal belief is that the predicted reduction of agricultural use of water is overly optimistic. Perhaps obtain concurrence from the California State Farm Bureau. Obtain the “buy-in” from representatives of the agricultural communities.

Attendance

Askley Indrieri, FWA
Shawn Ankeny, Shasta County
Tricia Bratcher, Ca. Dept. of Fish and Game
James Brobeck, Butte Environmental Council
Patrick Cole, Arcademe
Chris Dallas, Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Kim Davis, Senator Aanestad’s Office
Lee Edwards, Cherokee Pres. Society
Barbara Hennigan, BSBAGU
Richard Hinrichs, California Dept. of Health
Robin Huffman, Paradise
Maureen Kirk, Butte County Supervisor
Steve Lambert, Butte County Supervisor
Grace Marvin, Sierra Club
Kristen McKillop, Butte County
John Merz, Sacramento River Preservation Trust
Lester Messina, Glenn City
Dennis Moreland, SFWP
Julia Murphy, Graduate Student
Vickie Newlin, Butte County
Fran Peace, US Representative Herger’s Office
Ben Pennock, GCID
Karen Peters, BWGWD
Dr. C. Mark Rockwell, Federation of Fly Fishers
Ellen Simon, Cherokee Pres. Society
David Skinner, Butte County Water Commission
William Speer, Shasta Indian Nation
Susan Strachan
Ben Swann, CDM
David Tomm, Sutter County
Rachelle Valverde, GCID
Patrick Way, Consultant
Eric Wedemeyer, Shasta County
Kim Weir

**CWP Sacramento Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Oroville, CA – May 14, 2009**

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Chief, Dept. of Planning and Local Assistance
Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Glen Pearson, DWR, Chief, Northern District
Tito Cervantes, DWR, Northern District, Chief, Land and Water Use Section
Michael Serna, DWR, Northern District
Gary Lippner, DWR, Central District
Mark Rivera, DWR, Northern District
Todd Hillaire, DWR, Northern District
Scott Rice, DWR, Northern District Regional Coordinator
Jessica Salinas, DWR, Northern District
Andrew Aguilar, DWR, Central District
Dan McManus, DWR, Northern District
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS