

NOTES FROM FLIP CHARTS, 3/20/97 WORKSHOP

STORAGE AND CONVEYANCE QUESTIONS

3 - Intake configuration, could it be combined with other configurations?

Possibly north delta flood control improvements.

Upstream storage locations, they all use Tehama Colusa canal alignment, need to look at Red Bluff Diversion Dam and Fish Passage.

Task force is addressing fish passage at Red Bluff and other major intakes.

Alt 2C- operational flexibility and real time monitoring. Operational criteria is static; this is counter to real time monitoring yet maybe coupled to more flexibility.

Alternative 3C, concern regarding a combination of i.c.f. at Hood and some intermediate facilities.

This is an attempt to show and define range, not all possible configurations.

Alternative 2B and 2D how they differ, only for eco-restoration or other ways.

These are linkages issues.

When examining 2 million acre feet on aqueduct or other storage, are you looking at a range, say 0-2 million acre feet?

Short answer, yes. Doing sensitivity analyses to determine storage volume breakpoints and impact on supply and operational factors.

Have drinking water parameters been included in configurations?

This is part of Delta modeling, right now using the salinity standard. Also, flow patterns and other factors can change with each configuration.

Are physical facilities showing greater eco-restoration benefits than natural processes? Can these differences be shown in an EIR?

When will supplies to CVP/SWP be looked at?

Probably late this summer with environmental impact - have to include costs.

Base case, is it vulnerable to change after phase II preferred alternative is agreed upon?

Somewhat, but is accessible to public, have to be aware of complexity of the water supply system and associated models.

Support keeping storage as part of final solution.

Modeling needs to be accurate. Should also show how environmental values are affected by various storage and conveyance configurations.

When to consider social impacts to communities in the Delta?

What about flood flow and flood capacity - storage for these?

CALFED is attempting to integrate eco-restoration, flood control and water supply techniques, - ie, levee setbacks, off stream storage and many others.

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM COMPONENT

Net benefit ratio greater than one should include a risk factor.

Part of WUE is to reduce diversions without additional work on conveyance. AB 3616 appears to not generate new water, component needs water reclamation, water acquisition program.

Cost effectiveness, need to re-examine model for this.

Net benefit of one is basic premise and is supported.

Greater water supplies for eco-restoration, let's determine how water conservation has resulted in new supplies for whatever purpose and what are the opportunities.

Does WUE include water recycling?

Agree that WUE should reduce diversions and provide for future demand without structural improvements.

LAND RETIREMENT

Does this mean land *and* water rights, land alone or other?

Response: *with voluntary transfers, then land would be retired (temporary?)*

Bifurcate the issue, if voluntary then no problem, however, productive acres are shrinking and such interests of persons are not represented.

Evaluation of whether land should be farmed is one perspective; reverse argument is that many urban land uses are not efficient.

Could a land acquisitions program focus on impacts; local economies, agricultural land conversion.

WATER MEASUREMENT/CONSERVATION PRICING

AB 3616 puts burden of proof on water suppliers, that there are no additional measures, this is difficult to prove a negative.

Are the water transfers district to district, or user to user. How can it be done without water measurement?

Two processes exist. Would like CALFED to help with technical assistants to achieve social goals.

COST EFFECTIVENESS - STATE VS LOCAL PERSPECTIVE

Water recycling information shows cooperation , request CALFED look at programs that have joint funding and other measures.

AGRICULTURAL EFFICIENCY ASSURANCES

Two year planning needs clarification, performance of implementation measures could be impractical.

How trigger is calculated is an issue, federal districts that signed MOU and how CALFED will treat them is confusing, especially if already meeting CVIA requirements.

What are ag efficiencies that are required? These are the key to assurances.

Clarify timing of trigger, 2 years or number of agencies complying.

URBAN EFFICIENCY ASSURANCES

Water recycling in urban efficiency - expand beyond determining feasibility to having agencies implement.

There are additional stake-holders (green industry) who need to be included.

OTHER ISSUES

Need assurances for water for environmental purposes
Definition of "new" water supplies; ag expects to get back to pre-agreement conditions.
Need explanation of how WUE fits into program EIR/S.

ISSUE

PURPOSE OF WUE COMPONENT

If there is a problem, provide for a board, independent, that can mediate issues. Avoid courts.

District plans may identify measures that another district uses/pays for. Clarify what happens to water saved.

“Designed to promote,” but seems designed to enforce/force. Promoting voluntary? Needs to be clarified.

Issue of assurance, ag suppliers concerned about investment, that they be beneficiaries. Ensure it isn't just a paper benefit.

Don't think it should be expanded to development of water suppliers.

Role of CALFED vs local to encourage regional - need to focus on how to come to a decision on measures and their effectiveness.

Water use efficiency side, number of ag receive water for “free”. Some diversion capacity. If approach holistic, must address these users.

LAND RETIREMENT ISSUE

Comments on how using water overall - use v. value. Using water to irrigate marginal lands should be part of land retirement program.

Retiring land can have multiple benefits and can be considered in many areas.

Don't see relationship between land retirement and urban or ag efficiency statement in report has no validity only statewide efficiency.

Issue is really water acquisition. Would it be justified to look at land retirement as one tool for water acquisition.

WATER MEASURES AND CONSERVATION PRICING

There is no valid reason to conclude CVPIA is standard for the state.

Explain how any on-farm measure is effective if they don't see change in cost.

AB 3616 and CVPIA are closer in reality . Both processes can work if given chance.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Some communities don't need to buy, but increase cost a significant burden. There will need to be state and federal dollars to go along to ensure equity.

Cost efficiency should be looked at on a watershed basis.

ASSURANCE OF AG EFFICIENCY

Need to reconvene group to reconsider time line.

Why is 2 yr trigger necessary? Inappropriate to separate issue out. Why would CALFED increase requirement on ag users, creates obligations without providing assured benefits.

Internal inconsistency seems like going ahead with unnecessary trigger.

ASSURANCE OF URBAN EFFICIENCY

Stakeholder groups are looking at sanctions and incentives - use them. Having DWR reviewing, local agencies need some objective criteria.

Issue of assurances is key to move debate forward CALFED must grapple with seriously. Urban water management plans: DWR must have open, inclusive process before determining certification requirements/criteria.

OTHER ISSUES

Missing items dichotomy between ag/urban. Ag = water transfers away. Urban = reduce water consumption, increase transfers to. Need assurances to ag that issues resolved before development occurs.

Integration of components: Are there assurances that supplies will be available in dry years, with hardening of demand?

QUESTIONS

Bill Dubois: 2 yr trigger period
How did you get short 2 yr period?

*Planning cycle of ag MOU. Need for cohesive CALFED pkg of assurances.
>2 Years may be too late.*

Bill Johnson: Elaborate on how policy, not technical.

Decisions best made locally. As policy "cost effective" policies best overall for CALFED interests.

Mary, Kern County

Statement regarding statewide; explain what can be done statewide?

(Question held for issue discussion).

Placer County Water Authority.

For this report, is ag water considered raw and urban improved/treated? Placer county?

Assume both kinds in your service area.

If agency wanted to go beyond (cost effectiveness) "test" with activity, would dollars be available?

Too many intangibles to answer.

How is "new water" defined?

Anything above (1994 Delta) Accord. Cost effectiveness and planning should be done regardless.

Any other assurances?

Still evolving as we move forward.

What would you envision for certification process.

Hope DWR.

Is it appropriate for CALFED to suggest all purveyors prepare plans?

Geography, plumbing and state law answers. Possible to move water almost anywhere, those excluded from CALFED very limited. Good idea for any agency to prepare plans. Assurances will focus on CALFED agencies in (geographic solution area).

Clair Hill: Efficiency OK, but before make costly decisions, actions too long term.

Assurances will help make sure moving toward efficiency.

Many districts at various levels of local planning/implementation. How can CALFED get closely involved at local level?

Early comments strong that must efficiently use existing supplies. Hope CALFED does not have to exert controls, hope voluntary and up to districts.

Semi-mandatory components. Unclear on recycling, why not same degree of compliance required?

Recycling very complex and expensive, big challenges for local agencies, and low level of expertise. Premature to make strong requirements. DWR assurance mechanism will strengthen over time.

Overall efficiency programs, need to look at efficiency use of in-stream flows. Why are they excluded?

Instream flows will be an important part. Handled elsewhere/ workload split - limited scope to diverted water.

Will it incorporate drainage issues?

Complicated. Addressed with water quality. Will look at further.

Can't treat instream flows in same manner. Different fundamental assumptions.

Variations in storage components - same flexibility regarding efficiency.

Uniform approach on policy. How fits into integrated resource mgmt. Depends on local impacts. No funding difference between alternatives.

Appears converting voluntary programs to mandatory.

Yes and No. Drought water bank no surprise. State law requires water mgmt. plans and bmps. Maybe, regarding access to new supplies for ag, 7 year process with irrigation districts. Transfers need assurances to ensure supply and reduce impacts.

Instream flows: large component important to have policies for long term protection.

Did staff sort through other alternatives, how narrowed?

For each element of efficiency, looked at universe of possible actions; discussed, narrowed down.

QUESTIONS, AFTERNOON SESSION

2C: Still possible to combine elements from different alts? *Yes.*

Process of evaluation - What will it be to reduce number?

1st out to do red flag review, drop out those too costly, etc. Practibility issues & ecosystem problems. Look at what combination of facilities work well together. Look at physical elements and system integration.

Perception that it is hard to do restoration when also constructing large scale facilities. Give examples where construction of facilities have benefitted environment.

Can't point to specifics, but opportunities are substantial here.

California hydrology has extremes, challenge regarding how to affect flood peaks on average and dry years. Will their modeling account for restoration of tidal wetlands?

State water contractors; will you be factoring in demands of interruptible supplies?

Yes, they are separately accounted for in the spreadsheets and the modeling

ESA: Are you considering yield-existing bio opinions being considered?

May be opportunities later-now assume (1994) Accord is baseline.

Water quality and how that integrates with south of delta storage; is moving different levels of quality between storage part of plans?

Yes.

Perhaps need storage in upper areas to provide for better quality - quality dropping in north. Model should look at how it could contaminate another area by overdrafting.

Given modeling errors, we need to ensure enough time to minimize these errors. Extremely important to track how actual environmental values are impacted, not just those defined by the (1994) Accord.

Need to consider system up to Martinez, and keep in mind salinity impacts to Suisun Marsh Wetland impact needs to be kept in focus. Not just aquatic resources.

Balancing needs of ag and environment, but urban gets their supplies.

Text:C:\pam\workshp.que