

DRAFT

Focus Group on Water Use Assumptions and Projections

There has been intense public discussion regarding assumptions and analytical methods used to estimate current California water use and to project future demand. Much of this discussion has centered around the content of draft Bulletin 160-98 and CALFED's draft EIS/EIR. There is serious concern that if DWR and CALFED have overestimated current water use and underestimated future potential for conservation and recycling, this may lead CALFED to flawed decision making and selection of a preferred alternative that includes storage or conveyance actions that are not needed.

Given these concerns, CALFED will convene a facilitated focus group of agency staff and invited stakeholders to work through these issues. CALFED will supply facilitation through CONCUR.

Objectives

The primary objective for this effort is to **identify the effect that different levels of future demand would have on selection of a CALFED preferred programmatic alternative, including Delta conveyance and new or expanded storage.**

More specific objectives include:

1. Increase the level of understanding of assumptions and analytical methods used by DWR and CALFED by examining DWR's determination of 1995 normalized per capita water use and the criticisms of this approach, and how CALFED has used assumptions and demand projections from the California Water Plan (1993 and 1998 updates) in its EIS/EIR.
2. Provide a forum for discussion of alternative assumptions and the effect that these assumptions might have on projected future levels of water demand.
3. Assist CALFED in determining what additional steps CALFED should take regarding assumptions, analysis, and presentation of the effects of variability of future demand.

Participants

The table below lists types of expertise, authority, and viewpoints that should be represented in the discussion on assumptions, projections, and implications for CALFED and CALFED agencies. Also included are some tentative suggestions of individuals that may offer the technical knowledge, understanding of stakeholder issues, or authority necessary for a productive discussion. This is not an exhaustive list of individuals who meet the criteria, but a sampling. In order to assure that all participants have an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns, group size should probably not be larger than about 20 individuals. Therefore, it will be

necessary to select individuals who represent general stakeholder viewpoints rather than representatives of every individual interest group, local agency, and organization.

EXPERTISE, AUTHORITY, VIEWPOINTS	POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS
Knowledge of technical issues related to assumptions used in Bul. 160-98, development of estimates and projections.	Jeanine Jones, Kathy Kelly, Paul Hutton, Scott Matyac, Ed Craddock
Policy responsibility for development of California Water Plan, purposes of the Plan	Bob Potter, Kathy Kelly
Technical knowledge assumptions and analysis contained in CALFED EIS/EIR related to water use, projected demand, water use efficiency.	Mark Cowin, Rick Breitenbach, Rick Soehren, Greg Young
Responsibility for development of CALFED preferred alternative and preparation of EIS/EIR	Lester Snow, Steve Ritchie, Stein Buer
CALFED agency policy responsibility	Bob Potter, Kathy Kelly, Roger Patterson, Penny Howard, Felicia Marcus, Tom Hagler, Patrick Wright
Opinion leaders with good understanding of concerns, stakeholders with strong grasp of issues	Martha Davis, Peter Gleick, Dennis O'Connor, members of Bul. 160-98 Advisory Committee, representatives of urban and agricultural water users (eg CUWA, SWP contractors, etc.)
Other?	

Agenda

The following agenda is proposed as a working draft subject to CALFED agency input:

1. 9:00 Introduction: why are we here, what do we want to accomplish? (Lester Snow)
2. 9:10 Meeting format, ground rules for conduct of the meeting (Scott McCreary)
3. 9:20 How things fit together: CALFED goals, preferred alternative, staged decision making and adaptive management, linkages (Lester Snow or Stein Buer)
4. 9:50 CALFED view on range of uncertainty, and its effect on selection of a preferred alternative (Lester Snow, Stein Buer, Mark Cowin)
5. 10:20 Background: How Bulletin 160 is built: data sources, aggregation of information, constraints (Jeanine Jones?)
6. 10:40 Comments received on Bulletin 160-98, DWR responses and revisions in analysis, production schedule (Jeanine Jones)
7. 11:15 Panel discussion of concerns related to Bulletin 160 (Martha Davis, Dennis O'Connor, Peter Gleick)
- 12:30 Lunch
8. 1:30 How Bulletin 160 information is reflected in CALFED's EIS/EIR (Rick Breitenbach, Mark Cowin, Rick Soehren)
9. 2:15 Impact of demand projections on CALFED preferred alternative (Open discussion)
10. 4:15 Synthesis of discussion, wrap-up (Scott McCreary)
11. 4:30 Next steps and schedule (Snow, Wright, Potter)
- 4:45 Adjourn