

**CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2009  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
DECEMBER 18, 2008 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM  
DOUBLE TREE HOTEL  
2001 POINT WEST WAY, SACRAMENTO, CA**

**MEETING OBJECTIVES:**

1. Presentation of Update 2009 Public Review Draft to the Advisory Committee
2. Presentation on the Delta Vision Implementation Plan
3. Discussion of Next Steps: Rollout Process and AC View

**Next AC Meeting:**

**July 23, 2009**  
Double Tree Hotel  
2001 Point West Way  
Sacramento, CA 95815

**Table of Contents:**

---

Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Updates .....	1
Preview of Update 2009 Highlights.....	3
Revisions to Volumes 1, 2, and 3 .....	3
Group Reports – Suggestions for Highlights Document .....	5
Director’s Remarks .....	7
Update on Delta Vision Implementation Plan .....	8
Group Reports – Suggestions for Public Review Draft .....	11
Public Rollout and Regional Outreach .....	13
AC View Process .....	14
Attendance (50):.....	17

---

## Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Updates

### Opening Remarks:

Lisa Beutler, Executive Facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy, welcomed everyone to the sixth meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC) for the California Water Plan Update 2009 (Update 2009). In reviewing the agenda, Lisa noted that most of the day’s work would focus on reviewing the Public Review Draft (PRD). The agenda and all other meeting materials are available on the website: <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials>.

Ms. Beutler reminded the Advisory Committee that her role as a facilitator is to ensure a fair process and that all perspectives are heard. Her role is neutral as to outcomes of deliberations. This is important for members who may have been involved in Update 2005, in regards to the content for the AC View. That document is prepared by the Advisory Committee, not the Department of Water Resources (DWR), and the facilitation team will support the AC in preparing a similar document for the public review draft of Update 2009

## **Mark Cowin, Deputy Director, California Department of Water Resources**

Mark Cowin extended his appreciation for all the efforts of the Advisory Committee, and commended staff for the extensive work done on a compressed schedule. Recent events in state government and around the world highlight the importance for water planning. Recently, DWR looked at options for stimulating the economy by expediting grant programs, and starting projects to create jobs. The Pooled Money Investment Board concluded yesterday that the State cannot continue to sell new bonds for already authorized programs. DWR is looking at cash balances from previous loans and will provide as much information as we can, as it becomes available. The economic constraints underline and underscore the need for good planning.

The Water Plan provides a diversified approach for dealing with uncertainty in resource management and promoting sustainability. In DWR's continuing effort to provide for good water management planning throughout state, the Department is reorganizing consistent with the Key Initiatives from Update 2005. The Integrated Water Management Program addresses flood management, statewide planning, and regional planning. The proposed date for the formal reorganization is July of 2009 and is intended to help the Department better serve the State of California.

## **Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR**

Kamyar Guivetchi recapped key activities since the October AC meeting, including three workshops on Resource Management Strategies, and the first planning team meeting for the California Tribal Water Summit. The Summit will likely be held in August of 2009, as a two-day conference format. DWR also held three workshops regarding an expedited grant process for Integrated Regional Water Management grants and the process for review and acceptance of planning regions. The Air Resources Board adopted the scoping plan for Assembly Bill 32 and the PRD will need to be consistent with the scoping plan. Also, information on the 20X2020 Water Use Efficiency process will continue to be announced through the Water Plan eNews and other venues.

Update 2009 is dedicated to expanded outreach and now has achieved over 80% of the collaboration conducted for Update 2005, in 1/3 of the time. DWR is keeping the dialogue open with workshops and other forums to talk about the content of Update 2009. Referring to the timeline, Mr. Guivetchi noted that the PRD will be released in January.

## Preview of Update 2009 Highlights

Kamyar recapped that the initial draft of the highlights was presented at the AC meeting in October. Many of those suggested changes were incorporated into the current version of the highlights. A cover design has been developed and the suggested subtitle is “Integrated Water Management” (IWM). The theme of IWM reoccurs throughout Update 2009 – bringing in topics of flood management, water supply, ecosystem stewardship, and ways to provide diverse sets of actions that provide multiple benefits.

The revisions to the working draft include some sequencing changes, minor text changes, and editorial changes based largely on the comments provided at the last AC meeting. Also, specific references are provided that point to more detailed information. There is a 4-page fold-out section for the elements of the strategic plan, creating a brochure within a brochure. This section provides additional detail about the strategic plan, which can be skipped over without losing continuity. The scenario graphics were changed, with a more general focus on the factors being considered. Focus groups did not like the scenario title of “Active Institutions” and that scenario is now called “Blueprint Growth.” The table from Update 2005, showing benefits associated with Resource Management Strategies (RMS), has been carried forward – with dots reflecting what is described as benefits in the RMS narratives.

### Questions of Clarification:

Question: Will there need to be any adjustments made as a result of the biological opinion, which indicates that the Delta flow reductions may be a long-term factor?

Response: The “Imperatives to Act” section does talk about court decisions that impact water supply strategies. That specific opinion (Wenger) will be addressed in the main document. The highlights are intended to capture areas of uncertainty.

## Revisions to Volumes 1, 2, and 3

Marilee Talley, the Water Plan Editor-in-Chief, explained that changes to text in Volume 1 were based on comments received from the AC, the Steering Committee, and DWR Executives. In walking through the annotated Table of Contents, Ms. Talley highlighted the key changes to previous text.

### **Volume 1 – Strategic Plan**

Chapter 1 now discusses the progress made towards implementation of Update 2005. Information focuses on objectives for Update 2005, bonds and grants passed, and the focus on the health Delta – in large part coming from discussions that grew out of CWP Update 2005. Chapter 3 is now a full chapter, looking at some key companion state plans. Chapter 4 is continuing to be developed as a result of discussions regarding the Biological Opinion, AB32 scoping plan, and 20X2020 initiative. Chapters 5 and 6 will incorporate analytical results and

data as they become available, and the text on Integrated Flood Management is also being updated.

## **Volume 2 – Resource Management Strategies**

For Update 2009, many of the RMS chapters were written by staff outside of DWR. State and federal agencies have expanded the base of expertise for the State Water Plan. Also, chapter authors have also been asked to identify which strategies work together to produce multiple benefits. The RMS approach for flood strategies looked at several options and is now discussed in one RMS chapter on “Flood Risk Management.”

### **Questions of Clarification:**

Question: How will the use of specific words and terminology, and the consistency of terminology and definitions (where terminology is different in different chapters or volumes) be addressed?

Response: We will be posting a PRD of the glossary. There has been considerable discussion of definitions, particularly in Volume 2 (RMS). The RMS authors are being asked to define how they are using technical terms.

## **Volume 3 – Regional Reports**

The reports for each hydrologic region are being produced as a boxed set, with each Regional Report as a stand alone document. Regional stakeholders have been asked to identify local conditions and information, and topic specialists from the flood team and IRWM also providing text. Details and additional materials have been moved to appendices for each report. Information from the Water Boards and their basin plans was used to identify water quality issues for each region, and Tribal information is continuing to be developed through outreach.

### **Break-out Discussions**

Several hours of the meeting were devoted small group discussions of the highlights document and draft PRD. Feedback was sought on any key concepts or ideas to be added, subtracted, or changed to support wide acceptance of the Update. As the state’s investment plan, this aspect is very important for the Update. Participants were asked to consider the perspectives of their constituencies, in anticipating questions or concerns that might surface as people review this document. AC members were also asked to identify topics that might benefit from additional workshops.

Before moving to break-out groups, AC members expressed their appreciation for DWR adopting AC comments (from the October meeting) into the revisions. The fold-out format was also very well received. Transcripts of all comments were forwarded to the publications team and the following highlights summarize the main concepts reported out by the groups.

## Group Reports – Suggestions for Highlights Document

### Additions to Existing Outline

- Include the theme of groundwater management (more than conjunctive use).
- Provide more information about implementation of Update 2005 – create a report card.
- Hold a graphic review workshop.
- Provide more transparent and realistic discussions and approaches to financing.
- Where the Water Plan mentions “adapt” (for climate change), address mitigate as well.

**California Water Today...Imperative to Act:** Change title to “Challenges to California Water Today” (or create a full description of California Water Today, citing progress made – e.g., reduced consumption)

- Lack of good water-use data is another challenge.

### INTRO (page 4)

- Both “Court and regulatory decisions are significantly reducing water deliveries. (water deliveries, not water supplies); describe level of reductions over the last 10-15 years.
- Include a sense of urgency for each topic – the reason to take action and not wait.

**DROUGHT (page 4):** Change title to “Supply Constraints and Drought” (supply reliability is longer-term)

- Water supply constraints include over-allocation of water (see p.8 of Delta Vision report); up to eight times the flow – the Water Plan needs to address this disparity.
- There is a longer history to drought than going back to 1976; link to climate change history, where there are instances of 50 year droughts.

**FLOODS (page 4):** Change title to: “Increased Flood Risk”

- This section is deep-floodplain centric. Distinguish between local (regionally contained) floods and floods with inter-regional significance (e.g. impact statewide water systems).
- Make connections between fire/flood/mud and short- and long-term retention impacts.
- Connect flood with water supply

**ECOSYSTEM DECLINE (page 5)**

- Discuss ecosystem functions and services (and loss thereof); e.g. flood attenuation, groundwater recharge, habitat, etc.

**WATER QUALITY (page 5)**

- More than variability, water quality is declining due to human activities; emphasize pollution prevention and protection of public health
- Include better statistics for water quality and preventative measures (not just reactive measures)

AGING INFRASTRUCTURE (page 5): Change title to “Aging Distribution System.

- Sustainable funding is needed for infrastructure. Disadvantaged communities face funding obstacles; systemic funding is needed for infrastructure repairs and upgrades.

FUTURE STRESSES (box, page 5)

- The focus on uncertainties is vague – rephrase as statements, conclusions, or risks.

## **California’s Water Resources...Variable and Extreme**

Graphics (page 6):

- Compare projected water demand for 2050 and back to 1990.
- Use 1995 inter-regional water transfer graphic and add ocean outflow.
- Breakdown the 120 MAF by region.

Photos (Page 7): Use graphics and photos showing the extremes of variability in California.

## **Climate Change...Increasing Stress on Water System**

- Use italics, or highlight AB 32 in text, to call out.

WHAT HAS ALREADY HAPPENED (page 8)

- Cite sources amount of sea-level rise.
- Provide a longer time perspective.

WHAT MORE IS EXPECTED? (page 8)

- Confirm that 90% reduction can be expected; says in “northern Sierra” – clarify this
- Cite sources – tie back to model or scientific basis; verify level of expected change.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED IMPACTS? (page 9)

- Address mitigation, as well as adaptation.
- Add new bullet: Will affect key economic activities (agriculture, existing infrastructure, low-lying cities and coastal communities without flood protection, generation of hydro-power)

## **California Water Plan Update 2009...Building on a Framework**

page 10

- Clarify the difference between sustainable and reliable water supply. (They seem the same).
- Create stronger links between the IWM graphic and the highlights and other Water Plan sections.

page 10a: Include new technology and making maximum use of it

MISSION (page 10b):

- Include long-term actions as well.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES (page 10b)

- #6: Clarify this item, it seems to mix everything together (e.g. Is this trying to factor in costs and benefits that are not included in traditional cost-benefit analyses?)
- #8: Add in water rights priorities, area of origin, and protection of beneficial uses.

OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS (page 10c-d): Add an objective on infrastructure

Page 11: Review the bullet on climate change adaptation and mitigation to see if we are really there.

Sustainability (box, page 11): We need to increase system capacity and flexibility by coordinating new and existing storage and conveyance (reoperation and expansion of existing system).

### **Water Scenarios 2050...A Range of Considerations**

- The scenarios need work: more specifically, and especially, differentiation beyond growth.
- The scenarios appear to be fairly accurate at this time.

### **Regional Strategies...Response through 2050**

- Will there be responses for Mountain Counties and the Delta?

### **Conclusion...Recommendations**

- Delete page 18 – it dilutes the strength of the message on page 19.
- Provide a stronger statement regarding greater need for conservation and new technology.
- Clarify who the recommendations are target to, and what action is needed.

## **Director's Remarks**

Director Lester Snow joined the AC meeting and addressed the members, remarking that many individuals have been involved with the Water Plan for quite a number of years. Stakeholders are engaged for the long haul to change water management to deal with emerging issues. Director Snow remarked that the first Water Plan was published in 1951, the year he was born. At that time, the Water Plan was literally a blueprint for developing water supplies and distributing them. At that time, conservation meant storage. It was that blueprint for what became the State Water Project that really enabled the economic growth and development of California as one of the biggest agriculture producers in the world. That was an era of large projects, for developing water supplies on a large scale and transporting those supplies; it served all of the West well, in terms of economic development and growth.

Times have changed since then, both in terms of societal values and also hydrology. In the 1950s, no one knew what climate change was or would be about – but we know this was a force even then. Another issue was unintended consequences of the way we developed water supplies in California, in terms of environmental consequences in particular. So what's happened since then, with large projects, is that the projects could make changes to accommodate Delta smelt or salmon or other issues; there was a cushion in the system. That cushion and resilience is gone. Now, every time there's another accommodation of an issue, there's a consequence and impact, often an economic impact. That's a reality that many people like to deny.

The large system and the entire process need adjustment. We need a portfolio approach for water resource management – there are no big projects that can solve problems now and for next 50 years; it's a portfolio approach. More importantly, there is a need for integrated resource management. Some talk in a broader sense of managing the resource from the watershed mountain top all the way to the tap or the ocean, wherever it ends up. Doing so involves taking responsibility for the floodplain and flood management that happens in the journey of the water along the way, taking responsibility for habitat and how it's managed, and making sure there's a healthy ecosystem. As mentioned recently at an ACWA conference, water managers must be able to look at water as a natural resource and take responsibility for all the issues of that resource – including fisheries where agencies typically have little enforcement discretion.

A comprehensive approach is needed to deal with climate change, environmental needs, changes in demand patterns and growth, and agricultural and commodity needs that world depends on. That's why the Water Plan is so important. California's future involves diverse needs that require diverse responses. This change in direction for the Water Plan began a number of years ago, and became manifest Update 2005. Update 2009 must push further to integrate water quality, energy, habitat, and flood management issues into how we design, plan, and implement water strategies for the future. The Director emphasized his appreciation for all of the effort that AC members and staff have contributed to Update 2009. Special attention was given to Kamyar Guivetchi, and his ability to meet the Director's expectations and work with such a diverse group as the AC.

## Update on Delta Vision Implementation Plan

Joe Grindstaff, Deputy Director of Water Policy at the Resources Agency, referenced the Delta Vision Strategic Plan, the culmination of several years' work. The Task Force and Stakeholder Group were commended for doing an excellent job on the report. The Delta is perhaps the largest most difficult resource challenge in the nation right now. We are looking at how to balance water supply and restoration of a truly important ecosystem. The State has struggled unsuccessfully with this, for the last few years, and intends to make progress. The Plan was presented to the Cabinet Committee, which will forward an implementation plan to the legislature. Committee members supported all of the goals and strategies contained in the report. Without going through all the associated actions, the Committee is prioritizing efforts for the next few years. Mr. Grindstaff highlighted some of the items that Committee members mentioned as important.

**Conservation:** Conservation was strongly emphasized in the Strategic Plan, and the Committee believes this needs to move forward at an accelerated rate. This will require using every current legal authority, as well as additional legislated authority, to reduce both agricultural and urban water use – with special focus on urban use. California’s per capita water use is around 200 gallons per capita per day (gpcd); in Australia that value is between 50 and 70 gpcd. That’s what happens during long droughts, when water is highly valued and people start thinking about what they really need to have for water supply. It is essential to figure how we can conserve water and meet the Governor’s objective of reducing urban water use by at least 20% by 2020.

**Water Rights:** The Task Force pointed out the weaknesses in how California enforces water rights. Statewide levels of water diversion are not known, because there’s really no system that requires people to report diversions. In many cases, water users are exempted from having to report how much water is diverted and used. That needs to change, to determine how much water is being diverted and to allow the State Board to effectively enforce water rights. This does not mean changing the water rights priority system. The water rights system isn’t flawed, rather it’s our willingness to step up and enforce it.

**Co-equal Objectives:** Huge progress was made in setting co-equal objectives in the Delta, for both water supply and the ecosystem. That framework will need to be defined as we move ahead. What would that balancing look like? How would work for addressing endangered species or water supplies or water quality? How would that change what we do, if we really focused on that? That framework is a really valuable contribution for moving ahead.

**Ecosystem Restoration:** There is a commitment for 100,000 acres of ecosystem restoration by 2100. This is a bold objective, but probably close to what is needed to really make a change to the system. It’s a significant effort, dedicating 1/7<sup>th</sup> of the total land base in the Delta stabilizing the ecosystem. Talk about co-equal, that’s really stepping up. That’s something that we, as a State, need to embrace and figure out how to do – while at same time maintaining quality of life and economic activity. All of those things must be done; they are not incompatible.

**Self-sufficiency:** Integrated resource management will need to identify approaches for regional water supplies to become more self-sufficient. This is critical, in order to provide for needs that occur in 20, 30, and 40 years. Mr. Grindstaff shared that he has a 20-month old granddaughter, and just being with her reminds him of why he does this work. He wants her to have a great place to live 70 or 80 years from now, when she’s old and gray grandchildren of her own.

**Governance:** Potential governance structures include establishing a Delta Conservancy, enhancing the Delta Protection Commission, creating a high-level policy group, and using the Central Valley Plan of Flood Control as a basis for Delta land use decisions. The Committee supports most, are maybe all, of those in the long-term. Likely, a high-level policy group will be created to specifically address how a council might work and what long-term governance should be for the Delta. The policy group would have to develop the potential governance concepts and really think through the difficult issues.

In summing up the impact of coequal objectives, Mr. Grindstaff highlighted that the concept means different things to different people. Many interpret this as having sufficient water to meet their interests, whether that be agricultural, urban, or environmental water needs. There will be challenges ahead and the State will be up to meeting them. The State has done great things before. It was not easy to publish the first Water Plan in 1951; it took a long time to implement – DWR was formed in 1956 DWR formed, it went to the voters in 1962, and final reorganization occurred in 1969 with the Porter-Cologne Act. These were major steps in a long journey. Through the years, the State has been able to find a way to step up to address challenging conditions, make really tough decisions, and make the system work.

### **Questions for Speakers:**

Question: Would it be possible or desirable to change the bulletin 160 process to more like the Delta Vision process – through Executive Order, a task force, stakeholder committee, two-year deliberation, product, approved, etc? There will likely be immediate legislation on Appendix B and governance, regarding the Delta. With the Water Plan, elements are institutionalized in code and statute. A concern is that with the economic conditions, sharp budget lines will discourage comprehensive natural resources management. It would be great to have an automatic handover to legislative action. Creating an end-game will generate more excitement in the Water Plan.

Response: (From Director Snow) In conversations with Phil Isenberg, the Delta Vision process used the Water Plan as a base document – providing information and a foundation for that effort. One criticism of the Department is that more work needs to be done after acknowledging that agencies have sent in Urban Water Management Plans. There is a desire to have more rigor for implementation and coordination of Urban Water Management Plans, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans, and the Water Plan. Creating that type of packaged approach would need additional legislation. There are a lot of good intentions for creating legislation on the best elements of the Delta Vision recommendations. There is a shared understanding of the need for legislative action.

Question: The proposal for stakeholder groups exchanging information may not require legislation or funding. How might this be implemented other than through infrastructure and agencies collaborating to carry out elements of the strategic plan?

Response: (From Mr. Grindstaff) Collaboration between agencies is a high priority. The Cabinet Committee's implementation plan will be public, and released near the beginning of the year. The strategic plan provides a blueprint for all things that need to be addressed. The implementation plan identifies priority actions that can be undertaken over the next two years. There will be substantial efforts remaining after that initial timeframe.

Question: Will the Cabinet Committee's work and recommendations more nuanced than what the Delta Vision Task Force developed – that the Committee will make revisions?

Response: (Mr. Grindstaff) That's accurate. The Committee is not moving forward on all suggestions – for example, some proposals may not be viable at this time, there may be other options to consider, additional information may need to be developed, or permitting issues may need additional work. The emphasis on water rights is not to overturn the system but to make it work the way it was intended.

Question: How will multiple financing proposals be addressed? AB 32 proposed a broad-based water utility fee for certain things, and the Delta Vision Committee is looking at broad-based fees or more specific fees for different uses. How will agencies work together to determine the number and type of fees?

Response: (Mr. Grindstaff) The fee issue will be forwarded for the legislature to work through. As noted, the Air Resources Board has proposed a public goods charge on water and Delta Vision is discussing more specific fees. Resource managers will need to now the funding formulas as they implement their programs.

## Group Reports – Suggestions for Public Review Draft

### General Comments

- Provide greater discussion on the State's role regarding land use. (E.g. How will Update 2009 be useful for local flood agencies? Need better guidance in plan to address how this will be accomplished.)
- Expand discussion regarding legislative action that will be needed to initiate the process. (E.g. funding, regulation for more conservation efforts and implementing AB 32.)
- Flood discussions need to address more than Central Valley floods, including localized, coastal, and alluvial flooding.
- Suggestions for references:
  - peer-reviewed articles
  - usable, findable references (avoid links that could become inactive)
- Expand the online resources by adding a master one-stop calendar added to website – show meetings, document release date, and comment periods for Water Plan.

### Volume 1

#### Chapter 1 – Introduction

- It is not readily apparent how public was involved. This should be answered quickly, talking about the evolving regional outreach. Identify that Update 2009 is regionally focused and highlight the regional opportunities to participate.
- Provide a report card on successes/failures/progress of Update 2005.

- On page 19, #7, include expansion of system capacity.
- The discussion on Tribes should explain why there is a focus on Tribes. Many believe that Tribal water issues have been resolved by the Federal government. Make clear the diversity of Tribes throughout the state and that diversity becomes more apparent at the regional level.

## *Chapter 2 – Imperative to Act*

- Describe the urgency and then move directly to tie into regionally-implemented tactical plans and IRWM.
- Emphasize that regional plans, strategies, and tactics build into statewide planning.
- Point out economic uncertainties, which will be a factor for some while.

## *Chapter 3 – Companion State Plans*

- Basin plans should be included.
- Have the Cabinet Committee Implementation Plan as the companion plan for the Delta, rather than the Delta Vision Strategic Plan from the Task Force.
- Expand the CPUC discussion (that agency will help develop text).
- Emphasize the importance of AB32. Show relationship of AB 32 with SB 375, which address benefits for water.
- Note that regulations and laws also affect water.

## *Chapter 4 – California Water Today*

- Basin plans should be included.
- Additional focus on funding – reliance on propositions and bonds, reconciling proposals for new fees and taxes, definition of beneficiary pays, and need for a clear finance plan.
- Suggestions: clarify water energy uses; add “Regulatory Issues” as a challenge (addresses water rights, water treatment, public health); under “Responses and Opportunities” add ag water conservation, legislative recommendations for Delta, and General Plans and Water Elements; discuss water affordability for disadvantaged communities.
- This chapter will hold a lot of information; may want to have this peer-reviewed.
- Responses and opportunities should match or parallel the list of challenges. Special attention should be given to coordination of flood and land use.

## *Chapter 5 – Mapping an Uncertain Future*

- Worst-case scenarios are not addressed within the current scenario descriptions. Thought should be given to actions needed during a decades-long drought.
- This section should also reference the economy.
- Tie the issue of reliability to sustainability and convey it in easily understood terms. For example, use flood example (of 1 in 3 chance for flooding over a 30-year mortgage) for water supply reliability (is water available after the 30-year mortgage?).

## *Chapter 6 – Integrated Data and Analysis*

- Describe how agency coordination helps provide high-quality, useful data.
- Provide greater detail about IRWM planning, Urban Water Management Plans, and data gathering. Where does integration start and stop? Where are the gaps and how are we addressing the true challenges to integrated resource management planning?
- Everyone will use this data in their own studies and presentations – Update 2009 data needs extreme peer review and buy-in.
- How is life cycle costing factored into regional data?
- Build the capacity of the public on data and analysis.

## *Chapter 7 – Implementation Plan*

- Clarify the implementation pathway, including sustainability of funding sources.
- Discuss climate change mitigation strategies in greater detail.
- A prioritization strategy will be especially important for the current economic conditions.
- Provide performance measures that provide examples of change.

## **Volume 2**

- What does the RMS Table in Highlights (page 14, showing dots for each strategy's relevance) really tell us? Use solid and half-empty dots, otherwise the page is full of dots.

## **Volume 3**

- Include updates on dam conditions.

Lisa Beutler explained that the goal of these questions is refocus attention on the document. Information about how different groups will look at the Water Plan document is extremely helpful for the rollout. AC members indicated that the caucuses would benefit from meeting and discussing specific messages and outreach.

## **Public Rollout and Regional Outreach**

Judie Talbot, the Regional Workshop facilitator, noted that the master calendar will be updated to include when comment due dates. The deadline for comments on the PRD is June 1<sup>st</sup>, allowing feedback after the regional workshops are conducted.

Planning efforts are underway for the last round of regional workshops, which will be held in mid-April and May. The AC perspectives will be especially important during these workshops. AC members with presence in the regions will be asked to participate and help represent the work of the Advisory Committee. Knowing that many members are quite extended in their work loads, a worksheet was provided asking for potential participation by AC members in sponsoring or participating in the regional workshops. As in the past, the workshops would like to partner with existing meetings where possible.

## AC View Process

Lisa Beutler walked through the AC View that was created for Update 2005. The three-page document identified new features of the Water Plan, as well as areas of agreement and disagreement among AC members. The AC View provides an opportunity for AC members to share their thoughts with the public – raising topics you would like the public to know about and ask about. In Update 2005, the AC view really improved the public process by serving as a reviewers' guide.

To begin framing the AC View for Update 2009, members were asked to describe key themes and areas of shared and different perspectives. The facilitation team will prepare an initial working draft. As was done previously, each caucus will elect a representative to serve on the editing committee. The commitment is to develop the text together and then bring back to the whole group, creating a 100% consensus document. This is not a DWR document and the text that the AC agrees to will go forward; there is no executive review.

The AC View will go into the regional workshops and AC members will be asked to help present it. For Update 2005, AC members set up a schedule and representatives from different caucuses went to each of the regions and talked about how they were using the plan.

### Group Reports

#### *Themes or Perspective of Update 2009*

When thinking about the theme of the Water Plan, AC members were asked how they might respond if someone asked what Update 2009 was about. The response should be able to be delivered on an elevator. The “elevator speech” concept resulted in the following summaries:

- Dealing with the growing demand of water, climate change, aging infrastructure, and diverse regional needs requires a comprehensive approach with detailed actions for implementation to meet our needs for 2050.
- This is a transitional update of the State Water Plan that addresses flood, climate change, and Tribal water issues – but emphasizes much more the role of land use issues, companion plans, and interagency coordination for water resources.
- Using a regional integrated portfolio for water management, this Update conveys a higher sense of urgency and describes our challenges in stark language. The coequal goals of supply and environmental sustainability are not explicitly called out.
- Water, it's in everything we do.
- In the face of increasing and major uncertainties regarding water supply, climate, and economic conditions, California must use a comprehensive, region-based approach to solve its water supply and demand challenges.
- Sustainability, adaptive approaches, and a portfolio of regional strategies that are part of an overarching statewide strategy.

*Areas of Broad Agreement* Note: Numbers in parens ( ) indicate the number of tables reporting the same item.

- Importance of having Tribes and Environmental Justice at the table. (3)
- Land use is critical, but different perspectives on how to address. (3)
- Need for regional inclusion and emphasis. (2)
- Need for a comprehensive, integrated approach. (2)
- There is a need for balanced performance measures (scorecard) for the regional water management efforts to measure effectiveness in achieving regional and statewide objectives and goals. (2)
- Lack of certainty on how plan will be implemented. (2)
- Need to define and clarify terms (2) - including if conservation is “new water” or reallocation of water.
- High priority on water supply augmentation with conservation at top of list, but conservation alone can’t meet demand. (2)
- Inclusion of flood management, climate change impacts, and water quality. (2)
- Final drafts of vision, mission, goals, objectives, and recommendations. (2)
- Need for continuing sophisticated data analysis and peer review data and numbers; have a very defensible statement about the role of SWAN.
- Highlights document needs to provide clear guidance, direct message to legislators.

*Areas of Disagreement* Note: Numbers in parens ( ) indicate the number of tables reporting the same item.

- The need for additional surface storage and conveyance is glossed over and remains a point of contention. (4)
- State v. local control over land use planning, land use links to water planning, and General Plan Updates. (4)
- Level of contribution from agricultural conservation and WUE. (3)
- The concept of “beneficiary pays” – how is that defined? Does the environment pay as a beneficiary? (2)
- Degree to which Delta solutions are emphasized in this plan. (2)
- Scenarios and scenario descriptions.
- Water rights should not drive water management decisions. The role of reasonable use and public trust, FERC, different users.
- Water, especially for agriculture, is priced too low.
- The environmental caucus would not use the term “regulatory drought.”
- Need for groundwater management and regulations.

Lisa Beutler noted that the areas of disagreement tend to be very targeted around specific issues. The integration of the Delta Vision recommendations is creating some of these specific questions, and is hard to untangle.

Kamyar Guivetchi explained the transition that the Update process is going through: For many years, the California Water Plan was a technical document. A big critique after the 1998 Plan was there was no plan or policy direction, simply a presentation of water balances and a description of State program, projects, and effort. The Legislature and stakeholders alike pushed for planning and policy content. As a result, the Water Plan has moved towards providing information AND becoming a strategic plan, including policy recommendations. The caveat is that not everyone agrees on the direction the State should go.

With Update 2005, the AC view highlighted the amount of agreement – which was a very valuable contribution. Within the public political venue, people often talk about their differences and do not recognize agreements. Just being able to articulate what broad, diverse groups of stakeholders can agree about in the plan and where disagreements remain – that is an important element. Those areas of broad, general agreement provide significant leverage with the Legislature and Governor's Office. Where there's disagreement, DWR and the Steering Committee will have to decide how to present options to the Legislature and Governor. Using the AC View allows differences in perspectives to be shared with the public.

Lisa Beutler noted that in working to create text for the AC View, in her role as facilitator, she can sometimes see where differences are not as far apart as people believe. This allows AC members to do a bit more work to see if they can identify some common ground and reach agreement. Other times, the disagreements are fundamental differences in values and AC members agree to disagree. Either outcome is fine; the process allows the outcome to be developed in a transparent manner based on informed choices.

## Next Steps, Closing Comments

Kamyar Guivetchi recapped the 2009 timeline for the Update

- The PRD will be released in **January**, with the Highlights and Volume 1 posted online during the first week; Volume 2 at mid-month; and Volume 3 at the end of the month.
- Hard copies of the highlights, including a CD of all three volumes, will be available in **February**. Hard copies of the PRD will be available on request and printed as needed. Caucus sessions will also be scheduled for February.
- Workshops will be held in **March** for the Land Use and Agricultural Water Use Efficiency RMS. Other workshops will cover graphics, scenarios, and the water portfolio.
- By **April**, the AC View will be completed and presented at the regional workshops, which will be conducted from **mid-April through May**.
- The deadline for all public comments will be **JUNE 5<sup>th</sup>**.
- The PRD revisions will be completed in **July** and shared at the AC meeting on **July 23**.
- The **September plenary** will preview final revisions, with final comments due in **October**.

**Next AC Meeting: July 23, 2008**

## Attendance (50):

### Advisory Committee Members and Alternates (22):

1. **Elaine Archibald**, California County Planning Commissioners Association
2. **Danielle Blacet**, Association of California Water Agencies
3. **Max Gomberg**, Californi PUC, Division of Ratepayer Advocates
4. **Merita Callaway**, California State Association of Counties
5. **Grace Chan**, State Water Contractors
6. **Steve Cruz**, California Building Industry Association
7. **Justin Frederickson**, Farm Bureau
8. **Lucas Frerichs**, California League of Cities
9. **Pal Hegedus**, Floodplain Management Association
10. **Jack Hawks**, California Water Association
11. **Mary Lee Knecht**, California Watershed Network
12. **Kathy Mannion**, Regional Council of Rural Counties
13. **Jonas Minton**, Planning and Conservation League
14. **Rose Mose**, Intertribal Council of California
15. **Valerie Nera**, California Chamber of Commerce
16. **Wendy Phillips**, League of Women Voters
17. **Betsy Reifsneider**, Friends of the River
18. **Bob Riopel**, Recreational Boaters of California
19. **Larry Rohlfs**, California Landscape Contractors Association
20. **Atta Stevenson**, Intertribal Council of California
21. **Susan Tatayon**, The Nature Conservancy
22. **Iovanka Todt**, Floodplain Management Association

### Others (28):

1. **Donna Begay**, Tubatulabals of Kern Valley
2. **Katie Benouar**, Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency
3. **Jim Chatigny**, Mountain Counties Water Resources Association
4. **Mark Cowin**, DWR
5. **Dru Dunton**, DWR
6. **David Edwards**, ARB
7. **Tom Filler**, DWR
8. **Leanne Gilmore**, Office of Emergency Services
9. **Kamyar Guivetchi**, DWR
10. **Bruce Gwynne**, CA Department of Conservation
11. **Liz Haven**, State Water Board
12. **Barbara Hennigan**, Butte Sutter Basin Area Groundwater Users
13. **Marco Jennison**, Public
14. **Rosario Kapeller**, California Municipal Utilities Association
15. **Brian Leahy**, CA Dept. of Conservation
16. **Ron Lincoln**, Round Valley Allottee Association
17. **Lester Messina**, Glenn County
18. **John Mills**, Tuolumne-Stanislaus and Upper Feather River IRWMP

19. **Lew Moeller**, DWR
20. **Robert Morrow**, Public
21. **Vickie Newlin**, Butte County
22. **Elizabeth Patterson**, DWR
23. **Bernold Pollard**, Round Valley Allottee Association
24. **Judi Quan**, California Alliance for Jobs
25. **Marilee Talley**, DWR
26. **Jim Tischer**, California Water Institute, SCU Fresno
27. **Cynthia Truelove**, CPUC
28. **Ed Winkler**, CH2MHill

Facilitation Team: Lisa Beutler, Dorian Fougères, Judie Talbot – Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS