



ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR COMPANION PLANS EVALUATION OF NEXUS PLANS

REVIEW OF 2009 CRITERIA

VISION

(See Highlights page 12, and 12 A)



OBJECTIVES (2009)

(See Highlights 12 C)

1. Expand Integrated Regional Water Management
2. Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently
3. Expand Conjunctive Management of Multiple Supplies
4. Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality
5. Expand Environmental Stewardship
6. Practice Integrated Flood Management
7. Manage a Sustainable California Delta
8. Prepare Prevention, Response, and Recovery Plans
9. Reduce Energy Consumption of Water Systems and Uses
10. Improve Data and Analysis for Decision-making
11. Invest in New Water Technology
12. Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources
13. Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits

Background

The Update 2009 Vision will be incorporated into the 2013 Update with additional refinements as the Advisory Committee and others work on them. In general, the objectives will also move forward with relevant modifications. The Companion Plans are extremely important because the Water Plan team will make every effort to make the Water Plan text consistent with the Companion Plans. The policy perspectives of these plans will have exceptional influence on the overall Update 2013 document. The Nexus Plans will be evaluated to inform the Water Plan and some elements of those plans likely to



be reflected in the Update Text. This analysis will also inform the selection of the Companion Plans.

Discussion Questions Part 1

Knowing this will be part of the criteria against which the Nexus Plans will be evaluated, and the Companion Plans selected, what are your ideas about the following?

1. What if any objectives should be added, subtracted or changed when conducting this analysis?

2. How should the evaluation of the Nexus Plans against the objectives be weighted?

[For example, should we be looking for at least one companion plan for each objective? Should plans that have multiple objectives be given greater weight? Is there other weighting criteria we should consider?]

3. What, if any, other ideas would you offer about the using the objectives as part of the evaluation?

BACKGROUND

The 2009 Resource Management Strategies (RMS's) were used to analyze the Companion Plans for 2009. There were fewer RMS's in the 2009 plan than in the Update 2013 and they had slightly different groupings. Following is a copy of the 2009 Categories. These are also displayed in your other handouts and the Highlights document. (See Handout - Matrix Tables, See Highlights pages 18 & 19)



Table 3-2 Matrix of companion plans and resource management strategy categories

Title	Agency	Reduce Water Demand	Improve Operational Efficiency & Transfers	Increase Water Supply	Improve Water Quality	Practice Resource Stewardship	Improve Flood Mgmt
CA Transportation Plan 2025 and 2030	BTH	X			X	X	X

Resource Management Strategies Categories

Following are the 2013 RMS categories.

Proposed 2013 RMS Categories

Improve Flood Management
Improve Operational Efficiency
Improve Water Quality
Increase Water Supply
Recognize the Relationships of People and Water
Practice Resource Stewardship
Reduce Demand
Other

The full list of RMS's that are included in these categories is on the following page.

Discussion Questions Part 2

1. Knowing these will be used to evaluate the Nexus Plans, what, if anything, would you change about these groupings?

2. What, if any, priority would you place on individual RMS's, versus the categories of RMS's. [For example should any strategy be elevated for evaluation purposes or special treatment, such as it being a new RMS or some other reason?]



Resource Management Strategies in Water Plan Update 2013

Reduce Demand	Improve Water Quality
Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	Drinking Water Treatment & Distribution
Urban Water Use Efficiency	Groundwater / Aquifer Remediation
	Matching Quality to Use
Improve Flood Management	Pollution Prevention
Integrated Flood Management	Salt & Salinity Management
Improve Operational Efficiency	Urban Runoff Management
Conveyance – Delta	
Conveyance – Regional / Local	Practice Resource Stewardship
System Reoperation	Agricultural Land Stewardship
	Ecosystem Restoration
Increase Water Supply	Forest Management
Conjunctive Management & Groundwater	Land Use Planning & Management
Desalination –Brackish & Seawater	Recharge Areas Protection
Precipitation Enhancement	Watershed Management
Recycled Municipal Water	Sediment Management*
Surface Storage – CALFED	
Surface Storage – Regional / Local	Relationships of People and Water
Water Transfers	Economic Incentives (Loans, Grants & Water Pricing)
	Outreach and Education*
Other	Water-Dependent Cultural Resources*
Crop idling, dew vaporization, fog collection, irrigated land retirement, rainfed agriculture, waterbag transport	Water-Dependent Recreation

The Resource Management Strategies are described in Volume 3 of Water Plan Update 2013.

*New for California Water Plan Update 2013



3. How should the evaluation of the Nexus Plans against the Resource Management Strategies be weighted? [For example, should we be looking for at least one companion plan for each category or RMS? Should plans that have multiple RMS's be given greater weight? Are there other weighting criteria we should consider?]

3. What, if any, other ideas would you offer about the using the RMS's as part of the evaluation?

Discussion Questions Part 3

1. In addition to the Vision, Objectives and RMS's, what, if any, other criteria would you like added to the screening process?

2. Knowing the criteria discussed what would you add, subtract or change about the plans currently being considered as Nexus Plans?

3. Knowing the list of Federal Plans is not yet complete, is there anything different you would do with screening for those plans?