

CCTAG Meeting August 28, 2008

Meeting Notes

AI=Agenda Item, CC=Climate Change, C=Comment, Q=Question, R=Response

AI - 2: Welcome and Introduction by John Andrew

- Round-Robin introductions followed by agenda preview.
- Draft Objectives and Recommendations for Update 2009 and CC Science main items of discussion before lunch, followed by Integrated Data and Analysis discussion after lunch.

AI - 3: Draft Objectives and Draft Recommendations for Update 2009 by Kamyar Guivetchi

Presentation and Handouts – Staff Draft Objectives and Related Actions for Water Plan Update 2009; and Staff Draft Recommendations for California Water Plan Update 2009

- Comments regarding the Draft Objectives and Recommendations can be submitted through Tuesday, September 2, for the incorporation into the Public Review Draft.
- Also there will be an opportunity to submit comments on Public Review Draft in spring 2009.

Draft Objectives for Update 2009

- Objectives and Actions taken together should be the basis of Update 2009.
- There were 15 different objectives as of July 9. Nine objectives were based off of CC White Paper.
- Number of Objectives has now been reduced to 12 based on comments received. Work was done to consolidate and incorporate some objectives into other ones.
- Promote, improve and expand Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM), this it to have a central role in Update 2009.
- Actions to be taken vary by each objective. E.g.:
 - o Increase water use efficiency.
 - o Advance and expand conjunctive management. Using groundwater storage to help manage water supply by use of ground water management plans.
- Objective 7 is taken from the 3rd Draft Delta Vision Strategic Plan. The Delta was broken out as a separate objective due to the complex issues that are associated with this region and recommended actions that relate to other regions and statewide.

Discussion on Objectives and Actions:

- C – Obj 1 needs to include a discussion regarding watershed scale and the need for the IRWMPs to focus on watershed planning.
- C – Obj 2 needs to state that there is a need to gather information regarding data for water use and re-use.
- C – Regarding Obj 2, DWR needs to use this opportunity to nexus with the SWRCB on water use and efficiency.
- C – Need more emphasis on Ag efficiencies. More oversight is needed for Ag users regarding their water use, crop types and there associated water needs.
- Q – How do you get the Ag interests to participate in an IRWMP?
- C – Obj 1 needs additional language on how to remove impediments to water transfers.
- C – Ag has water rights and water quality issues that SWRCB is trying to address, and hopes to do so in the near future.
- C – Objective 5, page 11, needs to include better science. Also, Obj. 10 needs to include source of permanent funding.

Draft Recommendations for Update 2009

- The origin of the recommendations was in describing changes needed to reduce or eliminate constraints and impediments, or to harness opportunities, to help achieve the actions, objectives, goals, and vision.
- Implement related actions for achieving the goals and objectives of the Plan
- Provide Sustainable funding to achieve recommended goals
- Provide effective guidance to government leadership
- Are directed at decision-makers throughout California, the executive and legislative branches of State government, and/or DWR and other State agencies
- Clarify State, Federal, and Local roles
- Recommend adaptation and mitigation measures for Global Climate Change Impacts with emphasis on drought contingency planning
- Recommend the integration of various agencies policies for Land Use and Water Planning and Management.
- Improve aging water and flood infrastructure
- Ensure Env. Justice across all communities

- C – There needs to be a process recommended and implemented that addresses water quality and planning coordination with other strategic planning efforts for Rec 1 and 4.
- R – This needs to be addressed further if this wasn't readily apparent in the current text of these recommendations.
- C – Rec 6 needs consider that OPR consider a general plan water element.
- R – This would require legislative action so that OPR would be able to include a mandatory water element to be included in a General Plan.
- C – Many statements in recommendations seem weak and need to have stronger wording (Especially in regards to Federal government).
- R – This could be worked into Rec 6.
- C – Rec 4 needs more teeth. Need to spell out the roles and responsibilities here.

****Comments on Objectives and Recommendations are due on Tuesday Sept. 2****

AI – 4: Climate Change Science in Update 2009 by Mike Anderson

Handout – The State of Climate Change Science for California Water Resources Planning

Scope of the

- Observations
 - Paleoclimate
 - Future Projections
 - From Science to Planning
- Text of the current version is in draft status and should be considered a draft document subject to revision.
- Known holes in the current work are as follows:
- Water allocation
 - Water Quality
 - PIER program activities
 - Paleoclimate scope
 - Looking ahead

Comments and Feedback:

C – Section 5 is the focus of the paper, so the author needs to get there quickly. Also, can you walk the novice reader through the more complex areas by using more specific terms/descriptions in the document?

C – There needs to be a consistent State Climatology position that all agencies can refer to regarding climate scenarios. There appears to be a disconnect between the State agencies such as ARB, SWRCB, DWR, and CEC in that they all seem to have a different position regarding climate scenarios.

R – DWR will follow up on this to see how this disconnect can be addressed.

C – There is a need to tie what we are learning from science to the various planning efforts. There needs to be a statement regarding planning priorities and subsequent efforts for water resources.

Q – How much time will there be to tie in SWRCB’s Strategic Plan Update to DWR’s Update 2009 and the Climate Science document in particular?

R – There may be some opportunity, but for the Public Review draft, it is probably too late.

C – Consider moving Sec.6 from back of the paper to the front of the document. E.g., what are priorities, needs, and objectives? (Maybe short executive summary or a couple of paragraphs can accomplish this).

C – There needs to be a discussion of work that has been done with CALSIM and CALVAR.

C – Need a discussion of the fundamental question of why this document is important in its own right. (e.g., climate is essential for the production of food, fiber, etc.).

C – Need to include actions to address how this information could be applied to planning purposes or help OPR with their work.

C – There needs to be included within section 5 a discussion of how climate change will impact evapotranspiration and ag. Also regarding paleoclimate, current greenhouse gases could be different from greenhouse gases of the past atmospheres. Need to discuss the difference between the paleoclimatic record and present conditions and how these differences might result in different impacts from the past.

C – Document needs to discuss how paleoclimate matters to present climate conditions. Especially in regards to how current temperature increases compare with past changes.

Q – Are there economic studies that address climate science and that could be used for reference material here?

Q – Is this document the primary reference for CC in Update 2009?

R We are not sure where this document will be linked to Update 2009 at this time.’

C – A baseline needs to be included in order to be able to judge future changes.

C – There needs to be a discussion included regarding extreme events and a threshold for what is an extreme event.

C – How much effort that will be expended is dependent on probability and risk. A discussion of short term versus long term drought risk and how priorities and resources are developed and allocated should be included.

****Comments on the Climate Science Draft are due Friday September 12. Please send your comments to either Mike Anderson, John Andrew, or Tom Filler****

AI – 6: Integrated Analysis for Update 2009 by Rich Juricich

- Rich presented overview of integration process and Chapter 6 of Update 2009 using a PowerPoint presentation which can be found under Meeting Materials for August 28, 2008, on DPLA’s Water Plan website.
- Scenario Factors, Management Strategies, models and Outcomes will be used to evaluate the 3 different scenarios being considered when using the WEAP Model.

Q – What is time table for when WEAP model with become publicly available?

Q – What are the tributary areas that are being evaluated?

R – High level watershed areas.

Q – Will local watershed groups be able to use this and see the watershed(s) they are working on?

R – No, WEAP probably won’t help watershed groups at that level. Resolution in the model will not be that refined. We hope to possibly achieve that level of refinement overtime, but not now.

R – WEAP is not fully set up to integrate with all the watershed efforts at this time, but it is hoped it will be able to in the future.

Q – Will WEAP be looking at water quality?

R – The model is currently focused on the water supply side and not on water quality issues. DWR plans on addressing water quality issues with the WEAP in the future. The model will be looking at this in the long term, but not at the current time.

R – Level of detail – DWR is not proposing to look at a “site analysis” level of detail. This could be done with WEAP if someone could provide the effort to do this.

R – The scale currently being use for WEAP is at the hydrologic region scale for the majority of the hydrologic regions. However, for the Central Valley regions, WEAP uses the major watersheds for the scale of resolution.

Q – Is WEAP looking at ground water?

R – Yes, but only at a very high level of resolution.

AI – 7: Plan Potential CCTAG Presentation for the Water Plan Plenary Meeting by John Andrew

- Sometime during the morning of Friday, September 19, time would be allocated to provide an update of CCTAG efforts to the Water Plan Plenary.
- Is there anything beyond what has been suggested (Science, Planning, and Adaptation Response) to the CCTAG that the CCTAG would like to see presented to the Plenary?

Questions and Comments

Q – Would the CC White Paper Final Draft be available for the Plenary, and if so, would it be discussed at the Plenary?

C – You might want to discuss how CC fits into the Scenarios.

R – Rich Juricich will be covering the Scenarios at the Plenary.

AI – 8: CCTAG Debrief by John Andrew

Focus on the plus/delta review of the CCTAG process.

C – Bringing CCTAG members into the process earlier would have been helpful. The timing for involving the CCTAG limited input by members.

C – CCTAG could remain active through 2009 and begin planning process for next CWP update. This would allow for early input into the next Water Plan process.

C – It was positive that DWR looked outside the State’s borders for input (e.g., AZ and TX).

C – DWR did not engage the attention of most of the CCTAG members throughout the process. Is there some way to give a sense of urgency to the agendas? i.e., was there away to have members be more involved in formulating agenda topics? Also, it was thought that CCTAG would have had more input in helping with the development of the Climate Science Article and not have Mike Anderson do it all by himself.

C – DWR could have asked more of the CCTAG members asking them to provide their help. E.g., DWR could have ask more open ended questions CCTAG and also what the members saw as problems resulting from CC. It seemed that DWR limited the members

by providing too much info of their own and should have had the CCTAG members develop more themselves.

C – It would be helpful if DWR could jump start the process with the CCTAG in regards to the Objectives and Recommendations.

C – SWAN is ongoing group and is one way to get involved with long-term water planning efforts regarding technical work.

C – It is/was not always apparent as to what is needed or required from individuals, organizations, and groups, or what the outcomes are suppose to be from the efforts provided.

C – Meeting location and times are good and seem to work well for the group.

C – Reimbursement arrangements seem to be adequate.

AI – 9: Next Steps by John Andrew

- September 11, 2008 – Save the date for a meeting addressing State Adaptation Strategy and Climate Change Research as it relates to water, which is being presented by the Resources Agency.

Q – Regarding 2009 would quarterly CCTAG meetings work?

C – Yes set quarterly meetings for a target. Also, we would like to meet to discuss the Public Review Draft to see what has been addressed in it.

R – It sounds like we need to set up a CCTAG meeting in January sometime after the Public Review Draft has been released.

Q – Is there someway the CCTAG could see a copy of the Public Review Draft prior to its release? It might be helpful regarding review of technical issues that might still need to have work done.

R – CTAG will have the opportunity to see the Pre-Admin Draft prior to DWR's management reviewing.

C – Please make the Pre-Admin available with a message to the CCTAG to please review the climate items.

C – Resources Agency website regarding CC is climatechange.ca.gov/adaptation.