

**CWP Bay Area Regional Workshop Summary
Fairfield, CA – April 20, 2009**

OVERVIEW

The 2009 Regional Workshops for the California Water Plan featured the Public Review Draft of the Highlights document, as well as an overview of current conditions for the respective hydrologic region or area of special interest. Each workshop also included a presentation on the scenario planning approach used to consider future uncertainty for water management. In the agenda, several hours were dedicated to small group review and comment of the draft Highlights and Regional Report for that region or area. Based on suggestions made during the 2007 and 2008 workshops, time was also provided for updates on related planning processes.

A workshop for the San Francisco Bay hydrologic region was held on April 20, 2009 in Fairfield, CA. Copies of the workshop presentations, handouts, and materials are available on the Water Plan website at www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials. A brief recap of the presentations is provided in the following paragraphs and the remainder of this document provides a summary of the small group discussions. Flip charts and worksheets were used to record ideas generated during the discussions and transcripts of the recorded results are incorporated into the summary.

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Chief of Department of Planning and Local Assistance, made the first presentation and outlined the planning process and status of major 2009 Update activities, culminating in the release of the Public Review Draft. Paul described the sections of the Highlights booklet, which serves as an Executive Summary for Update 2009. The Highlights begins with a description of existing water conditions in California that require urgent attention and response. The following pages outline the range and variation in water resources throughout the State.

The Highlights also discusses Climate Change and the existing framework for Integrated Water Management, which links to the Resource Management Strategies outlined in Volume Two and Regional Management Strategies provided in Volume 3. Other features of the Highlights include a discussion on scenarios and a fold-out section describing the Strategic Plan for Update 2009, including key objectives. The concluding recommendations represent “policies, strategies, and approaches that will help reduce and remove impediments, and leverage resources and opportunities” to implement Water Plans goals, objectives, and related actions.

In the second presentation, Karl Winkler, DWR, Central District Chief, reviewed the key characteristics of the San Francisco Bay hydrologic region. The overview included items contained in the Regional Report, with special focus on local and regional issues, and management and planning activities. Paul Dabbs presented a third focus on the scenario approach being developed for future water planning. Work is currently underway to quantify potential water demands, with a subsequent phase to evaluate water resource management strategies.

Workshop attendees reviewed, discussed, and provided suggestions for each section, as recorded on the following pages. The agenda ended with several updates on related statewide water and planning initiatives: Pierre Stephens, DWR, Regional Lead for the Central District, gave updates on upcoming meetings related to water management as well as an overview of current drought conditions and activities.

**CWP Bay Area Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Fairfield, CA – April 20, 2009**

Discussion A – Public Review Draft: Highlights and Table of Contents

- The conclusions and recommendations need to tie back to vision
- How are water decisions made?
 - Need to describe governance: state role, local districts and jurisdictions
 - Highlight watershed approach with IRWMP (includes flood management)
- What are the specific, “concrete” actions for DWR? (relates to governance)
 - Add private actions
 - Link to chapter 2 and 7; good to provide incentives through bonds
- Bring the concept of regional self-sufficiency into Highlights
- Add links to website (url addresses)
- Page 16: map is too small – make it larger and wrap text to fit around it
- Concern: conservation devices at point of sale
 - Complicates sales and involves incredible costs elements
 - Work with local agencies and real estate interests to look at options
 - Not as efficient as phasing in requirements for all residences (e.g. how effective is this approach in areas of low turn-over?)
 - Make conservation a part of community response (IRWM perhaps?)
- Reference specific existing conservation standards
- 20x2020 baseline: look at fairness regarding business impacts
- How does Update 2009 show public/private efforts?
- Need to discuss water “wasters” – this is the elephant in the room (bring into the topics of water use efficiency and drought response)
- Think outside the box – infrastructure improvements should reduce water use and wastewater concerns (improvements and upgrades, instead of just repair or replace)
- Provide source for data that supports level of increase for sea-level rise
- Need more information about where water comes from generally (State Water Project, groundwater, local sources)
- Note sources of the 13 objectives (e.g. Kamyar’s presentation described connections to other State Companion Plans)
- Page 10c - 10d: numbering will be thought of as priorities, regardless of footnote; use bullets (or letters or Roman numerals) to remove sense of priorities
- Address debate between growth and water supply
- Provide historical linkage between population and water need
 - illustrate 1910, 1950 growth periods (with a graph)
 - show link to aging infrastructure
- Court decisions regarding species protection
- “Likes”
 - Easy to read
 - Like links to other sections
 - Graphics are helpful
 - This is valuable as an educational tool (rather than as an outline of required actions)
- Volume 1, Chapter 2: Describe climate change in terms of regional concerns
- Volume 2:
 - The strategies are helpful – need to be updated regularly (more than every 5 years)
 - Good to suggest Best Management Practices (by sector and region) as a checklist
 - Especially important to not mandate a one-size approach, since components of the Water Plan may show up as future requirements.
 - Look at experimental approaches and concepts for underwater desal

**CWP Bay Area Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Fairfield, CA – April 20, 2009**

Discussion B – Regional Report

- Make regional reports “wikepedias” with links to other information
- Presentation of information is excellent
- Implementation: there is an assumption of conformance to State laws. Where might that fit in? E.g. the connection between CEQA and implementation at the local level (perhaps in statewide summary) The Bay-Delta Conservation Plan is an EIR and ties into that.
- Regional water supply assessments should roll up to State overview.
- IRWMs are developing projects – might need to highlight regulations for water supply assessment.
- What qualifies as “good” water quality? Doesn’t mention North Bay Aqueduct, which is lower quality water. Be specific about water quality from different sources.
- Power Point slide describes various regional, large-scale projects – don’t see state-level IRWMP efforts and how they relate to region.
- Performance metrics: Evaluate regional efforts in terms of statewide planning principles (such as self-sufficiency)
- Provide a glossary and check for consistent use of terms and key themes (e.g. water management and conjunctive use)
- The major of use if urban – what would the effect of more recycled water have in terms of meeting demand?
- Aging infrastructure is a key issue – some dates back to the early 1900s.
- The biggest issue for the region is imported water supply. There is a public perception problem – people don’t see themselves as dependent on others for water (as is the case in Southern California). People don’t understand the fragmented imported water system (in- and through-Delta), which makes it harder to define. Watersheds are disconnected from water supply. Discuss the relationship between the Mokelumne and San Francisco.
- Discuss the North Bay Aqueduct and the implications for a healthy Delta.
- Flood discussion:
 - Levees are meeting 100-year event protection, the challenge is growing development and remapping. Provide information on encroachment into floodplains. Long-term planning for flood areas needs to be revisited, including removing or relocating development in floodplains.
 - BDCP is mapping out areas of sea-level rise.
 - Would like floodplain protection all along the river, to mitigate floods.
 - Discuss options for offstream storage of flood waters, such as the role of agriculture and floodplain management in the Yolo Bypass – there are agreements on when and how often areas are inundated. Flood easements should not have to prohibit agricultural uses. Integrated flood management and integrated water management need to find mutually beneficial venues.
 - Flood is not a major issue in the Sonoma Creek watershed.
 - Highlight flood issues in Napa.
- IRWMP discussion:
 - Be explicit about what this text represents (the Prop 50 process)
 - Put in information about IRWM proposals, even if not approved at this time
 - Napa/Solano/Tomales Bay working on unified IRWMP
 - Look at areas where IRWMPs have shared-strategy
 - The table on page 3-17 is more about history than fact, provide examples to support the check marks in categories. Provide links to reports.
 - Project implementation: CEQA review should ask questions that make data more meaningful. It is a thinking tool that encourages future actions or policies.
 - IRWMPs should be evaluated in terms of supporting CWP guiding principles

**CWP Bay Area Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Fairfield, CA – April 20, 2009**

- Water Quality discussion:
 - Include PCBs and trash
 - Provide some language on the municipal stormwater permit – a prescriptive process that identifies what’s expected for monitoring, low-impact development, and stormwater retention.

Discussion C – Scenarios

- Change titles to: Low, Medium, and High Water Demand Projections; put Current Trends in the middle. What are the economic assumptions associated with each of these scenarios? To the extent possible, provide an economic description for the scenarios.
- Inland Empire Utility District conducted a cost-analysis of management responses.
- Do scenarios provide risk analysis? (not yet – local agencies would conduct their own risk analyses; the Water Plan provides some tools to do that)
- Planning area approach will be helpful for sub-regional partnerships
- How do planning areas and detailed analysis units relate to watersheds?

Attendance

Kathy Barnes-Jones, Solano County
Melissa Bastian, North Bay Association of Realtors
Nick Burton, Solano County Dept. of Resource Management
Deborah Elliott, Napa County
Catherine Flowers, Kaiser National Facilities Services
Andy Florendo, Solano County Water Agency
Marcell Hall, Easy Bay Municipal Water District
Larry Heine, Lake County Association of Realtors
Dale Hopkins (DWR)
Misty Kaltreider, Solano County Dept. of Resource Management
Brad Ledesma, Zone 7 Water Agency
David Lucido, Lake County
Bielle Moore, Contra Costa Association of Realtors
Carl Morrison, Morrison and Associates
Lauren Parker, Air Force Western Regional Environmental Office
Chris Reeves, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Tito Sasaki, North Bay Agriculture Alliance and Sonoma County Farm Bureau
Edward Segal, Marin Association of Realtors
Joseph Rizzi, Natural Desalination
Jim Tischer, California Water Institute
Cynthia Wood, North Bay Association of Realtors
Stan Williams, Poseidon

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Chief, Department of Planning and Local Assistance
Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Karl Winkler, DWR, Chief, Central District
Marilee Talley, DWR, Publications Team
Pierre Stephens, DWR, Central District
Shicha Chander, DWR, Central District
Barbara Cross, DWR, Tribal Liaison
Alan Aguilar, DWR, Central District

**CWP Bay Area Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Fairfield, CA – April 20, 2009**

Jim Coe, DWR, Floodplain Assistance Section
Christy Spector, DWR, IRWM
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, DPLA
Lew Moeller, DWR, DPLA
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS