

**CWP Colorado River Regional Workshop Summary
El Centro, CA – April 29, 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 Colorado River hydrologic region was held on April 29, 2009 in El Centro, 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.

Paul Dabbs, Project Manager for Update 2009, 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, Mark Stuart, DWR, Southern District Chief, reviewed the key characteristics of the Colorado River 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: Chuck Keene, DWR, gave an overview of current efforts on drought activities as well as other Southern District programs.

**CWP Colorado River Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
El Centro, CA – April 29, 2009**

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

- Provide a footnote as to why water data is only provided through 2005. Explain challenge of bringing together data and generating numbers for each year.
- Type on page 16 – the footnote with asterisk (*) under region name.
- Point to the role of Colorado River water; mention Colorado River and Salton Sea in highlights. Include information of where it is stored.
- In margin on page 4, discussion for Colorado River should talk about Quantification Settlement Agreement.
- Emphasize water conservation in schools. (include in Urban WUE RMS)
- Point to statewide summary in Volume 3 (perhaps on page 16).
- Likes: foldout; and yellow boxes (clarify - do the yellow boxes point to info on CD?).
- Dislikes: for the yellow boxes, change the mouse icon to an icon of a laptop, computer, or CD); concern that too much data is trying to be presented in one graph.
- On inside front cover, identify whose Public Affairs Office (e.g. the DWR Public Affairs Office).
- On page 10a, explain the 2050 planning horizon. Why was this year selected? Point to where this is talked about.
- Reference where the planning process is described. Provide a short section about how this is an inclusive approach.
- On page 8, the section on “What More is Expected” should indicate that these are projects – rather than a stated fact. Use the words “may” or “might” rather than “will.”
- Provide more emphasis on agriculture and related business.
- On page 14, the RMS table needs to include some description of costs. Whether or not a RMS is desirable depends on the overall balance of costs (including 3rd party costs) and benefits. For example, increased Ag WUE → decreased runoff → increased concentrations of pollutants (relationship to TMDLs). This relates to Volume 1, Table 3-1 on page 3-15.
- Consider a “regional highlights” section – perhaps a table listing regions and significant issues.
- Include the regional relationships map in the highlights, showing regional imports and exports.
- On page 5, “Future Stresses” section – change from questions into statements, to identify current stresses (not have open-ended questions that ask people to speculate what the stresses are). Change the item on earthquake to disaster (more than earthquakes).
- On page 10b, for the Mission, include a list of opportunities (or point to where they are discussed). For instance, the initiatives and actions on page 10 are opportunities. Coordinate with previous text to show how these opportunities help address challenges.
- Page 4, Flood Risk Management, give some facts and examples of why this is an issue.
- Need to mention groundwater overdraft in highlights.
- The funding dilemma should be put into context – the recommendation is for \$5 billion, but the Salton Sea alternative is for \$8.9 billion.
- Explain that “water supplies” are developed water supplies – those that were used to meet demand.
- Don’t put in graphs for regional scenarios – these are not ready and “garbage in” will result in “garbage out”, say they are being developed for the regions; putting out results that don’t look right for the region will result in a loss of confidence in the report.
- In highlights, say that “current trends” uses the base period of 1970 -2000.
- Glossary needs to be up front, definitions provided for highlights readers (e.g. municipal use – includes all residential use, not just cities).

**CWP Colorado River Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
El Centro, CA – April 29, 2009**

Discussion B – Regional Report

- Bring in regional representatives when document is being edited down for size – important discussions are being lost while less important information remains.
- Graphics – look at the BOR report (Jenkins) as a model for water balances
- Where doable, all tables should show data sources.
- No text for section on “Relationships With Other Regions”
- Table 11-8 only lists IRWMs, need another table for other planning efforts; also, what’s the value of this table? (needs to tie to text, isn’t anchored).
- Heading structure does not match Table of Contents; pages don’t match up
- Flood risk: ties into wildfires, which destabilize slopes, which leads to mudflows.
- Salton Sea has wildlife refuges (DGF and USFWS)
- Clean Water Act – Imperial Irrigation District track about 4,500 rural water users where supply must be provided
- Funding needed to address pollution (including air pollution) from Mexico
- Water governance (page 15)
 - the table on the Law of the River is disjointed; take it out and replace with text, focusing less on historical timeline and talking more about the 4.4 MAF Colorado River water deliverable
 - the report mentions 3 major agencies (IID, CVWD, and Mission Springs) in numerous places, but generally not all in the same place
- Water quality (page 14):
 - have to sort through challenges and accomplishments sections to get the whole picture on water quality (e.g. PGE and Topoq chromium 6), the discussion should all be in one place
 - update reference on Coachella Valley TMDL
 - need to include NPDES permits
 - describe current salinity levels
- Discussion on groundwater relates more to the northern section of the hydrologic region and that should be pointed out.
- Text on Tribes (pages 5-6, 8) should be verified, condensed.
- Page 7, paragraph 2, sentence 5: alfalfa is an important export
- Accomplishments – recognize successful urban water management plan that are being implemented.

Discussion C – Scenarios

- Likes: Scenarios are valuable, huge improvement over where work left off in 2005.
- Needs a case study (IEUD) of how and where model was used, what the results were. This would be helpful to show how the modeling and scenarios could be applied as a planning tool. Would help show what costs and tradeoffs might be regarding demand projections. In this region, local agencies do their own demand forecasting.
- Don’t put graphs for regional scenarios into highlights – these are not ready and “garbage in” will result in “garbage out”, say they are being developed for the regions; putting out results that don’t look right for the region will result in a loss of confidence in the report.
- Having one set of conditions applied across all hydrologic regions leads to results that seem improbable. Assumptions should be region specific for each scenario.
- Would be better to show smaller-scale modeling results for the Sacramento and San Joaquin regions.
- How does acreage go up?

**CWP Colorado River Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
El Centro, CA – April 29, 2009**

Attendance

Megan Bakker, Imperial Valley Press
James Brownyard, Building Industry Assn., Desert Chapter
Bil Burns, WUESD
Dan Collins, AMEC
Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
Robert Edwards, City of Indio
Angie Haven, Imperial County Planning and Development Services
Cliff Hurley, public
Denise Landstedt, San Diego County Water Agency
Candace Nelson, Imperial County Farm Bureau
Robert Righetti, ERSC, Inc.
Jerry Rolwing, Borrego Water District
James Walker, JCSD Farms

Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Charles Keen, DWR, Southern District
Barbara Cross, DWR, Tribal Liaison
Vern Knoop, DWR, Southern District
Dave Scruggs, DWR, Southern District
Abi Aderonu, DWR, Southern District
Brian Moniz, DWR, Southern District
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS