

CWP North Coast Regional Workshop Summary Yreka, CA – May 28, 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 North Coast hydrologic region was held on May 28, 2009 in Yreka, 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, Tito Cervantes, DWR Northern District, Chief of the Land and Water Use Section, reviewed the key characteristics of the North Coast 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.

**CWP North Coast Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Yreka, CA – May 28, 2009**

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

- water portfolios
 - agricultural use and reuse for other water resources
 - “reuse” category for water supplies and impacts on downstream users needs a thorough discussion
 - water data needs to be verified at the local level
 - year type describes State condition, not regional water conditions
- FUNDING is a huge issue – explain the impacts at the local level
 - explain the impacts at the local level
 - IRWM contractors are not getting paid → RCDs are getting sued and don’t have the funds to pay → impacts contractors’ ability to be bonded → contractor may not be able to provide services on another project
 - some jurisdictions spending general funds to pay contractors
 - need incremental payments, advance payments and/or payments of retention
 - California Watershed Network website has some information on this
 - look at California contract code (v. individual agencies) – as RCD projects get larger, it’s impossible financially to maintain and operate projects
 - there are no overarching water districts – RCDs, municipalities, and NGOs work with private landowners on water management and issues
 - process is still skewed to big players (e.g. RFPs – cost \$4,000 to fill out application for grant)
 - worth noting that available funding is disappearing
 - disproportionate impact on small, disadvantaged communities who don’t have the capacity to offset loss
 - court order to address TMDLs now includes inventory of sediment and runoff from county roads – this is cost prohibitive
 - would be nice to see economic profiles (point to information)
 - the poorest of the poor should have access to funding
 - in unincorporated areas of the county, census tract counts do not provide data to support request for disadvantaged community grants
 - geographic footprint involved segments of 6 different census tracts; need to conduct a “Median Household Income” study (which costs about \$65,000) to prove we’re poor)
 - technical expertise is not available to support studies and assessments
- water management:
 - relationship to water issues in other states
 - coordination with Federal agencies
- need reliable supplies for agriculture
- objective #13, equitable benefits
 - include compensation to area of origin
 - could also apply to relative economics of water resource management strategies
- do energy values include residential use (wells)? (response: no)
- water and wastewater are considered separately, often not looked at together – are there technical proposals to address that?
 - it’s a more complex picture than either aspect alone
 - regulatory system and grant programs set criteria up without linking the two aspects; there is a disconnect

**CWP North Coast Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Yreka, CA – May 28, 2009**

- climate change: the greatest impact in California is on water
 - the greatest impact in California is on water
 - biggest impact is increasing ocean acidity – 2006, Nature Geoscience. Andrew Moy and William Howard (project leader for the ocean acidification team at the Antarctic Climate and Ecosystems Collaborative Research Centre)
 - consider paleo-climate
 - altering the climate is less expensive than adapting to it
- conduct/follow up on the study regarding California food security
- objectives should be tied to goals
 - agriculture gets lost
 - if objectives and actions were listed under foals, some of the disconnects would be clearer
- page 19, recommendations:
 - #12: financial realities often punish good work (e.g. water use efficiency results in less water being used, reducing income for water districts, rates get raised)
 - add new: revise/update/eliminate outdated or conflicting codes and laws (these prevent new approaches)
 - e.g. drinking water and wastewater are overseen by two different agencies; submitted an application with assistance from Self-Help – but it was for the wrong agency
- groundwater
 - supply management overseen by counties (or adjudicated)
 - water quality is overseen by Water Boards

Other Comments

- resource management strategies
 - agricultural water use efficiency: what are the consequences for other water uses and users?
 - look at source of use, impacts on supply
 - managing fire risks – where does that fit in?
- land use planning
 - there is encroachment by watershed councils on local jurisdictions regarding land use; their projects need local review
 - Oregon statute requires watershed councils to involve local jurisdictions
 - watershed “plans” need to be considered by/consistent with local planning efforts
 - there is no definition for who is considered a watershed council
- water resource management would be improve if other areas used a water master service
- who is responsible for authority for flood management/protection and drainage?
 - there is a development, in an unincorporated area, that is 40 years old and at 30% build out – the developer is gone; homeowners association now has responsibility for drainage for 1,800 acres of residential property
 - North Coast Water Board says natural drainage channels can't be used due to TMDLs
 - there is no room for an area to treat stormwater runoff
- Scott Valley groundwater basin is the only place in the Water Code where surface water and groundwater are defined as interconnected (it was a requirement for adjudication); should be defined as interconnected in all areas of the State where appropriate

**CWP North Coast Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Yreka, CA – May 28, 2009**

Discussion B – Regional Report (Issues)

- water portfolio data
 - year type describes State condition, not regional water conditions (year-type should indicate what the overall year type was for the State and then what the conditions were for that region – often not the same)
- groundwater description
 - Scotts Valley groundwater is not in overdraft; it recharges in a typical year (context and presentation need to be reworked)
 - DWR does not have complete well drilling or abandonment data
 - people are putting in wells now – fear they may not be able to in the future
 - potential regulatory requirements for future wells – TMDLs, ESA, WQA, State Drinking Water Act
 - requirements for instream flows
- looking at sufficiency of water supplies
 - water elements in General Plans (Humboldt County)
 - rural development is not associated with domestic water supply (very localized planning, doesn't look at overall groundwater basin)
 - unknown wells, illegal diversions
 - consider rainwater catchment, recycled water
 - look at population v. households (households a better indicator for landscaping water)
- water quality
 - the entire area is listed for TMDLs, except one water body
 - court order requires all to be addressed – cost of inventorying County roads is out of sight
 - State and federal drinking water standards
- environmental water issues
 - ESA and State legislation
 - high lakes and check dams affected by Wilderness Act
- flood management
 - during 2007 floods, dams on the Klamath held floodwaters for one day – allowing time to evacuate
 - if dams are removed, will need tools to increase warning time

Discussion B: Regional Reports (Management, Planning)

- juniper removal – UC Extension
- Scott River Water Trust is the first water trust in California
 - local program working with local sellers to provide instream flows (www.scottwatertrust.org)
- Humboldt County has water element in its General Plan update
- 12 communities identified by county are receiving a Community Development Block Grant to improve wastewater systems identified by the county department of public health as deficient

Discussion C – Scenarios

- “It's all in crisis at one time.”
- compare past projections with realized conditions
- factor in vegetation conversions caused by wildfires – changes forest composition as well as runoff

**CWP North Coast Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Yreka, CA – May 28, 2009**

- are ag demand projections based on similar or changing crop patterns?
 - perennial crops: alfalfa 5-7 (AF?) and pasture
 - the results don't look right
- model projections are often used to drive policy and requirements, which don't address local conditions
 - readers should be encouraged to use results to promote regional self-sufficiency, to be led at the regional level (rather than using results to create statewide policies that may not fit or be appropriate)
 - K-SIAM model being used in Oregon and California to look at minimum instream flows; being used to support political objectives
- statewide aggregate numbers cover up shortcomings
 - what does statewide aggregate tell you? water from one region to another is not interchangeable
 - regional projections provide useful information – data elements that provide a diagram for policies/action
- data sets:
 - need to characterize quality/validity of assumptions and results
 - be clear about potential shortcomings of data set
 - describe efforts to improve for next update

Attendance

Marcia Armstrong, Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors
Ric Costales, Siskiyou County
Rob Cozens, Resighini Rancheria EPA
Lee England, LSPOA
Don Flickinger, National Marine Fisheries Service Yreka
Rene Henery, The River Exchange
Adriane Garayalde, Shast Valley RCD
Jen Jenkins, County of Humboldt – North Coast IRWMP
Don Meamber, Shasta Valley RCD
Steve Niell, City of Yreka Public Works
Jim Patterson, Natural Resources Conservation Service Yreka
Mark Pisano, Dept. of Fish and Game
Sari Sommarstrom, Consultant
David Webb, Shasta Valley RCD
Tom Wetter, Lake Shastina Community Services District

Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Tito Cervantes, DWR, Northern District, Chief, Land and Water Use Section
Barbara Cross, DWR, Tribal Liaison
Dona Calder, DWR, Northern District
Mark Rivera, DWR, Northern District
Bill Mendenhall, DWR, Northern District, Chief, Water Management Branch
Pat Parsons, DWR, Northern District
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS