

**CWP North Lahontan Regional Workshop Summary
Susanville, CA – May 15, 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 Lahontan hydrologic region was held on May 15, 2009 in Susanville, 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 Lahontan 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 and Linda Hansen spoke about the Sierra Nevada Conservancy’s programs.

**CWP North Lahonta Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Susanville, CA – May 15, 2009**

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

- good to have the environment as a co-equal objective with supply
- one challenge is that water management is by entities whose responsibilities are blurred across hydrologic and jurisdictional boundaries
- provide a summary of the things that are occurring (transfers, cloud-seeding, etc.)
 - the bigger topic is what are the effects from the movement of water (transfers, cloud-seeding, etc.)
 - there is also movement across borders (Arizona, Oregon, Nevada, Mexico)
- pages 4-5: problems with supply + increase in demand = water crisis
- discussions on supply and demand need co-equal treatment (discussion is overweighted towards supply)
- page 6, water balances: can you provide a quick summary of how data was pulled together and what assumptions were made? (point to where that is described)
- pages 10-11: while the Delta is unique and important for water supply, so are other areas of California – particularly the Sierra Nevada, which provides about 60% of California's water supply. Maintaining healthy ecosystems in the Sierra is just as important to California water as the Delta. Sierra ecosystems provide other benefits such as flood control and carbon sequestration
- picture of Sierra Nevada needed on cover and on page 7
- page 14: include a relative cost-comparison of resource management strategies
- page 14: watershed management strategy can result in way more potential strategy benefits than 3
- expand the Mountain Counties region to include the Tahoe and Sierra Nevada Conservancy areas → rename to Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountain Counties (it makes NO sense to exclude these areas)
- page 19, recommendations:
 - there needs to be a disclaimer that recommendations are not ranked in priority order (such as the one at the bottom of page 10-c)
 - will recommendations be ranked? be clear
 - could impact funding and local decisions about project
 - recommendation #3 says water supply and water quality are equal goals, but this is not really reflected in the highlights document
- development is approved based on “paper” water; CEQA and the sub-division map act are beginning to change
- emphasize the complexity of supply/demand connection and the relationships with resource management strategies
- the connections that water has with local use and planning is misunderstood; it is good to call out.
- Onsite Water System (AB 835)
- get rid of the fold out – the content is too easy to miss or ignore, it's hard to photocopy, and lost in the electronic version

Discussion B – Regional Report (Issues)

- include cloud-seeding activities by PGE
- what is the status of monitoring regarding Fish Springs Ranch?
- for outreach, contact:
 - weekly newspapers (Tahoe Sun, Modoc Record, Lassen County Times)
 - farm bureaus and ag commissioners
 - CSAC and lists of planning departments

CWP North Lahonta Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Susanville, CA – May 15, 2009

- levees and FEMA flood map (FIRM) updates and provisionally accredited levees
 - Corps of Engineers looking at Truckee levee
- Water Board prohibitions on waste discharges in 100-year floodplain (Tahoe Basin and Truckee River floodplains)
- challenge: invasive species
 - quagga and recreation implications
 - white-top is spread through water bodies; important to keep out for agriculture
- juniper is a native species that is expanding beyond its historic territory
 - coordination with Forest Service on controlling juniper
 - Sierra Nevada Conservancy has been involved in reducing juniper

Discussion B: Regional Reports (Management, Planning)

- Lassen Groundwater Plan
 - Modoc becoming engaged
 - data collection
 - need flexibility in system to adapt
- groundwater management and need for joint monitoring
- 7 dams in Truckee River watershed
 - Boca (BOR), Stampede (BOR), Martis (ACE) – federal oversight
 - current evaluations could include raising the dams
 - what requirement for coordination with State – any?

Discussion C – Scenarios

- either provide baseline numbers, or show increases as percentages of base (now way to get a sense of the scale for change in water demand)
- need to check projected ag water demand
- spell out what the assumptions are, and where the assumptions can be found
- the kind of information presented here is what citizens are looking for at the community level
- what will happen with these results? used to justify transfers?
- requirement from recycled water policy – salt and nutrient management required for every groundwater basin and the State.

Other Comments

- it is GREAT to have the CD-ROM attached – inside the highlights and not separate
- internet tools and resources are important for helping smaller entities stay engaged – please do not delete these as a cost-saving measure during budget cutbacks
- how are water quality standards affected by Water Plan? (response: these are the responsibility of the Water Boards)
- how could other surrounding jurisdictions (Oregon, Nevada, Mexico, Arizona) provide input into CWP?
- is there a point that says there is a limit as to how many people and industries the water can support? is there a way to set that limit?
 - can you flag that certain areas are getting close to constraints; then point to here are things that can be done to reduce/ease constraints?

**CWP North Lahonta Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Susanville, CA – May 15, 2009**

Attendance

Noelle Haller-Riggs, Century 21-Cottage Realty
Linda Hansen, Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Kim Hunter, Modoc County Planning
Dan Macksay, Modoc County Board of Supervisors
Tom Rinne, T-TSA
Mark Steffek, Northern California-Nevada RC&D
Todd Swickard, Five Dot Ranch
Lisa Wallace, Truckee River Watershed Coalition
Cindy Wise, North Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Tito Cervantes, DWR, Northern District, Chief, Land and Water Use Section
Michael Serna, DWR, Northern District
Dan McManus, DWR, Northern District
Mark Rivera, DWR, Northern District
Todd Hillaire, DWR, Northern District
John Headlee, DWR, Northern District
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS