

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop Summary
Visalia, CA – May 8, 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 Tulare Basin hydrologic region was held on May 8, 2009 in Visalia, 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, Brian Smith, with the San Joaquin District for the Department of Water Resources, reviewed the key characteristics of the Tulare Basin 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 Tricia Wathen with the California Department of Public Health described the department’s Drinking Water Program.

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Visalia, CA – May 8, 2009**

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

- In the imperative to act section, Highlights document should include that not everyone has safe drinking water (people are not aware that there are communities without safe water supplies)
- ☆☆☆ Recommendations should call out provision of safe drinking water for everybody
- add a recommendation and objective for provision of safe drinking water to everyone in the State
- Recommendations:
 - seem like principles
 - need both short-term and long-term recommendations with:
 - measurable benchmarks
 - description of who/which jurisdiction is responsible
 - how to coordinate
 - timeframe
 - e.g., Rec. #8: define “state” and “local” (where can that be identified) – Delta Vision provides some examples of more specific guidance
 - build on authorities that are known
 - the resource issue of finance should not constrain identification of desired timelines, specific entities
 - water issues are extremely complex regarding roles, responsibilities, and authorities → it’s not clear who should lead/act (need to spell out)
- Implementation:
 - implementation for recommendations not included in Chapter 7 of Volume 1, “Implementation Plan”
 - look at authority for implementing
 - what’s the purpose of the Water Plan regarding specific actions (e.g. are there actions that specific State agencies should under-take?)
 - IRWMs as overseeing entities (e.g. IRWMs well-suited to implementing a particular item)
 - it’s easier for state agencies to implement actions suggested by the Water Plan; that they support actions for their particular agency
- Coordination:
 - here’s what coordination should look like (see table, next page)
- provide more about options and investment in the hydrologic headwaters
- IRWMs need to be specifically mentioned and discussed; will be part of our solutions
- the overview is OK, data is good – is there enough detail for decision-making?
- this is an inventory, not a plan
- short on recommendations and quantifiable objectives
- need quantifiable objectives, while remaining at strategic level (evaluate Chapter 7 for whether or not there are quantifiable actions, objectives)
- Recommendations: what are the Water Plan actions? need more detail
 - high-level nature of recommendations doesn’t indicate need for action, or what’s next
 - recommendations need to include short-term timeline, as well as long-term issues
 - describe recommended steps and projects
 - identify actionable items for the next 5 years
 - include legislation recommendations:
 - building codes
 - water reuse program (gray water)

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Visalia, CA – May 8, 2009**

Proposal for identifying **coordination** on recommendations

*responsibilities and authorities may vary by region

*Responsibility	Legislation	Funding	Federal	Tribal	State	Regional	Local	NGOs
Action			FERC NMFS US ACE USBR USDA etc.	Tribes Non-profit BIA etc.	DWR Water Bds CalEMA DFG etc.	IRWMs RCDs JPAs MOUs etc.	Counties Cities public-private partnerships etc.	Watershed groups Self-help interest grps etc.
WUE								
Flood								
Groundwater								
etc.								

- RACI chart showing which agency leads, assists, coordinates; as well as local coordination
- use code or symbol to differentiate between lead, assisting, and coordinating responsibilities

- needs adequate specificity, so that agency can develop budget
- providing focused targets will support justifications for budgets

- develop budget priorities in accordance with Water Plan
- build those priorities into bonds and legislation (Federal and State)

- report on benchmarks (e.g. public report on expenditures, projects, programs, policy)

- mandates are powerful – if not mandates, then very strong recommendations and specificity
- mandates need to be tied to funding mechanism – that needs to be sorted out

- there needs to be a clearinghouse for projects and information

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Visalia, CA – May 8, 2009**

Discussion A (cont'd) – Public Review Draft: Highlights and Table of Contents

- add an introduction that lays out clearly the goals of the Update, and that specific actions are meant to be taken a policy recommendations for the identified lead agencies – so they can craft their budgets and strategic plans accordingly
- make the Water Plan as concrete, intentional and action-oriented as possible
- a sustainable Delta needs to include agriculture in the Delta – definition of sustainability needs to adhere to definitions in Delta Vision
- implement environmental justice recommendations in the plan, rather than deferring them to the next one
- in objectives, actions, and recommendations: some of the “shoulds” need to be changed to “musts”; one “must” is more monitoring and hydrologic capacity studies
 - there is a need for a public database by watershed
- data collection, management, and availability:
 - data collection is necessary
 - objective #10: add more and specific data collection and monitoring (watershed specific hydrologic studies) – show ranges over broad cycles
 - provide links/information for possible funding and assistance sources (Federal, State, other)
- like the yellow boxes – a means to obtain additional information
- streamline environmental permitting/mitigation process to expedite water development process; requires inter-agency cooperation.

Discussion B – Regional Report (Issues)

- need to distinguish and define “recycling” and “reuse”
- need to distinguish and define “total water supply” and “developed water supply”
- use cross-hatch to show difference in applied v. consumptive uses
- would be good to see which supplies go to which uses:
 - SWP is a supply for urban and agricultural uses
 - CVP – agricultural uses
 - groundwater (increasing demand for, and dependence on, groundwater)
 - surface water
- water quality section
 - says that primary source of salt is imported – need to identify additional salt loads
 - page 8-13: Central Valley Salts organization can provide info
 - page 8-14: discuss CAPO
 - non-point sources: houseboat and vessel wastes; on-site sewage treatment
- key issues/challenges:
 - providing potable drinking water – Alpaugh (Community Drinking Water Center and DPH have info)
 - drinking water supplies and wastewater treatment for disadvantaged communities
 - invasive species (quagga, arrondo); boating recreation at Lake Kaweah
- Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners are working on securing supply
- how well is San Joaquin River restoration tracked?

Discussion B: Regional Reports (Management, Planning)

- the Forest Service and Park Service manage the bulk of lands in the upper watershed, need to find the right approach for involvement (senior staff involvement?) – also for USFWS and BLM
- is Kern County EWA a state program? (delete this item – won't be continued)
- include San Joaquin Valley IRWM Framework

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Visalia, CA – May 8, 2009**

- there are 14 projects for conjunctive use/water supply
- Poso Creek – ecosystem
- chart on page 8-22 should relate to the 27 RMS; show efforts to address water needs of disadvantaged communities
- Tulare Basin-wide JPA
- Self-Help can provide info on accomplishments for new sewage treatment
- look at alternative energy-water nexus, digesters (Mike Hightower, with Sandia Labs)
- groundwater:
 - Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program will have to address groundwater quality
 - discuss approach to groundwater management
 - partnerships on groundwater data monitoring and reporting program
- Sarge can provide maps and info for Southern Sierra, Tule, Kern (IRWMs?)
- Kings County BOS can provide information

Discussion C – Scenarios

- what are the economic drivers for population growth? is it land use?
- Steinberg has introduced SB 575 regarding local planning housing element (passed in the Senate on June 3)
- the Blueprint scenario title needs to be changed – perhaps managed growth
- environmental water:
 - the water conservation/supply report – which high resource riparian corridors should get additional supplies
 - where might supplies come from for conservation (restoration) plans?
- sawtooth pattern for permanent → annual crops
- evapotranspiration zone: ag moving from zone 12 to 16 due to urbanization – what is the change in water demand?
- Richard Howitt did a report on economic impacts of crop changes
- the value of these scenario efforts is not in providing a crystal ball, but as good heuristics; show functional relationships among factors
- what are the individual variables/drivers? how much difference does one factor make?
- glad there is consideration of climate change impacts
- need to add consideration of the economic demographics of each scenario (how do we know if people are better off? are poor people any more likely to get safe drinking water under each scenario?)
- need to prioritize safe drinking water for all and environmental health
- why aren't we considering water quality and protection of water quality in scenarios? could have significant impact on both water supply and demand (reduced quality means less supply and increased demand for higher quality water)
- how are scenarios tied to the objectives and actions in the other parts of Update 2009? need to demonstrate who the actions that are recommended will get us to a particular scenario and why what would be preferable

Other Comments

- add a “Drinking Water” section to each regional report
- per capita water consumption
 - what do you want this metric to do for you (is it for residential consumption?)
 - decision-makers need metric to understand where they are – perhaps multiple metrics are needed to provide separate breakouts for residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural consumption
- stormwater/flood control – multiple use recharge basins (e.g. parks) that redirect stormwater away from houses

**CWP Tulare Basin Regional Workshop – Flip Chart Transcripts
Visalia, CA – May 8, 2009**

- Volume 1, IRWMs
 - IRWM planning needs a stronger definition and elaborated criteria that reflect the goals of the Water Plan – should include drinking water and disadvantaged community needs; evaluate whether they are addressing these needs
 - need for IRWM efforts to include water quality monitoring and water use measurement, including projects to install meters – especially for small water systems
 - include Best Management Practices – what kinds of projects they should have – especially multiple use projects; projects that provide regional solutions to multiple needs; projects that match source to need (e.g. swap surface water for groundwater, use lower quality water for irrigation and higher quality water for drinking)
 - more regional treatment plants

Attendance

Julie Allen, South Sierra IRWMP; Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Lauren Bauer, Kern County Water Agency
Pam Buford, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Carole Clumb, Tulare County Citizens for Responsible Growth
Carole Combs, Tulare Basin Wildlife Partners
Lloyd Fryer, Kern County Water Agency
Nick Gatti, Kern County Water Agency
Andy Gordus, Ca. Dept. of Fish and Game
Steve Haze, Upper San Joaquin River Watershed Program
Rick Hoelzel, Kings River Conservation District
Ronald Jacobsma, Friar Water Authority
Bobby Kamansky
James May, Tulare County Resource Management Agency
Eric Osterling, Kings River Conservation District
Britton Schwartz, Community Water Center
Martin Spongberg, AMEC Geomatrix
Tricia Wathen, Ca. Dept. of Public Health
Tome Weddle, Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
John Shelton, Ca. Dept. of Fish and Game
Karl Longley, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Debbie Vaughn, Tulare County

Paul Dabbs, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Brian Smith, DWR, San Joaquin District
Michael McGinnis, DWR, San Joaquin District
Cindy Moffet, DWR, San Joaquin District
Neil Rambo, DWR, San Joaquin District
Ernie Taylor, DWR, San Joaquin District Regional Coordinator
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS