

California Water Plan Update 2009
Resource Management Strategy Workshops: Conveyance
August 25, 2008

Conveyance [Introduction]

- **clarify**: Update 2005 boundary of Delta stopped in Collinsville, but now in this update to be consistent with Delta Vision the west boundary is now at Martinez – so includes Suisun Bay and Marsh
- **clarify**: whether finance studies exist and if a preferred finance approach has been identified – capital as well as operations and maintenance
 - CALFED studies exist, but other than this the authors are not aware of any
 - Delta Vision has finance of major area of discussion – for conveyance as well as broader strategic plan
- **clarify**: how strategy fits within larger context of Delta Vision
- **clarify**: this document is not a planning document – Water Plan will not recommend a project or site-specific alternative or initiate a CEQA process
- **add**: early on mentions movement of water, while Water Plan mentions purpose of State water management is also efficient use – so early on need to talk about *efficient movement of water* as a main aim; this goes beyond just conservation and speaks to existing and future system operations – whether from energy, water supply, or water quality standpoints
 - **add**: explanation of what we mean for “efficiency” – there are many ways to discuss this
 - **add**: examples of ways to improve efficiency specifically with regard to conveyance – both statewide and regional/local
 - **add**: context is climate change
- **add**: term “water loss” is still unclear – whether gone or just moved to another area: leaking conveyance is a groundwater recharge activity or ecosystem benefit, so need to be clear about these goals
 - in last Water Plan this term was removed for this reason – had to be specific, whether water lost to the system or something else
 - **add**: since beneficial use is another charge from the Water Boards, these beneficial uses of leaky conveyance or other actions should be identified
- **add**: purpose of conveyance is not just to move water, but to move it and then put it to beneficial uses
- **clarify**: organization of chapter is confusing – talk about general, Delta, or local conveyance
 - for example, in Potential Benefits section, first sentence talks about flood management sentence, but many conveyance facilities in rural Sierra are water systems – so flood management is potential benefit not universal, but this section blurs the two
 - **suggestion for reorganization**: organizing around size would be confusing because have interregional sections, and “large” is ambiguous, suggest keeping as single strategy – many principles and concepts and objectives and requirements are the same

- to the extent that there are unique Delta or interregional aspects, sub-sections could be created
 - **suggestion for reorg:** can defer specifics and refer people to other venue where decisions are being made
- **suggestion for reorg:** combine first paragraphs and only then pull out Delta conveyance – can switch and talk about general and regional/interregional first, and then Delta as particular – could even put as a box
 - **suggestion for reorg:** if becomes too difficult, can break out Delta Conveyance as separate RMS
- **suggestion for reorg:** put overarching general stuff first, then Delta, then regional stuff – sometimes will not need all categories
- **suggestion for reorg:** deal with Delta separately from all other conveyance – the two topics are quite divergent

Conveyance in California

- **clarify:** context of this proposal, particularly the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta section: it's very general, but then get into specifics about isolated facility, need to explain *how* these benefits will be created
 - **add:** paragraph identifies negative conditions in the Delta, so could add connection that explains how these problems raise the need for some kind of alternative conveyance
- **add:** the Science and Planning section (below) offers background information about conveyance and should be moved up front to help provide context
- **add:** reference to Judge Wanger's decision – it's a driver of what's happening
- **clarify:** reference the amount of historical alteration of the Sacramento River and riverbed so that people aren't misled by the term "natural river"

Potential Benefits of Conveyance

- **clarify:** augmenting water supply is mentioned at the start of the second paragraph – is there any quantification of the benefits for this? will need to revisit numbers if new numbers come out of Delta Vision (current numbers are from CWP Update 2005)
- **clarify:** improving efficiency is mentioned, but likely would increase energy demands, so clarify how will balance additions to conveyance system with efforts to reduce energy
 - Victor notes: second to last bullet notes that decline is during *peak* periods
 - Jim notes: also night versus day costs – can do more efficiently with larger conveyance
- **clarify:** what portion of energy is being looked at – isolated facility may involve new pumps versus in-channel modifications, so clarify the boundary for the analysis of energy use and costing

- **clarify:** whether analysis exists of reduced energy costs of delivering higher quality water – in exports as well as treatment
 - Jim: insofar as exports, Franks Tract is an example – source water quality is improved and minimal energy needed for that
- **add:** efficiency, environment, recharge – these may be tradeoffs and this issue should be noted
 - **clarify:** explain depends on application in different parts of the state, which will mean that benefits (and restrictions) will accrue differently, and the applications do not always go together
- **add:** “dual conveyance” definition, note that emphasis would be on keeping freshwater in Middle River

Potential Costs of Conveyance

- **add:** some costs should be added for not just construction but operation and maintenance, as well as governance, legal/regulatory, agreements and partnerships, monitoring
- **clarify:** second paragraph costs estimates – it’s not clear what these include, what’s in and what’s out – construction, mitigation, legal, etc
 - need consistent accounting within and across strategies
- **add:** for context, add how much current conveyance structure has cost California historically, and how much it currently costs to maintain before start talking about future costs – giving an overall sense of what the system currently requires would be very helpful to reader to put future costs in perspective
 - **add:** what’s approved in terms of bonds for existing system
 - Jim notes: information exists on past costs, but DRMS is not yet complete so identifying future needed costs is difficult
 - Victor notes: Delta costs are difficult to break out because of levee maintenance activities for the freshwater corridor, so the authors will do their best but will have to caveat costs
 - **add:** if compare historic costs, have to be brought to standard dollars/inflated by some index
 - **add:** Delta conveyance is its own number, and other interregional systems are part of a regional table, because some branches of SWP more interregional

Major Issues Facing Conveyance

General comment:

- **clarify:** there are also environmental costs during construction and operation that are the impacts of the project on society, and these may not be easy to assign a dollar
 - **however, note:** costs in the Potential Costs section are supposed to parallel the benefits identified during the planning horizon (2050); externalities are typically

put in this Major Issues section – a detailed life-cycle analysis is not provided here because a site-specific, project-specific analysis would be needed for this

Science and Planning

- **clarify**: not clear how science and planning creates an obstacle to improved conveyance— need simple sentence identifying obstacle
- **clarify**: in third paragraph, the second sentence says flexibility will contribute to increased survival of anadromous fish: this is offered as statement of fact, but it’s an intended outcome – anticipated to, expected to

Regulatory Compliance

- **clarify**: again, not clear why this is an issue or obstacle, everybody has to comply
 - Victor notes: this was a listing of issues to address and not specifically obstacle
- **suggested reorganization**: unless there’s a specific aspect of this that would lead to a recommendation, this should be moved to the background section – compliance needs to be done as matter of practice, not an issue

Area of Origin Interest

- **clarify**: need standardized language – switches at some points from maintaining water to increasing, and creates wrong impression
- **add**: “area of origin” is a term of art so needs definition (see Volume 3 in Update 2005)
 - term is noted in regulatory compliance, and one concern that needs to be addressed here is that it is unclear whether new facilities would be part of State or Federal projects – if they aren’t, area of origin rights may not be protected/covered
- **add**: riparian rights are protected by another set of laws, and these need to be paired with the area of origins rights section here
- **add**: how area of origin rights are linked to water quality and fish impacts – externalized costs and redirected impacts
- **add**: need more robust context explaining court decisions
- **add**: isolated facility makes Northern Californians think Southern California is going to take all their water and is tied to governance – this is important for the context
- **add**: can flag that area of origin rights is concern for people in the Delta
 - **however**, it does not rain in the Delta much, residents are recipients of upstream water, so putting Delta under here is inappropriate, so break out this issue and cross-reference it
 - **however**, the section should not be inflammatory and explain all the fears that people have – it should lay out what needs to be considered
 - Jim notes: can add box explaining operational flexibility – moving more water means sometimes not necessarily all the time

Climate Change

- **clarify**: says “this scenario would require larger conveyance capacity...” – this is an opinion linked to the particular scenario and that might require capacity
 - the statements should be neutral and fact-based, so can add qualifying language like “some studies believe..” and add a reference

Delta Conveyance

- **suggestion for reorg:** could move parts of this up front to context, e.g., first bullet sets up context of what needs to be done, it is not an issue that would arise if something is done, while levees, on the other hand, would appropriately remain here
- **clarify:** last bullet: the term “implementation” is not clear – does it include environmental costs as well as financial?

Recommendations to Promote Conveyance

- for first recommendation, clarify what output will be – put this at the beginning, like increase output, reduce energy needs
- if public opinion is mentioned, the suggestion would be to create governance agreements that provide Northern Californians with certainty, and go with Delta Vision
 - **clarify:** nexus with Water Plan, which has a planning horizon to 2050 (even though updated every 5 years)
 - will have Companion State Plans chapter in Volume 1 that will provide greater context for nexus with Delta Vision
 - **suggestion:** add language like “leverage government initiatives and public input/outreach”

References

- add Delta & Suisun Status and Trends report, and Delta Vision context memos
 - Victor notes: this section lists documents used in the text, not all possible source

Attendance

In Room:

Lisa Beutler, Center for Collaborative Policy
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Philip Erro, Westside Resource Conservation District
Megan Fidell, DWR
Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
Rebecca Kanegawa, Montgomery-Watson Harza
Jennifer Kofoid, DWR
Bob Mannebach, Parsons Consulting
Sogol Moghadam, DWR
Robert Murrow, Winzler & Kelly
Victor Pacheco, DWR
Michael Perrone, DWR

Duke Pope, USAF Naval Postgraduate School
Endo Takahiro, UC Davis
Emilia Wisniewski, EBUD
Jim Wilde, DWR

Phone/Webinar:

Bev Anderson, SRCAF
Jim Atherstone, South San Joaquin Irrigation District
Josh Brown, no stated affiliation
Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
Barbara Hennigan, no stated affiliation
Fred Lee, Davis
John Mills, Office of John S. Mills
Lew Moeller, DWR
Judi Quan, California Alliance for Jobs
Ron Silva USBR Tracy

internal working document, not for distribution

George Visger, GeoEngineers
Lorraine White, California Energy
Commission