

California Water Plan Update 2009
Notes from Surface Storage – Regional/Local Strategy Workshop
August 19th, 2008

I. Surface Storage in California

- *Suggestion:* would like to see a graph or chart of major reservoirs in terms of relative storage space (i.e. a visual way for a layman to understand relative storage volume)
- *Suggestion:* would like to see a table of the 200 existing surface storage reservoirs in California that are more than 10,000 acre-feet, that indicates source river/streams, year of construction, beneficial uses, and who operates
 - A table like this exists in the *California Water Plan Update 2005 Volume 4 Reference Guide*. It could be updated/expanded and placed in Update 2009 Volume 4 Reference Guide (as an appendix)
- *Suggestion:* would like to have example(s) of dams that have been removed or dams that have been enlarged; it would provide a real-world case for the help the reader grasp concepts and learn from example

II. Potential Benefits of Surface Storage

- Because the emphasis here is on regional and local, mention how integrated regional water management plans include reservoir storage in their planning efforts. Explain how it local surface storage that services the watershed is linked to the principal of increasing regional self-sufficiency with respect to water supply. Example: Metropolitan Water District’s Diamond Valley Reservoir and the Kern Water Bank has enabled those regions to invest in various resource management strategies that would otherwise not have been possible
- Change the section heading to “Potential Benefits of Local/Regional Surface Storage”
- *Suggestion:* Mention if there are is significant differences in benefits for storage facilities located at the high or low (terminal) ends of the watershed (for example, for dealing with climate change or flood management)

III. Potential Costs of Surface Storage

- *Comment:* Many of the older dams had significant hydropower generation that subsidized their costs
- *Suggestion:* Many surface storage facilities are costly to maintain, upgrade, or replace as they age. Many of them are over 40 years old.
- *Suggestion:* Mention that cost has a time-scale.

IV. Major Issues Facing Surface Storage

- Add “Aging Infrastructure” as a major issue.

- Add “Siltation” as a major issue
- Add “Area of Origin” as a major issue: there is concern that groundwater will be integrated into the surface water supply, and that new dams may create unrealistic expectations for export delivery
- *Comment:* Local reservoirs impose costs on counties for O&M and safety
- *Clarify:* Mention if evaporative losses are more significant for multiple smaller local reservoirs than for larger facilities
 - Also mention if leakage is a concern (example, Oroville)
- *Suggestion:* Mention that in terms of public support and controversy for new surface storage, it matters whether the service area for a new reservoir will be inside or outside of the watershed.
- *Suggestion:* Page 3, under “Funding and Identifying Project Beneficiaries,” mention Prop 218 as an obstacle. It requires 2/3 voter approval for local cost share.

V. Recommendations to Increase Surface Storage

- *Suggestion:* Add a recommendation for life cycle analysis that includes silting.
- *Suggestion:* Rewrite Recommendations #5 and #6 to identify the entity that is supposed to implement them (i.e. the State)
- *Suggestion:* Expand on concept in Recommendation #6 to encourage partnerships and coordination between upstream and downstream entities
- *Suggestion:* Have additional funding opportunities for projects in upstream areas
- *Clarify/Suggestion:* It would be helpful to know if large hydropower (greater than 5 megawatts) will be considered a renewable resource; currently the California Energy Commission does not consider it renewable. This has major implications for FERC relicensing.
 - If the nonrenewable hydropower policy does not change, then recommend then dams not be relicensed for hydropower and instead be dedicated for water supply

Participants

In Room:

James Brobeck, Butte Environmental Council
 Justin Fredrickson, California Farm Bureau Federation
 Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
 Rebecca Kanegawa, MWH
 Vickie Newlin, Butte County
 Christopher Reeves, BIA
 Matt Zidar, GEI

On Phone:

Lloyd Fryer, Kern County Water Agency
 Nick Konovaloff, Regional Council of Rural Counties
 John Mills, Offices of John S. Mills

Melanie Powers, CABY
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

DWR and CCP:

Lisa Beutler, CCP
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Megan Fidell, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Ray Hoagland
Eric Hong, DWR
Jennifer Kofoid, DWR
Dan McManus, DWR, Northern District
Sogol Moghadam, DWR
Victor Pacheco, DWR
Michael Perrone, DWR
David Sumi, DWR
Shenjun Wu, DWR