

**California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee  
Water Supply Subcommittee  
Wednesday November 5, 2008  
9:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon  
Bonderson Hearing Room  
901 P Street  
Sacramento, California**

**Meeting Summary**

**Introductions**

The following California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) members attended the meeting: Ronald Jacobsma, Jerry Meral and Richard Denton (for Greg Gartrell).

The meeting focused on the following agenda items (listed in the order presented at the meeting and is different than the agenda):

1. Integrated Regional Water Management (Ralph Svetich)
2. Delta Vision (Leo Winternitz)
3. Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDPC) (Paul Marshall)
4. Public Policy Institute of California (Jeff Mount)
5. Storage Update (Ron Ganzfried/Steve Roberts)
6. Budget for 2008-2009 (Steve Roberts)
7. Water Bonds (Steve Roberts)
8. Public Comments

Wendy Martin was expected to report on drought planning and related water conservation planning, but she was unable to attend the meeting.

Jerry Meral and Ron Jacobsma, Water Supply Subcommittee co-chairs, opened the meeting by welcoming those attending and reviewing the meeting agenda.

The summary below provides a brief overview of the presentations at the meeting, as well as comments and questions received from the subcommittee and meeting participants.

**1. Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) - Ralph Svetich, Department of Water Resources (DWR)**

Ralph Svetich provided a summary of IRWM and IRWM grant programs. IRWM is a cornerstone of the California Water Plan. IRWM encourages regional relationships and planning, and considers all aspects of water resources planning, including water quality, water supply and demand, water uses, land uses, stormwater and flood management, etc. The direct objectives of the IRWM program are:

- Improve water supply reliability
- Protect and improve water quality
- Ensure sustainability through environmental stewardship.

Additionally, the program promotes multiple benefits and provides financial incentives for regional planning. The IRWM program includes multiple grant opportunities and strives to streamline the grant process. The IRWM program provides grants for the development of IRWM plans (planning grants) and for the implementation of existing IRWM plans (implementation grants). IRWM grant funds were initially provided under Proposition 50, through which DWR and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) awarded \$24 million for 29 planning grants and \$365 million for 22 implementation grants. The 22 implementation grants were inclusive of 213 discrete projects. The next cycle of grant funding is currently being planned, along with several informational workshops to be held in November, 2008. The funding for the next grant cycle comes from Propositions 84, which will provide \$100 million for implementation projects, and 1E, which will provide \$150 million for stormwater management and flood damage reduction projects.

### **Questions/Comments**

- *There are already a number of regional groups with IRWM plans, will there be any conflicts with SBX2-1? Next week there will be a Roundtable of Regions, which will be a venue for DWR to discuss the region acceptance process and new guidelines.*
- *Are there expenditure plans or cost effectiveness metrics, such as dollars per acre-foot, that DWR is reviewing the projects for? Currently, there is insufficient staff in the program to do those types of reviews. Additionally, dollar per acre-foot values vary significantly across the State. Another metric used could be projected yield versus actual yield. These metrics could be used to determine a particular project's success, but there would be no penalties associated with not meeting them.*
- *These types of metrics would be good to show the legislators for funding renewals. The program is starting to do this through Bond Accountability (Tracie Billington).*
- *It is difficult to represent project benefits in dollars per acre-foot, because it is not representative of the multiple benefits of a project.*

### **Action Items**

- *The Committee would like a program update in six months.*

## **2. Delta Vision - Leo Winternitz, CALFED**

Mr. Winternitz explained what Delta Vision was and summarized the Delta Vision Strategic Plan. The Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force was created two years ago by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger to achieve a durable solution for Delta sustainability. In addition to the Task Force, there is a Delta Vision Committee, stakeholder coordination group, and science advisor group that work together to fulfill this mission.

On October 17, 2008, the Task Force unveiled its statewide blueprint for a sustainable Delta—the finalized and adopted Delta Vision Strategic Plan. The plan included a comprehensive set of recommendations designed to ensure long-term sustainable management of the Delta. The recommendations were developed based on Delta Vision's seven overarching goals:

1. Legally acknowledge the co-equal goals of restoring the Delta ecosystem and creating a more reliable water supply for California.
2. Recognize and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the California Delta as an evolving place, an action critical to achieving the co-equal goals.
3. Restore the Delta ecosystem as the heart of a healthy estuary.
4. Promote statewide water conservation, efficiency, and sustainable use.
5. Build facilities to improve the existing water conveyance system and expand statewide storage, and operate both to achieve the co-equal goals.
6. Reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta by effective emergency preparedness, appropriate land uses, and strategic levee investments.
7. Establish a new governance structure with the authority, responsibility, accountability, science support, and secure funding to achieve these goals.

The Strategic Plan is being reviewed by the Delta Vision Committee, which is chaired by the Secretary for the Resources Agency, Mike Chrisman. By December 31, 2008, the Committee will send the recommendations to the Governor, with the expectation that enabling legislation will be adopted in 2009.

### **Questions/Comments**

- *What will be the difference between the California Delta Ecosystem and Water Council, and the Delta Protection Commission?* The California Delta Ecosystem and Water Council will have overriding authority and ensure that decisions made by the Delta Protection Commission are consistent with a new Delta Ecosystem and Water Plan (to be developed).
- *How does OCAP (Operations Criteria and Plan) affect the Delta Vision goals?* Mr. Winternitz assumed a new plan would be developed for adapting to OCAP.
- *How does BDCP fit into the Delta Vision Strategic Plan?* BDCP is looking at long-term operating strategies for the Delta. What comes out of BDCP will be rolled into the Delta Ecosystem and Water Plan.
- *Where does drinking water fit in the co-equal goals?* Water supply and water quality are specifically called out in the Strategic Plan. Drinking water is addressed within both goals (i.e., water quality will improve with a restored Delta ecosystem).

**Action Items - None identified.**

### **3. Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), Paul Marshall, DWR**

The last update in BDCP was provided to the BDPAC in March 2008. Mr. Marshall provided a brief status report on the progress of the Conveyance Work Group, Habitat Restoration Program Technical Team, and Other Stressors Work Group. The Conveyance Work Group looked at four types of diversion facilities at ten locations along the Sacramento River. The Conveyance Work Group has technical teams looking at project impacts on habitat, flood flows, salinity and X2, exports, and water quality. The Habitat Restoration Program Technical Team looked at appropriate locations for tidal and floodplain habitat, including a habitat corridor concept. Tidal habitat would require an appropriate land elevation; much of the central Delta has subsided

too significantly to have candidate islands for tidal habitat restoration. BDCP looked at using floodplain areas for habitat restoration, such the Yolo Bypass. If operated differently, the Yolo Bypass (provided as an example only) could provide habitat for a variety of anadromous fish and other aquatic species during certain times of the year. The Other Stressors Work Group has looked at the impact of contaminants in the Delta and the work of other agencies on the BDCP. A BDCP draft plan is expected in December 2008, followed by project scoping in early 2009, and the Draft EIS/EIR at the end of 2009.

### Questions/Comments

- *How consistent is the BDCP governance strategy with Delta Vision's?* BDCP has looked at Delta Vision's strategy, but has also come up with its own ideas. There is some definite agreement between the two; a single body is needed to review actions that may have conflicting focuses.
- *Delta Vision recommended coordination of storage and conveyance studies. Do you know if BDCP is using Common Assumptions?* BDCP has not looked much at storage. However, modeling assessments were made to determine the impact of plans on surface storage. The Integration Working Group is looking at this.
- *Is BDCP coordinating modeling assumptions with the surface storage investigations?* Yes, BDCP has tiered off of Common Assumptions and has looked at various OCAP impacts.
- *Delta Vision has recommended that the State start looking at diverting more water in wetter periods when habitat impacts are less and to mitigate climate change impacts.*

**Action Items** - None identified.

#### **4. Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), Jeff Mount, University of California, Davis**

Dr. Mount summarized *Comparing Delta Futures*, the follow-up report to *Envisioning Delta Futures*. PPIC believes the Delta of tomorrow will be substantially different, as the Delta is in a "state of degradation" due to physical instability (i.e., insufficient levees), ecosystem instability (i.e., habitat alterations and invasive species), and worsening water quality. PPIC looked at the net value of each Delta island to make a determination if island restoration made economic sense following a levee breach and flood event. PPIC believes it does not make economic sense to upgrade the Delta levee system, but to continue the cycle of levee failure and repair. They even determined that for 10-19 islands levee repair after failure did not make economic sense. In fact, for islands in the western and central Delta, PPIC determined it made "ecosystem-sense" not to repair levee failures.

Additionally, PPIC looked at four export strategies for the Delta:

1. Current export system
2. A peripheral canal (isolated conveyance facility)
3. Dual conveyance
4. No exports

PPIC concluded that a peripheral canal with additional fish improvements satisfied the most economic and environmental goals. PPIC also concluded that the State must be prepared for a changing Delta ecosystem and the final solution must be multi-purpose, eco-friendly, and diverse physically and hydrologically.

### Questions/Comments

- *Fetch will be a significant concern for such large bodies of water in the Delta if flooded islands are not restored.* Yes, that is a significant challenge that we are starting to look into.
- *Are the costs of doing the “Eco-friendly” Delta included in the Peripheral Canal alternative?* No, the costs and impacts are not known. An interesting and telling method would be to flood an island now for study.
- *Why is Frank’s Tract not a good indicator?* Frank’s Tract was not deeply subsided when it was flooded; it is difficult to know how the deeply subsided islands would react.
- *The appendices of the PPIC report will be presented and examined next week during a 2-day meeting in Sacramento.*
- *Has PPIC considered USGS (US Geological Survey) subsidence reversal methods?* PPIC looked at subsidence reversal, but some islands could take hundreds of years to return to former elevations and these islands would likely be impacted by levee failures within that timeframe.
- *PPIC should consider attaching CD with report appendices to hard bound report.* Good idea. That will be suggested to the publisher.
- PPIC report, presentation, and fish/money model are on the PPIC website.

**Action Items** - *None identified.*

### 5. Storage Update, Ron Ganzfried/Steve Roberts, DWR

Steve Roberts and Ron Ganzfried summarized current surface storage investigations. Steve Roberts opened the discussion by relating how the State budget and OCAP revisions impact the planning studies:

- **State Budget** – There was no budget for surface storage in FY 2007/2008. *SBX2-1* appropriated \$15.8 million for FYs 2008/2009 and 2009/2010. However, the funds will likely not be available until March 2009 because the money was appropriated during a special session that is not scheduled to end until November 30 (statutes approved during special session are not enacted until 90 days after the session ends).
- **OCAP** – The revised OCAP will change future operations in the Delta for exporters and diverters; thereby, changing the modeling and planning assumptions used for investigations. The US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion is expected in December 2008; whereas the National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion is not expected until March 2009.

Even with the challenges from the State budget and OCAP, State Feasibility Reports for the investigations are due December 31, 2009. The surface storage investigations include:

1. Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigations – investigating various Shasta Dam raises to increase survival of anadromous fish species in the Sacramento River and increase water supply and water supply reliability.
2. North-of-the-Delta Offstream (NODOS) Storage – investigating offstream storage potential north of the Delta to increase the survival of anadromous fish and other aquatic species; increase water supply and water supply reliability for urban, agricultural, and environmental purposes; and improve Delta water quality.
3. Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion – investigating increasing the size of Los Vaqueros Reservoir to develop environmental water supplies for fish protection and habitat management and increase water supply reliability for water providers within the San Francisco Bay Area.
4. Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigation – investigating various water storage alternatives to improve water supply reliability and system operational flexibility and enhance water temperature and flow conditions in the San Joaquin River.

Preliminary estimates show these investigations to be cost effective (e.g., having benefit/cost ratios greater than one).

### Questions/Comments

- *All of the investigations are doing feasibility studies?* Correct.
- *What are climate change impacts on flood control space in Shasta?* The impacts are still to be determined, however, the Shasta investigation (and all other surface storage investigations) will address impacts of climate change.
- *Are the Tehama-Colusa and Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District canals large enough to fill Sites Reservoir and supply the farmers?* Yes, the reservoir will be filled during the rainy season. However, the operations are dependent on new facilities at Red Bluff Diversion Dam.
- *Has the NODOS Investigation used Cal-Lite?* No, Cal-Lite does not accommodate the needs of the investigation.
- *What is the progress of Hetch Hetchy and Santa Clara Valley Water District studies/projects?* Reclamation has not been involved in those studies.
- *What is the height of the Shasta Dam raise reflected in the benefits table?* Eighteen and a half feet.
- *Monetizing environmental benefits is difficult to do, how are the investigations tackling this?* So far the benefits account for water available for environmental purposes. We are developing a variety of models to determine fish benefits.
- *Does the table reflect total capacity or yield?* Total capacity.
- Between the investigations the average cost of the water is \$300 per acre-foot.

**Action Items** - None identified.

## **6. Budget for 2008-2009, Steve Roberts, DWR**

Steve Roberts thought the State Budget was adequately covered under Item 5 (please refer to Item 5 first bullet) and asked if there were any further questions. As there were none, the committee moved on to the next agenda item.

**Questions/Comments** - *None received.*

**Action Items** - *None identified.*

## **7. Water Bonds, Steve Roberts, DWR**

Steve Roberts referred the audience to State Bond Appropriation handout.

**Questions/Comments** - *None received.*

**Action Items** - *None identified.*

## **8. Public Comments**

- *For Common Assumptions, does water use efficiency include 20% reduction? No it currently does not.*

*The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.*