

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, William Marble.

Board members present: William Marble – City of Woodland, WRA Chair
Cecilia Aguiar-Curry – City of Winters, Treasurer
Matt Rexroad – Yolo County
Regina Cherovsky – Reclamation District 2035
Jim Mayer – Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Sue Greenwald – City of Davis
Chris Ledesma – City of West Sacramento

Alternate members present: Tim O’Halloran – Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Jacques De Bra – City of Davis
Duane Chamberlain – Yolo County
Kurt Balasek – City of Winters
Gary Sandy- University of CA, Davis
Donita Hendrix, Dunnigan Water District

Members Agencies absent: Colusa County Water District
Reclamation District 108

Associate members present: Fran Borcalli
Lynnel Pollock, Cache Creek Conservancy

Members of the Public & Agency Staff:

Mark Cocke, City of Woodland
Cindy Tuttle, Yolo County
Max Stevenson, Yolo County Flood Control & WCD
Betsy Marchand, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Ron Berry – Wood Rodgers, Inc.
Elly Fairclough – Congressman Mike Thompson
Catherine Nou, Assemblymember Yamada
Geoff Johnson, Daily Democrat
Bob Schneider, Tuleyome
Yvonne LeMaitre, Yolo County Landowners Association
Wayne Ginsburg, Woodland Chamber of Commerce
Dave Pratt

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the agenda.

3. PUBLIC FORUM – There were no comments from the public.

4. CONSENT ITEMS - The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved all consent items.

- a. Approved minutes: March 7, 2011 Board meeting
- b. Received financial reports: March, April, May 2011
- c. Received minutes of Executive Committee: 3/1, 4/14/11
- d. Received minutes of Technical Committee: 1/20, 1/27, 2/3, 3/3, 4/7, 5/5/11

5. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. *Report from WRA Chair:* Chair Marble reported on his monthly participation in the Sacramento Metro Chamber water/flood committee meetings that review water issues pertaining to the entire region. He informed that the WRA Executive Committee meets regularly and actively discusses topics of interest for

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

the Board. Suggestions for future topics are always welcome. The Executives Committee meetings are open to the public and meeting times are posted on the WRA's website.

- b. *Correspondence*: On behalf of the WRA, Bill was one of 28 agencies to sign a comment letter on the Delta Plan from the Ag-Urban Coalition to the Delta Stewardship Council. A copy of the letter was included with the agenda packet. Tim O'Halloran is actively involved in this Coalition with ACWA and NCWA and he provided some background on the basis for the comment letter.

6. UPDATE on WATER LEGISLATION & REGULATORY ISSUES

- a. Tim O'Halloran reported on Delta legislation impacts. He gave some background information about the Ag-Urban Coalition. The Coalition represents a larger group of agencies than represented in the letter. Tim informed that the Delta Stewardship Council has released the 4th draft of their Delta Plan for public comment.

Cindy Tuttle had additional comments on the Delta Plan and Yolo County's involvement. Yolo County has concerns, along with other local agencies, about a proposed regional flood agency that has resurfaced in the 4th draft of the Delta Plan. It was previously thought that this concept died at the Delta Protection Commission level. She also informed that the Delta Protection Commission has released an Economic Sustainability Plan. Cindy encouraged everyone to read the Plan's levee analysis information. Tim reiterated that it takes a diverse team of people to review the Delta documents from a variety of perspectives in order to see the whole picture. The YCFCWCD's Delta Plan focus is mostly on water supply issues, Yolo County on land use issues and Stephen McCord of Larry Walker Associates keeps the WRA Technical Committee informed about water quality regulations and in particular methylmercury issues.

- b. Other legislation: Tim reported that the YCFCWCD is actively monitoring SBx7-7's impacts of the agricultural measuring legislation. DWR is writing the regulations to implement the legislation. Unfortunately for ag water businesses, this is shaping up to be a costly regulation requiring them to install gate metering equipment. The task of defining ag water use efficiency is also part of that legislation. The Regional Board, through their irrigated lands program, is engaging in the next phase of groundwater quality monitoring. They are engaging Central Valley stakeholders in the process by asking for their input. Tim wanted the WRA Board to be aware that members of the Technical Committee are watching and involved in these processes.

7. WRA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (TC) UPDATE

- a. *Technical Committee Report* : Jacques De Bra, TC Chair, reported on the proposed FY 2011-12 project funding recommendations for Board approval as outlined in the Technical Committee Report (see below). The unallocated funds will be reserved for proposals anticipated later in FY2011-12. The TC will review funding proposals, which will be presented to the WRA Board for consideration and approval prior to allocation. The project fund recommendations will be adopted as part of the FY2011-12 operating budget in Agenda Item #8.

Jacques was asked to clarify the scope of the foundational action to development a surface monitoring program during discussion of Item 8a. The project is not going to analyze surface water data, but proposes to develop a program to collect existing data and organize the data, which is currently not available in any one location.

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

Recommended FY2011-12 WRA Project Funds Allocation

Project	WRA Funding	Local Match	Total Project Costs
Foundational Action: Develop surface water monitoring program	\$ 35,000	TBD	\$ 70,000 over two-years
Yolo Bypass Integrated Action-Yolo Bypass Working Group/YBF	\$ 20,000	YBF	Varies
Westside IRWMP/ Proposition 84 Funding (5 County MOU)	\$35,000	Cost Share Westside MOU	\$1.2M
Administrative Legislative/Legal Support Services	\$ 18,194	TBD	\$ 35,000
Unallocated Project Funds reserve	\$52,118	-	-
TOTAL	\$160,312		

- b. Receive Final Yolo County IRWMP 2011 Project Accomplishments and Implementation by 2020 Priority Project lists: Jacques reported on the TC's committed effort to review all 200+ actions in the Yolo County IRWMP adopted in 2007. The two lists presented are a condensed summary of that work effort. These lists will be updated annually to document project accomplishments and progress. The Priority Projects list will assist the WRA in prioritizing regional needs for future funding opportunities. Chair Marble suggested highlighting both lists in a summary report from the Technical Committee to each WRA member agency. Especially the Priority actions which are the "living document" part of the IRWMP. The WRA Board concurred.
- c. Update on Westside IRWMP/Proposition 84 Planning Grant Process: The WRA is a signatory on the Westside Regional Water Management Group which was awarded a \$1 million Proposition 84 planning grant to develop a Westside IRWMP. The WRA's cost share of this 5 county collaborative effort is \$35,000 for FY 2011-12. Work is scheduled to begin later this year.

8. ADOPT FY 2011-12 WRA OPERATING BUDGET

- a. Review FY 2010-11 Projected Year-End Budget: Cecilia Curry, WRA Treasurer, reviewed the current year's income and expenses to-date and the projected year-end figures for June 30th. The final year-end budget will be presented at the September Board meeting.
- b. Review and adopt FY 2011-12 Budget: Cecilia reviewed the details of the proposed budget for Board adoption for FY2011-12. She reviewed income and expense items that have changed from FY2010-11 to FY2011-12 as detailed in the side-by-side column comparison. The Board motioned, seconded and unanimously approved the FY2011-12 budget.
- c. WRA Accomplishments FY 2010-11: A list of WRA's fiscal year accomplishments is presented to the Board for informational purposes as part of the budget adoption process.

9. PRESENTATION: California Water Resources "The Cost of Doing Nothing"

Chair Marble introduced John Brown who is currently a member of the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) and past Vice Chairman of the California State Water Resources Control Board.

Background:

John grew up in Visalia and relayed his childhood memories of the Westside of the San Joaquin Valley when its soil characteristics were inhospitable for agricultural. The Federal government's Central Valley Project (CVP) brought water to the Westside so that farmers could reclaim the land and grow profitable crops. Over time, money and effort, the soil improved and the cropping patterns grew from field crops to row crops to

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

more high value permanent crops with reduced water needs. Some believe that this relationship represents the Federal government subsidizing California agriculture through the CVP which is unfair to the other water needs, while others believe it was a sound Federal investment turning thousands of acres of useless land into a highly productive agriculture area sharing the wealth with local communities while paying local, State and Federal taxes.

Problem:

Today's critical water issue in California is the imbalance of supply vs. demand. The total long-term average yield of regulated water in California is approximately 33 million acre feet per year (afy), while the long-term average demand is approximately 35 million afy. This 2 million acre feet shortfall is expected to grow considerably in the near future for the following reasons. The settlement of litigation between Arizona vs. California and five Native American tribes along the Colorado River water has resulted in 200-400,000 afy that may no longer be available to California. The recent completion of the Central Arizona Project will result in the loss of approximately 662,000 afy previously used by Southern California. The population of California is projected to grow from approximately 36 million to around 50 million by 2030-2040*, therefore the shortfall or need could easily grow to 5-7 million afy. The state-wide approach to compensate for this shortfall has been by over-drafting (mining) groundwater basins.

Examples:

John gave several examples of how mining groundwater basins can have negative impacts. The Salinas Valley produces almost 10% of the State's agricultural economy on 200,000 acres of irrigated land and uses approximately 570,000 afy, which is about 70,000 afy more than the basin's safe yield. As a result this basin has seawater intrusion into the 180 foot aquifer to within about a mile of downtown Salinas. Ground subsidence caused by over-drafting is another factor that decreases an aquifer's recharge capacity. He illustrated his point by passing around a photo of land subsidence in the Mendota area where the ground elevation has subsided 30 feet since 1955. The photo of a telephone pole showed where the ground elevation was in 1955 compared to today. (Photo viewed at: <http://ga.water.usgs.gov/edu/earthgwlandsubside.html>).

Solutions:

John relayed that there are only a few solutions to resolve this supply versus demand imbalance - either develop more water or use less water or a combination of both.

Focusing on building any new projects can be a polarizing issue. Generally, people don't change their point of view on specific projects where, in their opinion, the benefits do not outweigh the project's environmental concerns and/or costs.

To address the need of **additional regulated water**, the last major project constructed in California for water yield and flood control was back in 1982, which was New Melones Dam and reservoir (except for Kern County Groundwater Bank). This is not to say that the State and Federal Agencies have not tried to develop new projects, quite the contrary. Over the last 30 plus years many State and Federal agencies have pursued developing additional water supplies only to be stopped due to cost and/or environmental concerns. However, John believes that the type of analysis made for such projects did not address the over-riding concerns of the damage to renewable resources (groundwater basins) and the economic effect on the state as a whole, if nothing is done. It is this consideration that must be evaluated on specific project solutions and not just the advantages or disadvantages of site specific project analysis.

To **use less water**, California agriculture uses approximately 80% of all regulated water, generally with very high irrigation efficiency. Agriculture has for the last 30-40 years continued to improve on irrigation practices along with converting to higher value crops, usually requiring considerable less water to irrigate.

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

However, some water conservation improvements can be made as growers convert to higher value permanent crops provided there is some certainty of a reliable water supply.

Summary:

Water demands in the State continue to grow along with the imbalance and short fall. One may argue about the quantity of shortfall where it is 2-5 million afy, but the point is it should be nothing. There should be no mining of resources from future generations. For supply, all domestic, agricultural and environmental needs are important to the State. To try and resolve certain short-falls and needs of one by taking from another is not a solution.

In addition:

1. John considers the imbalance of supply and resulting impacts on groundwater basins, fallowing of agricultural land, the loss of local, State and Federal taxes, and loss of jobs to local communities, collectively, the “Cost of Doing Nothing”. These costs to our State are a magnitude greater than the negative impacts generally considered for any specific project. It is this kind of a cost analysis that must be considered in future alternatives to insure a balanced water supply vs. demand for future generations.
2. Groundwater is an important source of supply for domestic and agricultural needs and serves to supplement surface water during drought years. State regulation of groundwater will not increase supply and therefore is not an answer to balancing supply with demands.
3. To assist in his endeavor, John suggests that California needs a “Statewide Water Master Plan” that would balance supplies with demand and for project benefits to be integrated with flood control needs, water resources sustainability, recreation, and power generation, all resulting in a greater project payment capacity and chance of attaining broader support.

In Summary, John stated the over-riding issue is whether today’s responsible citizens want to pay our own way (water wise) for these resources we use or do we continue mining our limited water resources from future generations. If the answer is “we collectively do not wish to mine these resources from the little people“, then it begs the question “how can we best accomplish this most worthy goal?” John suggested we try with a “State-Wide Master Plan” that would first and foremost include the needs of all Californians.

John heard comments and answered questions from the Board and public. Chair Marble thanked John for his timely and informative presentation.

*Post meeting notes: California 2010 census population is now over 37 million (source: <http://2010.census.gov>);

Reference: John W. Brown, Registered Civil Engineer, Registered Agricultural Engineer, Graduate of the California Agricultural Leadership Program, Chief Engineer Irvine Co., Vice Chairman SWRCB, National and International Consulting Engineer, Board Member CVFPB

10. PRESENTATION: Current Water Issues and Considerations for Yolo County

Chair Marble introduced Senator Lois Wolk, 5th Senate District. Senator Wolk began by discussing the current changing dynamics regarding water in California. She feels there are unique factors that offer opportunities to help shape the debate and outlined several important points stemming from recent developments.

- The National Academy of Science reviewed the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan’s (BDCP) science and released a report critical of their science findings.

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

- Secretary John Laird stated that the BDCP's outcomes were no longer predetermined, which was contrary to previous statements. This means that to participate in the BDCP, a pre-condition for supporting conveyance is not required.
- Southern California water agencies continue to feud amongst themselves. Recently, the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) has become more vocal with lawmakers and the media about seeking independence from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). The SDCWA receives 25% of its water supply from the MWD. The SDCWA has stated that MWD's vision for the future and the BDCP may be too costly for Southern California ratepayers. They criticize the assumptions that underlie the BDCP's statement of need. The Achilles' heel in this scenario has always been what is it going to cost and who is going to pay for building conveyance. MWD has stated that those who use the canal will pay for it, but the price is astronomical and growing. MWD is a wholesaler so its retail ratepayers will foot this cost. Local Southern California water agencies have an ongoing concern that their ratepayers will not pay substantially higher fees for building a northern conveyance system when there are other local priorities to fund. It is not clear how this expensive BDCP process can move forward if they do not have the financial backing of the water exporters.
- The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) called for new flow criteria for the Delta to determine how much fresh water the Delta needs. The legislation asked for flow determinations and the SWRCB responded by sending a letter to the Delta Stewardship Council stating that a good starting point for analysis would be a ranking of alternatives that would increase Delta outflows by 1.5 million acre feet per year. The incorporation of this response in the Delta Plan set off a firestorm of conflict.
- The Delta Protection Commission just released a first draft of an economic analysis plan, as required by legislation. Senator Wolk urged everyone to read it. The report attributes a monetary figure on what the cost of the Delta process will be to agriculture, the counties, and recreation and for mitigation.
- Governor Brown declared war on the State's wall of debt, because California cannot afford more debt. This will affect whether or not the State will consider a general obligation water bond again.

The current changing dynamic presents an opportunity to be realistic about what California needs to do to resolve a variety of crisis situations. The answers need to be respectful of the climate we are now in and will likely be for the next generation. Senator Wolk stated that Yolo County is on the cutting edge of the Delta situation because it will be the first impacted and is working with MWD and the Administration. Although all five counties may have different interests, they are working in partnership for solutions that benefit common regional goals.

Senator Wolk discussed three bills that she introduced this year. SB 200 (Delta Protections) was an effort to be very specific about the impact that a canal might have and who was going to be responsible. Although the initial response to the bill was contentious, it resulted in a wide variety of regional agencies coming to the table to talk. SB 200 is now a 2-year bill, which allows more discussions for building a coalition. Senator Wolk anticipates that SB 834 (Water Plans: Reduced Delta Reliance) will be successful. The bill adds language requiring IRWMP's to demonstrate compliance to the State policy (WC Section 85021) concerning reducing reliance on the Delta for water supply and improving regional self-reliance for water. Senator Wolk introduced another 2-year bill, SB 571 (Water Finance Reform), to establish a policy on how to fund water projects differently. She explained how the bill was modeled after transportation funding policies that identify a consensus based list of priority projects. This process of establishing a list of priority projects in advance has not previously been prepared for water.

**MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2011
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION OF YOLO COUNTY**

Senator Wolk heard comments and answered questions from the Board and public. Chair Marble thanked Senator Wolk for addressing the WRA Board with important regional and legislative information.


11. MEMBERS' REPORTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

This item was not covered due to time constraints.

12. NEXT MEETING DATE: September 19, 2011 from 3-5 pm, Woodland Community Center

13. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Donna L. Gentile

Board Secretary & Administrative Coordinator